Acute Effects of Cannabidiol on Hippocampal Blood Flow in People at Clinical High Risk for Psychosis
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ABSTRACT

Background: Hippocampal hyperperfusion has been observed in people at Clinical High Risk for Psychosis (CHR), is implicated in the pathophysiology driving psychosis onset and represents a potential disease-modifying treatment target. Whether cannabidiol (CBD) has ameliorative effects on hippocampal blood flow (rCBF) in CHR patients remains unknown.

Methods: Using a randomised, double-blind, parallel-group design, 33 CHR patients were randomised to a single oral 600mg dose of CBD or placebo. Nineteen healthy controls were studied under identical conditions but did not receive any drug. Hippocampal rCBF was measured using Arterial Spin Labelling. We examined differences relating to CHR status (controls vs placebo), effects of CBD in CHR (placebo vs CBD) and linear between-group relationships, such that placebo>CBD>controls or controls>CBD>placebo, using a combination of hypothesis-driven and exploratory wholebrain analyses.

Results: Placebo-treated patients had significantly higher hippocampal rCBF bilaterally (all $p_{FWE}<.01$) compared to controls. There were no suprathreshold voxels in the CBD vs placebo contrast. However, we found a significant linear relationship in the right hippocampus ($p_{FWE}=.035$) such that rCBF was highest in the placebo group, lowest in controls and intermediate in the CBD group. Exploratory wholebrain results replicated previous findings of hyperperfusion in the hippocampus, striatum and midbrain in CHR patients, and provided novel evidence of increased rCBF in inferior-temporal and lateral-occipital regions in patients under CBD compared to placebo.

Conclusions: Our findings suggest that CBD may partially normalise alterations in hippocampal blood flow associated with the CHR state and therefore merits further investigation as a potential novel treatment for this population.
INTRODUCTION

Psychotic disorders such as schizophrenia are usually preceded by a prodromal stage, characterised by attenuated psychotic symptoms and social, emotional and cognitive dysfunction (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020a). Such individuals are said to be at Clinical High Risk for psychosis (CHR) and have a ~20% three-year risk of transitioning to the full-blown disorder (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020a). The neurobiological mechanisms underlying psychosis onset are incompletely understood (Millan et al., 2016), but compelling evidence places hippocampal dysfunction at the centre of its pathophysiology (Tamminga et al., 2010; Lieberman et al., 2018; Knight et al., 2022). Specifically, preclinical models suggest that hippocampal hyperactivity is key to the development of psychosis and arises due to NMDA receptor hypofunction on GABAergic interneurons, leading to disinhibition of hippocampal pyramidal cells (Lodge and Grace, 2007; Lisman et al., 2008) (Supplementary Fig S1). This is thought to drive hypermetabolism and elevated blood flow in the hippocampus (Schobel et al., 2013) as well as downstream midbrain-striatal hyperdopaminergia (Modinos et al., 2015; Grace and Gomes, 2019), with the consequent induction of psychotic-like phenotypes in animals and symptoms in humans (Fig S1).

These findings are consistent with in vivo evidence of increased hippocampal blood volumes in patients with established psychosis (Schobel et al., 2009; Talati et al., 2014, 2015; McHugo et al., 2019) and at baseline in CHR patients who go on to transition (Schobel et al., 2009, 2013). Further work demonstrates that resting regional cerebral blood flow (rCBF) in the hippocampus is increased in CHR patients relative to controls (Allen et al., 2016, 2018a), with longitudinal reductions in hippocampal rCBF associated with remission from the CHR state (Allen et al., 2016). Hippocampal rCBF has also been associated with prefrontal GABA levels (Modinos et al., 2018b) and striatal dopamine function (Modinos et al., 2021) in CHR individuals. Hippocampal hyperactivity (and associated hyperperfusion) therefore represent potential disease-modifying treatment targets. Importantly, as the CHR state progresses to the first episode of psychosis, functional perturbations originating in the hippocampus appear to spread to regions such as the frontal cortex (Schobel et al., 2013; Lieberman et al., 2018), and excitotoxic as well as atrophic processes culminate in hippocampal volume loss (Ho et al., 2017b, 2017a; Vargas et al., 2017) (Fig S1). If functional hippocampal changes precede structural (atrophic) changes, treatments targeted to hippocampal hyperactivity during the CHR stage may prove more effective as preventative strategies. However, there are currently no licensed pharmacological interventions for people at CHR (Davies et al., 2018a, 2018b), which remains a critical unmet need.
One of the most promising candidate treatments is cannabidiol (CBD), a phytocannabinoid constituent of the cannabis plant (Davies and Bhattacharyya, 2019). Compared to the main psychoactive cannabinoid in cannabis, delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), which has psychotomimetic (D’Souza et al., 2004; Bhattacharyya et al., 2009; Morrison et al., 2009; Englund et al., 2013; Sherif et al., 2016) and potential anxiogenic effects, CBD is non-intoxicating and has anxiolytic (Bergamaschi et al., 2011; Crippa et al., 2011) and antipsychotic properties (Leweke et al., 2012; Crippa et al., 2018; McGuire et al., 2018). However, the mechanisms underlying these effects remain unclear. In healthy volunteers and patients with established psychosis, CBD modulates blood-oxygen-level-dependent (BOLD) haemodynamic responses to fMRI tasks in several regions, particularly medial temporal cortex and striatum, as well as functional connectivity between these regions (Fusar-Poli et al., 2009; Bhattacharyya et al., 2010, 2012, 2015; Gunasekera et al., 2020; O’Neill et al., 2021b). In CHR patients, we previously demonstrated that a 600mg dose of CBD partially normalises mediotemporal and striatal function during verbal memory (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018) and fear processing (Davies et al., 2020), such that activation in the CBD group was intermediate between that of healthy controls and CHR patients under placebo. CBD has also been shown to modulate hippocampal perfusion. Two single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT) studies found reductions in hippocampal blood flow following CBD in healthy individuals (Crippa et al., 2004) and patients with social anxiety disorder (Crippa et al., 2011). Conversely, a more recent study using Arterial Spin Labelling (ASL) found that CBD increased hippocampal rCBF in healthy participants, a specific effect not found in five other regions-of-interest (ROIs) (Bloomfield et al., 2019). The presence of hippocampal effects across all three prior studies is encouraging and suggests that CBD may engage one of the most strongly implicated neurobiological treatment targets for people at CHR. However, whether CBD has ameliorative effects on hippocampal blood flow in CHR patients remains to be investigated.

To address this gap, in the present study we used ASL to examine hippocampal blood flow in three parallel groups: CHR patients randomised to CBD or placebo and healthy controls. On the basis of data from previous studies in CHR populations (Allen et al., 2016, 2018a), we selected bilateral ROIs within the hippocampus and assessed extra-hippocampal effects with exploratory wholebrain analyses. We first established whether CHR patients under placebo conditions show elevated hippocampal blood flow compared to healthy controls. We then tested our primary hypothesis that CHR patients receiving CBD would show at least partial ‘normalisation’ of hippocampal blood flow in the same regions identified as different in the placebo vs control analyses. That is, perfusion in the CBD group would be intermediate between that observed in healthy controls and the CHR placebo group.
PATIENTS & METHODS

Participants
The study was registered (ISRCTN46322781) and received Research Ethics (Camberwell St Giles) approval. All participants provided written informed consent. Thirty-three antipsychotic-naive CHR individuals, aged 18–35, were recruited from specialist early detection services in the United Kingdom. CHR status was determined using the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States (CAARMS) criteria (Yung et al., 2005). Briefly, subjects met one or more of the following subgroup criteria: (a) attenuated psychotic symptoms, (b) brief limited intermittent psychotic symptoms (psychotic episode lasting <1 week, remitting without treatment), or (c) either schizotypal personality disorder or first-degree relative with psychosis, all coupled with functional decline (Yung et al., 2005). Nineteen age (within 3 years), sex and ethnicity-matched healthy controls were recruited locally by advertisement. Exclusion criteria included history of psychotic or manic episode, current DSM-IV diagnosis of substance dependence (except cannabis), IQ<70, neurological disorder or severe intercurrent illness, and any contraindication to magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or treatment with CBD. Participants were required to abstain from cannabis for 96h, other recreational substances for 2 weeks, alcohol for 24h and caffeine and nicotine for 6h before attending. A urine sample prior to scanning was used to screen for illicit drug use and pregnancy.

Design, Materials, Procedure
Using a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, three-arm parallel-group design, CHR participants were randomised to a single oral 600mg dose of CBD (THC-Pharm) or a matched placebo capsule. This dose was selected based on previous findings that doses of 600-800 mg/day are effective in established psychosis (Leweke et al., 2012) and anxiety (Bergamaschi et al., 2011). Psychopathology was measured at baseline (before drug administration) using the CAARMS (positive and negative symptoms) and State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (State Subscale). Following a standard light breakfast, participants were administered the capsule (at ~11AM) and 180 min later, underwent a battery of MRI sequences. This interval between drug administration and MRI acquisition was selected based on previous findings describing peak plasma concentrations at 180min following oral administration (Martin-Santos et al., 2012; Millar et al., 2018). Control participants were investigated under identical conditions but did not receive any drug. Plasma CBD levels were sampled at baseline and at 120 and 300 min after drug administration.

MRI Acquisition and Image Processing
All scans were acquired on a General Electric Signa HDx 3T MR system with an 8-channel head coil. For image registration, high resolution T2-weighted Fast Spin Echo (FSE) and T1-weighted Spoiled Gradient Recalled images were acquired. Resting CBF was measured using pseudo-Continuous ASL acquired with a 3D-FSE spiral multi-shot readout. Acquisition parameters and preprocessing procedures (conducted using FMRIB Software Library; FSL/6.0.2) were in line with previous studies and are detailed in the Supplementary Methods.

**Statistical Analysis**

**Global Blood Flow**
To exclude potential group differences in global CBF, we extracted mean CBF values from the MNI152 grey matter mask (thresholded at >.50 probability) for each subject using fslmeants in FSL. We then conducted analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) in SPSS 27 using mean-centred age, sex, education and smoking as covariates. All subsequent analyses were conducted with global CBF as a nuisance covariate.

**Hippocampal Blood Flow**
Analyses of rCBF data were conducted using Statistical Parametric Mapping 12 (SPM12) in Matlab/R2018b using an ROI approach. Hippocampal ROIs were specified *a priori* using coordinates from a previous (Allen et al., 2016) (and replicated (Allen et al., 2018a)) study comparing CBF in CHR patients vs healthy controls, which have since been used in studies across the extended psychosis phenotype (Modinos et al., 2018b, 2018a); MNI coordinates in right: x=20, y=-28, z=-8 and left hippocampus: x=-22, y=-28, z=-8. 6mm spheres around these coordinates (123 voxels per ROI) were combined into a single volume and used as an explicit mask (246 voxels in total). In line with our first objective, we used an independent samples t-test to compare the placebo-treated CHR group with healthy controls to identify differences in rCBF (within our pre-defined ROIs) related to CHR status. In a second independent samples t-test, we directly compared CHR patients under placebo with those under CBD to test whether CBD had effects on rCBF in the same ROIs. Finally, to test our primary hypothesis that rCBF in the CBD group would be intermediate between that of the healthy control and placebo groups, we examined whether a linear relationship in rCBF (controls>CBD>placebo; or placebo>CBD>controls) existed within the same ROIs using ANCOVA (flexible factorial). In line with previous CHR studies of CBF (Allen et al., 2016, 2018a), mean-centred age, sex, smoking status and years of education (the latter included due to significant group differences in our sample) were included in all analyses as nuisance covariates. Individual differences in mean global CBF were accounted for via its inclusion as a covariate in the general linear models. Results were considered significant after p<.05 with...
family-wise error (FWE) correction for multiple comparisons at the voxel level, as in previous CHR studies (Allen et al., 2018b; Modinos et al., 2018a).

**Exploratory Wholebrain Analyses**

For completeness, we examined the same contrasts as above at wholebrain level. We conducted a wholebrain search using the explicit grey matter mask (again thresholded at >.50) and cluster-level inference (cluster-forming threshold: p<.005; cluster reported as significant at p<.05 using FWE cluster correction in SPM).

**Demographics**

Analyses of baseline and demographic variables were conducted in SPSS using independent t-tests for continuous data and chi-square tests for categorical data. Significance was set at p<.05.
RESULTS

There were no between-group differences in the majority of demographic and baseline clinical characteristics, except for fewer years of education in the placebo group relative to controls (Table 1), as reported in our previous publications (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018; Wilson et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2020). In the CBD group, mean (SD) plasma CBD levels were 126.4nM (221.8) and 823.0nM (881.5) at 120 and 300 min after drug intake, respectively (Supplementary Fig S3). Three CHR individuals exited the scanner prior to the ASL sequence, and two CHR subjects’ data were corrupted at source, leaving n=14 in the placebo group, n=14 in the CBD group and n=19 controls (see Supplementary CONSORT details).

<Table 1>

Global CBF
There were no significant group differences in mean global grey matter CBF values (ml/100g/min): healthy control (marginal mean ± SE)= 48.96 ± 2.92; CBD= 45.39 ± 2.88; placebo= 47.79 ± 3.27; F(2,40)=0.38, p=.69.

Hippocampal Blood Flow – Pairwise effects of CHR status and CBD
Pairwise t-tests examining differences related to CHR status revealed that compared to healthy controls, placebo-treated patients had significantly greater rCBF in the hippocampus bilaterally (right hippocampus: MNI coordinates X=22 Y=-24 Z=-4, T(26)=5.29, ZE=4.32, k=90, p<.001 FWE; left hippocampus: MNI coordinates X=-24 Y=-24 Z=-10, T(26)=4.01, ZE=3.50, k=96, p=.009 FWE; Fig 1A). There were no suprathreshold voxels in the CBD vs placebo pairwise comparison.

Hippocampal Blood Flow – Between-Group Linear Analyses
Our primary a priori analysis revealed a significant linear relationship in the right hippocampus, such that blood flow was highest in the placebo group, lowest in healthy controls, and intermediate in the CBD group (MNI coordinates X=24 Y=-24 Z=-6, F(2,39)=8.01, ZE=3.03, k=4, p=.035 FWE; Fig 1B-C). The relationship in the left hippocampus was not significant but followed the same pattern (placebo>CBD>controls) at trend-level (X=-26 Y=-24 Z=-10, F(2,39)=7.30, ZE=2.87, k=8, p=.053 FWE; Fig 1B).
Exploratory Wholebrain Analyses

In pairwise analyses for main effect of CHR status, compared to healthy controls, placebo-treated patients had significantly higher CBF in two clusters spanning the bilateral hippocampus, parahippocampal gyrus, thalamus, midbrain and brainstem, left striatum (mostly putamen) and amygdala, and right cerebellum (2 clusters, both $p<.01$ FWE_cluster; Fig 2). In pairwise analyses for the main effect of CBD in CHR, we found significantly higher CBF in left inferior and middle temporal gyri (temporo-occipital parts) and lateral occipital regions in the CBD compared to the placebo group ($p=.014$ FWE_cluster; Fig 2). There were no suprathreshold clusters in the wholebrain three-group linear analyses.

<Figure 2>
FIGURE 1. Hippocampal blood flow across CHR patients receiving placebo, CHR patients receiving CBD and healthy controls

Legend: (A) Increased blood flow (shown in red) in CHR patients in the placebo group relative to healthy controls in right (p<.001 FWE) and left hippocampus (p=.009 FWE), overlaid on a standard brain template. (B) Voxels where blood flow followed a linear pattern across groups (placebo > CBD > controls) in right (p=.035 FWE) and left hippocampus (p=.053 FWE). Hippocampal ROIs are depicted by the inner bounds of the blue circles. The right side of the brain is shown on the right of the axial and coronal images. The left side of the brain is shown in the sagittal images. (C) Plot showing group means ± 95% CIs of the covariate-adjusted mean rCBF values for the right hippocampal cluster (indicated in panel B) as extracted from the F-test design matrix for each subject using the MarsBaR toolbox in SPM (arbitrary units). The adjusted means ± SD (arbitrary units) were: placebo (M= 17.81, SD= 48.9), CBD (M= 9.59, SD= 47.8), and healthy controls (M= -21.98, SD= 42.0).
FIGURE 2. Differences in CBF related to CHR status (placebo vs healthy controls) and effects of CBD in CHR patients (CBD vs placebo) from wholebrain analyses

Legend: Axial and sagittal sections showing significant clusters of group differences in CBF from wholebrain analyses. Two large significant clusters were identified for the placebo > control contrast (regions shown in red), cluster 1 peak MNI coordinates X= -26 Y= 10 Z= -8, T(26)= 5.17, ZE= 4.25, k=735, p=.008 FWE cluster; cluster 2 peak MNI coordinates X= 20 Y= -22 Z= -16, T(26)= 4.85, ZE= 4.05, k=1271, p<.001 FWE cluster. For the significant CBD > placebo cluster (regions shown in yellow), peak MNI coordinates X= -44 Y= -80 Z= 6, T(21)= 4.51, ZE= 3.75, k=638, p=.014 FWE cluster. There were no significant results for the control > placebo contrast, the placebo > CBD contrast, nor either of the three-way linear contrasts. The right side of the brain is shown on the right of the axial images. The sagittal sections are ordered from right to left hemispheres (top row to bottom row).
DISCUSSION

This is the first study to investigate the effects of CBD on cerebral blood flow in patients at CHR for psychosis. We first established that hippocampal rCBF is elevated in CHR patients under placebo compared to healthy controls. To test our primary hypothesis that CBD would at least partially normalise any such alterations in hippocampal rCBF, we then examined whether a linear relationship existed between the groups. In line with our predictions, our key finding was that hippocampal blood flow was indeed highest in the placebo-treated CHR group, lowest in healthy controls and significantly intermediate in the CBD-treated CHR group. Together, these findings provide the first—albeit preliminary—in vivo evidence that CBD may engage and partially normalise one of the key pathophysiological treatment targets for patients at risk of psychosis. Given the current lack of effective pharmacotherapies for CHR patients (Davies et al., 2018a, 2018b), CBD represents a promising compound for future preventive studies.

Hippocampal Blood Flow is Elevated in CHR Patients

Our finding that hippocampal blood flow is increased in CHR (placebo) patients vs controls is consistent with studies to have addressed this issue previously (Allen et al., 2016, 2018a), as well as contemporary models suggesting that hippocampal hyperactivity is present prior to psychosis onset and plays a critical upstream role in its pathogenesis (Schobel et al., 2013; Lieberman et al., 2018). In using ROIs based on hippocampal clusters previously found to be altered in CHR patients (Allen et al., 2016, 2018a), our results provide a further external replication of elevated rCBF in these regions in an independent CHR sample. Notably, in line with prior work (Schobel et al., 2013; Allen et al., 2016) we found hyperperfusion in the hippocampus bilaterally, whereas some previous studies using the same hippocampal ROIs find effects only on the right side, both in CHR (Allen et al., 2018a) and high schizotypy (Modinos et al., 2018a).

CBD May Attenuate Hippocampal Blood Flow in CHR Patients

The key finding of the present study—that hippocampal blood flow in CBD-treated CHR patients is intermediate between controls and placebo-treated patients—is translationally relevant, given previous evidence linking hippocampal hyperperfusion in the CHR state with the onset of psychosis (Schobel et al., 2013) and longitudinal reductions in hippocampal CBF associating with CHR remission (Allen et al., 2016). Animal models have explicitly demonstrated a causal pathway between excess glutamate, hippocampal hyperperfusion and psychosis-like phenotypes (Schobel et al., 2013; Lieberman et al., 2018), and thus the reduction of hippocampal perfusion—as demonstrated here—would seem a plausible
therapeutic target for novel antipsychotic treatments. Elevated hippocampal rCBF and blood volumes are also positively associated with symptom severity across psychosis and CHR patients (Schobel et al., 2009), as well as delusional thinking in non-help-seeking healthy individuals (Wolthusen et al., 2018). A partial normalisation of hippocampal rCBF by CBD could, therefore, underlie or contribute to the therapeutic effects of CBD that have been reported in patients with established psychosis (Leweke et al., 2012; McGuire et al., 2018). However, our study was designed and powered to examine neurophysiological rather than symptomatic effects and as such, future longitudinal studies administering CBD to a larger sample are needed to evaluate clinical efficacy. In addition, given that our study was cross-sectional, follow-up studies employing within-subject designs are required to confirm these results.

Using the same patient and control sample, we previously demonstrated that CBD has effects on task-based BOLD haemodynamic readouts (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018; Wilson et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2020), finding the same commensurate pattern of placebo > CBD > controls (or vice versa) in mediotemporal regions during fear processing and verbal memory fMRI (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018; Davies et al., 2020). CBF is intrinsically linked to BOLD responses via neurovascular coupling (Kim et al., 2020), but its acquisition does not require the cognitive or other manipulation needed for task-based fMRI contrasts (Alsop et al., 2015). As such, CBF can be used to index more proximal basal resting-state conditions (Alsop et al., 2015). Moreover, it permits exploration of quantitative pharmacological effects across the brain without being spatially restricted to (and dependent on) the regions engaged by specific fMRI tasks. Capitalising on these advantages, our results extend previous knowledge by suggesting that CBD may also attenuate basal resting-state hippocampal activity in CHR patients. An interesting corollary of this finding is that in patients with early psychosis, hippocampal hyperperfusion has been directly associated with reduced hippocampal BOLD signal during fMRI scene processing (McHugo et al., 2019). Increased basal perfusion combined with an attenuated stimulus-driven activation has also been observed in the amygdala in patients with schizophrenia (Pinkham et al., 2015). These findings raise the possibility that elevated baseline activity (i.e. hyperperfusion) might be limiting effective recruitment during task performance (McHugo et al., 2019). Although speculative, if CBD is indeed able to partially normalise basal hippocampal hyperperfusion this may, in turn, allow hippocampal circuitry to be recruited normally to meet mnemonic or other cognitive demands. Future CHR studies that combine perfusion imaging and memory fMRI (ideally with concomitant measures of performance), together with a CBD challenge, would allow investigation of this intriguing possibility.
Albeit in the context of our linear between-group results, the direction of CBD effects we observed is in line with two previous SPECT studies, which found significant reductions in hippocampal rCBF following CBD in healthy people and those with anxiety disorders (Crippa et al., 2004, 2011). Conversely, the direction of our effects contrasts with the only other study to have examined CBD using ASL, which found that out of six ROIs examined in healthy individuals, rCBF effects (an increase) were observed only in the hippocampus (Bloomfield et al., 2019). Several methodological differences, such as the acquisition method (SPECT vs ASL) and CBD dose (400 vs 600mg) may account for the differential results between previous findings in healthy controls (Crippa et al., 2004; Bloomfield et al., 2019), but our results are harder to reconcile with the recent ASL study (Bloomfield et al., 2019), which employed the same method and dose. In our view, the most likely explanation is that the effects of CBD on hippocampal rCBF differ as a function of the sample population and more specifically, the presence vs absence of baseline pathophysiology. Several lines of disparate evidence support this notion. For example, CBD does not modulate reward processing-related activity in healthy individuals (Lawn et al., 2020) but does so in early psychosis populations (Wilson et al., 2019; Gunasekera et al., 2022). One study showed that CBD has opposite effects on prefrontal and subcortical GABA levels in neurotypical vs ASD individuals, despite convergent effects on glutamatergic metabolites (Pretzsch et al., 2019a). CBD also modulates spontaneous resting-state brain activity, but post-hoc testing indicated this was due to CBD effects in the ASD group with no significant effects in neurotypical individuals (Pretzsch et al., 2019b). Collectively, these findings suggest that the direction of CBD’s effects may depend on the specific clinical vs healthy population under study, with CBD potentially having effects in the direction towards normalisation in those with baseline dysfunction. A broader implication is that if effects in clinical populations cannot accurately be extrapolated from findings in healthy cohorts, future pharmacological studies to establish group-specific target engagement may be of particular value prior to later-stage efficacy trials.

Although we found significant effects in our a priori regions and in the direction that appears to be of therapeutic and translational relevance, it is worth noting that the resulting cluster of voxels (with statistics based on voxel peak) in the linear analyses was small (k=4), and we did not find any suprathreshold voxels in the direct CBD vs placebo pairwise analysis. A significant cluster with greater spatial extent, and significant CBD vs placebo pairwise results, would have provided more convincing evidence of CBD effects, and thus we await future replication and confirmation/refutation of these findings in future studies with larger sample sizes. However, regarding the latter point, the rationale for performing the three-way linear analyses—as implemented in our previous publications (Bhattacharyya et al., 2018;
Wilson et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2020)—was that we do not necessarily expect that a single dose of CBD will fully reverse aberrant brain function in CHR patients. Rather, we hypothesised that a signal of change towards normalisation in the CBD group (i.e. a significant linear relationship) would provide initial evidence of disease-target engagement in a direction indicative of therapeutic effects. Based on our initial findings here, future studies administering CBD repeatedly over longer durations are warranted.

**Exploratory Wholebrain Results**

Outside of the hippocampus, in exploratory wholebrain analyses we found significant hyperperfusion in CHR (placebo) patients compared to controls in each of the major nodes implicated in psychosis pathophysiology by preclinical models and extant literature (Lodge and Grace, 2011; Grace and Gomes, 2019). This included the striatum, midbrain, thalamus and cerebellum, as well as bilateral hippocampi. Very few CHR perfusion studies have utilised a wholebrain approach, but one study reported corresponding hyperperfusion in most of these regions (Allen et al., 2016), although another study did not (Kindler et al., 2018). The myriad methodological and analytic choices, combined with the clinical heterogeneity inherent within CHR samples (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020a) may account for the variability in findings. Effects in these regions do, however, also correspond with results of previous ROI-based studies, which include increased putamen rCBF in CHR patients (Kindler et al., 2018) which was correlated with positive symptom severity. Greater perfusion in the putamen and thalamus has also been identified as a potential marker of genetic susceptibility for schizophrenia spectrum disorders in a neuroimaging twin study (Legind et al., 2019). Conversely, although both increased (Allen et al., 2016) and decreased (Kindler et al., 2018) prefrontal perfusion has been observed in CHR and established psychosis groups (Schobel et al., 2009), we did not find differences here in the present exploratory analyses.

In terms of wholebrain CBD effects, we found significantly increased CBF in inferior temporal and lateral occipital regions in CBD-treated relative to placebo-treated CHR patients. A previous SPECT study in healthy individuals reported attenuated perfusion in medial-occipital and inferior-temporal regions following CBD, albeit at a relaxed significance threshold (Crippa et al., 2004). The exploratory nature of our findings here combined with the paucity of prior literature means that their relevance is uncertain and requires replication. Moreover, in view of the potential divergent effects of CBD on CBF across samples, it should be noted that these wholebrain effects may well differ in healthy or other clinical populations.

**Mechanisms**
The molecular mechanisms by which CBD might have its effects on hippocampal rCBF remain unclear (Pertwee, 2008), but preclinical and in vitro work suggests that the general effects of CBD may be mediated by various mechanisms, including negative allosteric modulation of the CB1 receptor (Laprairie et al., 2015). CB1 is highly expressed in hippocampus (Glass et al., 1997) and CB1 agonism has been shown to disinhibit glutamatergic pyramidal neurons (Hájos et al., 2000), an effect directly related to circuit-based models of psychosis (Fig S1) and which may be predicted to increase hippocampal blood flow (Lisman et al., 2008; Knight et al., 2022). By ‘antagonising the agonists’ of CB1 and impacting hippocampal endocannabinoid tone, it is possible that CBD modulates CBF through these direct receptor/circuit mechanisms. Further proposed mechanisms include inhibition of anandamide hydrolysis (Bisogno et al., 2001) and actions on 5-HT1A (Russo et al., 2005), vanilloid type 1 (Bisogno et al., 2001) and GPR55 receptors (Ryberg et al., 2007; Pertwee, 2008). Recent work has also implicated effects on the glutamate system (Gomes et al., 2015; Linge et al., 2016), which is of particular relevance to psychosis pathophysiology (Lodge and Grace, 2011; Howes et al., 2015; Bossong et al., 2019). On the human neuroimaging level, CBD modulates hippocampal glutamate in patients with early psychosis while concomitantly reducing psychotic symptoms (O’Neill et al., 2021a). CBD also alters glutamate and GABA in ASD and neurotypical individuals (Pretzsch et al., 2019a). Whether CBD has ameliorative effects on glutamatergic dysfunction in CHR patients, and how this relates to effects on rCBF, therefore remains an important avenue for future research.

Limitations

In addition to the small spatial extent of the cluster identified in our primary results, several further limitations warrant consideration. The first is that our study was parallel-group rather than within-subject. Although we used a randomised, double-blind design and there were no baseline differences between the two CHR groups (including in measures of substance use), the possibility that any between-group differences we observed were attributable to between-subject variability, as opposed to an effect of CBD, cannot be completely excluded. Future work administering both placebo and CBD in the same CHR (and healthy) individuals would address this issue and permit full factorial analyses. Such a design would also rule out potential expectation effects in the CHR placebo group in the contrast with controls. In terms of our patient group, we recruited a representative sample of CHR individuals as typically found in specialist CHR services (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020b). However, the CHR population is clinically heterogeneous (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020a) and thus the effects of CBD may be greater (or different) in specific subgroups of patients. Future studies with larger sample sizes are needed to stratify results by transition status or, for example, the three component
subgroups of the CAARMS (Fusar-Poli et al., 2020a). Finally, this study reports on the acute neurophysiological effects of CBD and it is possible that the effects may differ after a sustained period of treatment. Future work by our group aims to address this issue while examining the effects of CBD on psychotic symptoms.

**Conclusion**

Our findings indicate that a single dose of CBD may partially normalise aberrant hippocampal perfusion in CHR patients, a region critically implicated in the pathophysiology of psychosis onset. Moreover, this effect occurred in the same region we show to be altered in CHR patients under placebo relative to healthy controls. CBD therefore merits further investigation as a candidate novel treatment for this group.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>CBD (n = 16)</th>
<th>Placebo (n = 17)</th>
<th>Control (n = 19)</th>
<th>Pairwise Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control vs Placebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, years; mean (SD)</td>
<td>22.7 (5.08)</td>
<td>24.1 (4.48)</td>
<td>23.9 (4.15)</td>
<td>p=.91 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex, N (%) male</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>11 (57.9)</td>
<td>p=.32 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity, N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10 (62.5)</td>
<td>7 (41.2)</td>
<td>11 (57.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2 (12.5)</td>
<td>5 (29.4)</td>
<td>5 (26.3)</td>
<td>p=.59 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (5.9)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
<td>4 (23.5)</td>
<td>3 (15.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, years; mean (SD)</td>
<td>14.4 (2.71)</td>
<td>12.6 (2.76)</td>
<td>16.9 (1.58)</td>
<td>p&lt;.001 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handedness, N (%) right</td>
<td>14 (87.5)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>18 (94.7)</td>
<td>p=.37 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAARMS Positive, mean (SD)</td>
<td>40.19 (20.80)</td>
<td>42.94 (29.47)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAARMS Negative, mean (SD)</td>
<td>23.25 (16.49)</td>
<td>28.41 (20.49)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAI-S, mean (SD)</td>
<td>40.31 (9.07)</td>
<td>38.94 (10.18)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine drug screen results, N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>10 (63)</td>
<td>8 (47)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3 (19)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>NA 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current nicotine use, N (%) yes</td>
<td>9 (56)</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>2 (11)</td>
<td>p=.15 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current alcohol use, N (%) yes</td>
<td>11 (69)</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not compared 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime cannabis use, N (%) yes</td>
<td>15 (94)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>NA 5</td>
<td>Not compared 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current cannabis use, N (%) yes</td>
<td>7 (44)</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>NA 5</td>
<td>Not compared 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis use frequency, N (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a week</td>
<td>11 (69)</td>
<td>12 (71)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once/twice monthly</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few times a year</td>
<td>2 (13)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only once/twice lifetime</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:** CAARMS, Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States; CBD, cannabidiol; CHR, Clinical High Risk for Psychosis; N, number of subjects; NA, not applicable; PCP, phencyclidine; STAI-S, State-Trait Anxiety Inventory-State Subscale; THC, Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol.

1Controls were selected to have minimal drug use and hence were not compared with CHR participants on these parameters;
2Independent t-test;
3Pearson chi-squared test;
4Controls tested negative on urine drug screen for all substances tested;
5Cannabis use less than 10 times lifetime (no current users).