

1 **Exploring consumer preferences for cannabis edible products to support public health**
2 **policy: A discrete choice experiment**

3 Jennifer R. Donnan^a, Karissa Johnston^a, Michael Coombs^a, Maisam Najafizada^b, Lisa D. Bishop^a

4 ^a School of Pharmacy, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

5 ^b Faculty of Medicine, Memorial University, St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador, Canada.

6 Address: 300 Prince Philip Drive, St. John's, NL, Canada, A1B 3V6

7

8 **Corresponding Author:**

9 Dr. Jennifer Donnan

10 School of Pharmacy, Memorial University of Newfoundland

11 300 Prince Phillip Drive

12 St. John's, NL, Canada A1B 3V6

13 Email: Jennifer.donnan@mun.ca

14 Phone: (709) 864-3587

15 **Author Contributions**

16 **Conceptualization, Methodology:** JD

17 **Investigation:** JD

18 **Formal Analysis, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation:** JD, KJ

19 **Data curation and Validation:** JD, KJ

20 **Funding acquisition:** JD, LB, MN

21 **Resources, software licensing:** JD

22 **Project Supervision and Administration:** JD

23 **Writing – Review & Editing:** All authors (JD, LB, MN, MC)

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** In October 2019, cannabis edibles were legalized for sale in Canada. This move was
26 intended to improve public safety by regulating contents (including a maximum 10 mg
27 tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) per package) and packaging to prevent accidental ingestion or over
28 consumption. This study aimed to explore consumer preferences for cannabis edibles to inform
29 cannabis policy.

30 **Methods:** We explored the relative importance and trade-offs consumers make for attributes of
31 cannabis edibles using a discrete choice experiment. Attributes included type of edible, price, THC
32 content, cannabis taste, package information, product consistency, product recommendations, and
33 Health Canada regulation. Participants lived in Canada, were 19 years of age or older, and
34 purchased a cannabis edible in the last 12 months. A multinomial logit (MNL) model was used for
35 the base model, and latent class analysis to assess preference sub-groups.

36 **Results:** Among 684 participants, the MNL model showed that potency was the most relevant
37 followed by edible type. A two-group latent class model revealed two very distinct preference
38 patterns. Preferences for group 1 (~65% of sample) were driven primarily by edible type, while
39 for group 2 (~35% of sample) were driven almost entirely by THC potency.

40 **Conclusion:** This study found that consumer preferences for ~65% of consumers of cannabis
41 edibles are being met through regulated channels. The remaining ~35% are driven by THC potency
42 at levels that are not currently available on the licensed market. Attracting this market segment
43 will require reviewing the risks and benefits of restricting THC package content.

44

45 **Key Words:** Cannabis, Consumer Preferences, discrete choice experiment, cannabis edible

46 **1. Introduction**

47 On October 17, 2018, Canada became the second country to legalize cannabis, starting with
48 dried flower products. One year later, additional product types including cannabis vapes and
49 edibles were approved for sale (1). Its legalization and regulation changed the way Canadians
50 could access cannabis to promote health and safety. From the 2017 Canadian Cannabis Survey
51 (CCS) (2), 22% of those 16 and older reported using cannabis in the last 12 months, with greater
52 use among those aged 16-24 (41%) compared to those aged 25 years and older (18%). More males
53 (26%) reported past 12-month use versus females (18%). During the year after cannabis was first
54 legalized, 37% of individuals obtained cannabis from a legal storefront or online source (3). A
55 greater– albeit slower– transition to licensed sources was observed in the years to follow.
56 Purchases from legal and licensed sources jumped in 2020 (54%) and expanded further in 2021
57 (64%) (4). Despite this, unlicensed sources still compose a great portion of sales, reinforcing the
58 need for further efforts and consideration of what consumers value (5).

59 Smoking cannabis is the most common method of consumption regardless of province or
60 territory; however, the use of other product types is expanding. National survey data demonstrated
61 that the prevalence of edible use has increased since legalization from 32% in 2017 to 53% in 2021
62 (2,4). Data from the United States has shown that those individuals who consume edibles tend to
63 be heavier cannabis users, with more frequent use and longer periods spent high compared to those
64 who do not consume edibles (6). While edibles have the benefit of not carrying the respiratory
65 health impacts of smoking and vaping, they are not benign with respect to health consequences.
66 More frequent edible cannabis consumption has been significantly associated with physical
67 dependence, impaired control, academic/occupational problems, self-care problems, and risk
68 behavior, after controlling for demographics and socioeconomic characteristics (7). Additionally,

69 due to the delayed effects of edible cannabis, studies have shown edibles to be more likely to result
70 in unexpected highs among adults (8). Unintentional pediatric exposure to cannabis also increased
71 after decriminalization in certain US states. Most of the more serious exposures were a result of
72 ingestion, which was believed to be due to their increased palatability over other cannabis forms
73 as well as the typically higher THC concentrations (9).

74 These public health and safety considerations were the reason behind Canada's approach
75 to strictly limit the amount of THC in edible cannabis products. Canadian federal regulations limit
76 the amount of THC to 10 mg per package regardless of the number of edible items in the package
77 (10). Some consumers, in particular those who require higher doses to achieve their desired effect,
78 have stated that Health Canada-approved cannabis is cost prohibitive and too calorically dense at
79 such low doses of THC per package (11). The extent to which limited THC content impacts
80 decisions to purchase from either licensed or unlicensed sources is not clear, nor is the relative
81 impact of other attributes such as package information, taste, or consistency in dose across units.

82 The multi-attribute utility theory states that when people make decisions, they take into
83 account various attributes of the options presented to them and then make trade-offs between those
84 attributes to optimize personal preferences (12). Discrete choice experiments (DCE) are used to
85 measure the strength of consumer preferences for the attributes of decisions via a survey-based
86 approach. Within these surveys, participants choose between two hypothetical options, each
87 described by a set choice of attributes. Based on the participants' repeat selections where the
88 hypothetical options are altered slightly within the attributes, the relative importance of each
89 attribute can be quantified. Knowledge of the trade-offs that consumers make for edible cannabis
90 products is key to refining public policy to encourage greater uptake of regulated over unregulated

91 products. The purpose of this study was to quantify consumer preferences for attributes of edible
92 products using a DCE.

93 **2. Methods**

94 *2.1 Study Design*

95 A survey consisting of a four unique DCE questions, including one focused on attributes
96 for cannabis edible products, was used to solicit preferences from cannabis consumers across
97 Canada. This study was carried out following the general framework for good research practices
98 as outlined for conducting DCEs by the International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and
99 Outcomes Research (13). This study is part of a series of studies that explored consumer
100 preferences for different types of cannabis products. Earlier work includes a systematic review of
101 the literature to identify attributes of importance for cannabis consumers (14), focus groups and
102 interviews with cannabis consumers (11) and two DCEs focused on consumer preferences for
103 cannabis vapes (15) and dried flower (16). Detailed methods for the current study have been
104 previously published (15), presented here is a condensed summary.

105 Data from the systematic review, focus groups and interviews were used to identify
106 attributes and levels that are both important to consumers and policy-relevant for cannabis edible
107 products (Table 1). While we know that price and the amount of THC would be relevant, we also
108 explored the type of edible, cannabis taste, package information, dosing consistency, product
109 recommendations, and if it was regulated by Health Canada. The type of edible refers to the food
110 type (e.g. candy, baked good, savory product) and while not all of these are available in the legal
111 market, they are available through non-licensed channels and impacting consumer choices. Taste
112 gets at preference distinctions between products with a cannabis flavor over a masked flavor (e.g.

113 fruit) Consumers reported that they want access to detailed product information, and not just what
114 is required on a Health Canada approved label, but also information on terpene profiles and
115 cultivation history (11). In previous work, it was found that consistency between servings of
116 homemade edibles (e.g., cookies) was problematic, and accurate knowledge of dose per serving
117 influenced decisions for some consumers (11). The attribute of product recommendations was used
118 to get at the impact of social influences on choices, and what sources of recommendations were
119 most relevant to impact ultimate purchase decisions. Finally, we wanted to include an attribute that
120 explored the impact of having the product regulated by Health Canada, and to see if attributes were
121 more important than Health Canada regulation.

122

123 Table 1: Attributes and levels for one package of cannabis edibles

Attribute	Levels
Type of Edible	A Candy (e.g. chocolate bar, gummy, mint) A Baked Product (e.g. brownie, cookie, granola bar) A Savory Product (e.g. pretzels, trail mix)
Price for Package	\$5, \$10, \$15
Amount of TCH per Package	5 mg 10 mg 50 mg 100 mg
Cannabis Taste	Strong cannabis taste Mild cannabis taste No cannabis taste
Package Information	No info on the package Producer, Amount of THC and/or CBD in milligrams, nutritional information Producer, Amount of THC and/or CBD in milligrams, nutritional information, strain, terpenes, growth and supply Chain Info
Consistency of THC across servings	Unknown Exactly the same
Product Recommendation	Recommended by person selling Recommended by family or friend Recommended in online reviews Self-selected without input from others
Regulated by Health Canada	Yes No Unknow

124

125 The DCE choice task included two unlabeled alternatives, meaning each combination of
126 attribute levels was described as “Option A” or “Option B”, which does not hold any meaning (17)
127 (Figure 1). A fractional factorial design was used. A total of eight choice tasks were included,
128 which allowed for a standard error below the threshold of 0.05. The DCE question was prefaced
129 by a description of a scenario to help frame the choice which the consumer was asked to make.
130 Additional questions on sociodemographic characteristics (e.g. age, province, sex, gender),
131 cannabis consumption, and purchasing history were also included.

132

133 Figure 1. Edible Cannabis Sample Choice Task

134

135 *2.2 Participants*

136 Participants were eligible to complete the survey if they lived in Canada, were 19 years of
137 age or older, and reported having purchased cannabis within the last 12 months. Only those who
138 indicated they had purchased a cannabis edible in the past 12 months were eligible to complete the
139 edible specific DCE. An online research company (Angus Reid) used email solicitation to recruit
140 a representative sample from their proprietary panel between October 8-25th, 2021. Interested
141 individuals provided electronic consent within the Sawtooth survey instrument. Only consenting
142 participants proceeds to answer survey questions. Data from respondents who were eligible for the
143 edible DCE and completed the full survey were included in the analysis.

144

145 *2.3 Analysis*

146 Descriptive statistics were used for sample characteristics. Analysis of the DCE data was
147 completed within Sawtooth (Lighthouse Studio) software and included a counts analysis and two
148 regression models, a multinomial logit (MNL) model and a latent class model.

149 The MNL model was used for the base analysis to calculate average preferences across the
150 sample. The data for each attribute was effects coded except for cost where continuous coding was
151 used to allow for interpretable willingness to pay (WTP) values. Using the least desirable level
152 from each attribute as a reference, odds ratios were calculated. WTP was calculated by estimating
153 the marginal rate of substitution (MRS) by taking the ratio of two co-efficients, with the linear cost
154 estimate used for the comparison attribute.

155 Finally, a latent class model was used to examine potential sub-groups of preferences
156 within the consumer population. The model of best fit was assessed by selecting the number of
157 latent classes with the lowest CAIC (Consistent Akaike Information Criterion) and BIC (Bayesian
158 Information Criterion) values (18,19). Segment membership probabilities estimated by Sawtooth
159 were used to explore differences in participant characteristics between the groups. Chi-squared
160 tests were used to assess significant differences with key demographic characteristics of the sample
161 (e.g. age, sex, income, province of residence) as well as cannabis use behaviors (e.g. purchase and
162 consumption frequency, reason for use, length of time of use).

163 *2.4 Ethical Considerations*

164 This study was carried out in accordance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and
165 approval by the Memorial University Interdisciplinary Committee on Ethics in Human Research
166 (File #20210143).

167 **3. Results**

168 Of the 3,261 individuals who started the survey, of which 1,920 consented and were
 169 eligible, and 1626 completed the full survey. The survey consisted of four unique DCE questions
 170 and not all participants were eligible for each question. The findings here represent the sample of
 171 684 who completed the DCE focused on edible cannabis purchase decisions. Just over half of the
 172 sample identified as men, and about a third were between 30 to 39 years of age. The vast majority
 173 (91.8%) had at least some-post secondary education (Table 2).

174

175 Table 2: Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic		Number (%) N=684
Sex	Female	333 (48.7)
	Male	344 (50.3)
	Prefer not to say	7 (1.0)
Gender	Woman	322 (47.1)
	Man	343 (50.1)
	Gender Diverse	8 (1.2)
	Other	6 (0.9)
	Prefer not to say	5 (0.7)
Age	19-29	146 (21.3)
	30-39	238 (34.8)
	40-49	95 (13.9)
	50-59	94 (13.7)
	60 or above	111 (16.2)
Race	Black	12 (1.8)
	East/Southeast Asian	18 (2.6)
	Latino	5 (0.7)
	Middle	7 (1.0)
	South Asian	14 (2.0)
	White	628 (91.8)
	Other (please specify):	26 (3.8)
Province	British Columbia	79 (11.5)
	Alberta	82 (12.0)
	Saskatchewan	67 (9.8)
	Manitoba	65 (9.5)
	Ontario	115 (16.8)
	Quebec	41 (6.0)
	New Brunswick	42 (6.1)
	Nova Scotia	89 (13.0)
	Prince Edward Island	18 (2.6)
	Newfoundland and Labrador	81 (11.8)
Territories	5 (0.6)	

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

Education	Did not complete high school	7 (1.0)
	High school diploma	49 (7.2)
	Some post-secondary	102 (14.9)
	College/trade/technical/ vocational training completed	221 (32.3)
	Undergraduate degree	197 (28.8)
	Graduate degree	108 (15.8)
Employment	Full time student	65 (9.5)
	Part time student	18 (2.6)
	Unemployed, but seeking employment	31 (3.5)
	Unemployed by choice	8 (1.2)
	Unemployed due to disability	19 (2.8)
	Employed part time	57 (8.3)
	Employed full time	367 (53.7)
	Self employed	69 (10.1)
	Retired	90 (13.2)
	Other (please specify:)	13 (1.9)
Income	<\$25,000	53 (7.7)
	\$25,000 to \$49,999	118 (17.3)
	\$50,000 to \$74,000	122 (17.8)
	\$75,000 to \$99,999	108 (15.8)
	\$100,000 or more	228 (33.3)
	Prefer not to say	55 (8.0)
Frequency of Cannabis purchase in last 12 months	< 1 per month	313 (45.8)
	1-2 times per month	238 (34.8)
	3 or more times per month	133 (19.4)
Cannabis consumption frequency	Less than once per month	132 (19.3)
	At least once per month, less than once per week	126 (18.4)
	At least once per week	152 (22.2)
	Once per day	126 (18.4)
	Multiple times per day	146 (21.3)
Prefer not to answer	2 (0.3)	
Reason for cannabis use	Medical (Self Prescribed)	65 (9.5)
	Medical (Authorized)	26 (3.8)
	Non-medical	277 (40.6)
	Both medical and non-medical	307 (44.9)
	Other	8 (1.2)
Initiation of Cannabis Use	Since legalization	120 (17.5)
	Used in the past then started again since legalization	252 (36.8)
	Regular user prior to legalization	312 (45.6)
Cannabis Purchase Location	Licensed in-person store	553 (80.8)
	Licensed online store	288 (42.1)
	Licensed Medical Dispensary	66 (9.6)
	Unlicensed in-person store	87 (12.7)
	Unlicensed online stores	189 (27.6)
	Unlicensed connection on the community	160 (23.4)
	Other	22 (3.2)

176

177

178 All attributes were found to significantly influence choice ($p < 0.05$ for within attribute
 179 chi-squared test). No attribute level dominated choices, with the level selection ranging from
 180 34.4% to 64.3%. No significant between attribute interactions were found.

181 The results of the MNL model show that potency carried the most weight in purchase
 182 decisions, followed by edible type, cannabis taste, package information, and price. Product
 183 recommendations was the least relevant attribute (Table 3).

184

185 Table 3: Relative importance of attributes for cannabis edibles using a multinomial logit model

	Level	Part-Worth Utility (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	WTP (95% CI)
Price	Price	-0.16 (-0.209, -0.119)	N/A	N/A
Type of Edible	Candy	0.33 (0.277, 0.380)	1.98 (1.93, 2.03)	-20.82 (-20.87, -20.77)
	Baked	0.03 (-0.024, 0.079)	1.47 (1.42, 1.52)	-11.66 (-11.72, -11.61)
	Savory	-0.36 (-0.408, -0.304)	Ref	Ref
Amount of THC per package	5 mg	-0.63 (-0.700, -0.566)	Ref	Ref
	10 mg	-0.22 (-0.289, -0.160)	1.50 (1.44, 1.57)	-12.42 (-12.48, -12.36)
	50 mg	0.26 (0.200, 0.329)	2.45 (2.39, 2.52)	-27.27 (-27.34, -27.21)
	100 mg	0.59 (0.525, 0.660)	3.40 (3.34, 3.47)	-37.26 (-37.32, -37.19)
Cannabis Taste	Strong	-0.29 (-0.341, -0.238)	Ref	Ref
	Mild	0.09 (0.034, 0.136)	1.45 (1.40, 1.51)	-11.40 (-11.45, -11.35)
	None	0.20 (0.153, 0.256)	1.64 (1.59, 1.69)	-15.03 (-15.08, -14.97)
Package Information	None	-0.20 (-0.252, -0.151)	Ref	
	Basic	0.04 (-0.013, 0.089)	1.27 (1.22, 1.32)	-7.28 (-7.33, -7.23)
	Detailed	0.16 (0.113, 0.214)	1.44 (1.39, 1.49)	-11.09 (-11.14, -11.04)
Consistency of THC across servings	Unknown	-0.13 (-0.157, -0.095)	Ref	Ref
	Exactly the same	0.13 (0.095, 0.157)	1.29 (1.26, 1.32)	-7.66 (-7.69, -7.63)
Product Recommendations	Seller	-0.05 (-0.116, 0.013)	1.01 (0.94, 1.07)	-0.15 (-0.22, -0.09)
	Family/Friend	0.08 (0.020, 0.147)	1.15 (1.09, 1.21)	-4.27 (-4.33, -4.21)
	Online	0.02 (-0.040, 0.089)	1.08 (1.02, 1.15)	-2.46 (-2.53, -2.40)
	None	-0.06 (-0.121, 0.008)	Ref	Ref
Regulated by Health Canada	Yes	0.19 (0.14, 0.25)	1.37 (1.32, 1.42)	-9.62 (-9.67, -9.57)
	No	-0.15 (-0.17, -0.07)	Ref	Ref
	Unknown	-0.07 (-0.12, -0.02)	1.05 (1.00, 1.10)	-1.46 (-1.51, -1.41)

186 CI – Confidence Interval; OR- Odds Ratio; WTP – Willingness to Pay

187

188 A two-group latent class model demonstrated the best fit (Table 4). In Group 1, which
189 represented almost 65% of the sample, their choices were driven primarily by edible type (candy
190 preferred to baked goods or savory products), followed by taste (preferred less cannabis flavor)
191 and package information (preferred more detail). Of note, price played a very little role in the
192 decisions. In Group 2, representing 35% of the sample, choices were driven almost entirely by the
193 THC potency (preferred 100 mg package over 5 mg package, OR = 304.3), followed by price
194 (Table 5). Participants in this group were willing to pay nearly \$42 more for a package with 100
195 mg over those with 5 mg when all other attributes remained constant. Other attributes played very
196 little role in the choices for this group. Notably, even though Health Canada regulation played a
197 small role in decisions, participants still demonstrated a preference for regulated over non-
198 regulated products. The Venn diagram, set at a 20% inclusion threshold highlights the likelihood
199 of group membership. About 15% (n=103) of the sample have preference tendencies seen in both
200 groups (Figure 2).

201

202 Table 4: Latent class model fit statistics

Groups	CAIC	BIC
2	6319.92	6286.92
3	6364.02	6314.02
4	6451.71	6384.71
5	6548.28	6464.28

203 CAIC - Consistent Akaike Information Criterion; BIC - Bayesian Information Criterion

204

205

206 Table 5: Relative importance of attributes for cannabis edibles using a latent class model

		Part-Worth Utility			Part-Worth Utility		
		OR	WTP	OR	WTP		
Segment Sizes		Group 1 - 65.2%			Group 2 - 34.8%		
Price for Package		-0.09	N/A	N/A	-0.68	N/A	N/A
Type of Edible	Candy	0.43	2.43	-48.23	0.26	1.81	-4.34
	Baked	0.03	1.64	-26.71	0.07	1.50	-2.98
	Savory	-0.46	Ref	Ref	-0.33	Ref	Ref
Amount of THC per Package	5 mg	-0.19	Ref	Ref	-2.80	Ref	Ref
	10 mg	0.01	1.23	-11.04	-1.30	4.47	-10.97
	50 mg	0.10	1.34	-15.91	1.17	52.98	-29.08
	100 mg	0.08	1.31	-14.80	2.92	304.27	-41.88
Cannabis Taste	Strong	-0.35	Ref	Ref	-0.24	Ref	Ref
	Mild	0.10	1.58	-24.66	0.03	1.31	-1.97
	None	0.25	1.82	-32.59	0.21	1.56	-3.28
Package Information	None	-0.27	Ref	Ref	-0.08	Ref	Ref
	Basic	0.08	1.42	-19.21	-0.10	0.98	0.18
	Detailed	0.19	1.58	-24.84	0.18	1.29	-1.84
Consistency of THC across servings	Unknown	-0.14	Ref	Ref	-0.19	Ref	Ref
	Exactly the same	0.14	1.33	-15.31	0.19	1.47	-2.83
Product Recommendations	Seller	-0.04	1.08	-3.96	-0.20	0.77	1.90
	Family/Friend	0.10	1.23	-11.33	0.08	1.03	-0.18
	Online	0.05	1.17	-4.71	0.06	1.00	-1.91
	None	-0.11	Ref	Ref	0.06	Ref	Ref
Regulated by Health Canada	Yes	0.25	1.52	-22.87	0.17	1.21	-1.40
	No	-0.17	Ref	Ref	-0.02	Ref	Ref
	Unknown	-0.07	1.11	-5.53	-0.15	0.88	0.90

207 OR – Odds Ratio; WTP – Willingness to Pay in Canadian Dollars

208

209 Figure 2: Venn diagram depicting group membership from the latent class model

210

211 The distribution of group membership demonstrated that individuals who were members
 212 of group two were significantly more likely to purchase more frequently, consumer more regularly
 213 and consumer greater amounts, to consume for recreational purposes and to have consumed
 214 cannabis prior to legalization (p-values all <0.001). Age, sex, province or income were not
 215 significant predictors of group membership (Table 6).

216

217 **Table 6:** Latent class significance of group membership by participant characteristic

Factor	Chi-squared	p-value
Age	1.65	0.800
Sex	3.03	0.219
Province	19.31	0.081
Income	8.39	0.136
Cannabis use in the past 12 months	35.57	0.000
Frequency of cannabis use	72.09	0.000
Amount of cannabis use	31.82	0.000
Purpose of cannabis use	22.94	0.000
Use of cannabis pre-legalization	41.79	0.000

218 **4. Discussion**

219 This research indicates that the THC content in cannabis edible products plays a major
220 role in Canadian consumers choices to purchase between the licensed and unlicensed markets.
221 This main finding, however, was driven by only a third of the consumer sample population.
222 Notably, this subset represented a much larger segment of the market, characterized by
223 consumers who purchased more frequently, and consumed more frequently and in larger
224 quantities. These consumers do not have access to the products they seek through the licensed
225 channels. Conversely, approximately 65% of our sample appears to have their preferences met
226 by products available in the licensed market, and this segment of the sample were less concerned
227 with THC potency or price. A report by Deloitte (20) estimated that the market for cannabis
228 alternatives in Canada is valued at \$2.7 billion, with about half of this allocated to cannabis
229 edibles. A report using data from the International Cannabis Policy Study survey estimated that
230 only 56% of cannabis edibles are were purchased through legal sources (5).

231 This is the first study using a DCE to explore consumer preferences for edible cannabis
232 products. In fact, there is very limited evidence on cannabis consumer preferences in general
233 (14), and most studies focused on dried flower as the dominant product type. There is minimal

234 overlap of the relevant attributes between dried flower and edibles and therefore dried flower
235 preference studies cannot be extrapolated to represent such preferences.

236 While attributes other than THC content did influence purchase choices, factors like
237 edible type, taste, package information, and Health Canada regulation seemed to only influence
238 choices for those whose needs are already met by the licensed market. Shifting more consumers
239 to the licensed market will require changes to regulations limiting THC content, and to a lesser
240 degree price.

241 In comparison to Canada, regulatory bodies in the United States provide access to higher
242 potency THC edible products. For states that have legalized non-medical cannabis, there is a
243 predetermined standard amount of 5 or 10 mg THC per serving of cannabis edibles. However,
244 packages can contain up to 50 or 100 mg THC in many legalized states and up to 500 mg in the
245 state of Michigan (21,22). Canada's conservative policy approach to edibles reflects the lack of
246 international experience in codifying laws and the unknown impact on public health and safety.
247 While serious harms are not common with cannabis, edibles pose increased risk due to the
248 delayed onset of effect, increasing consumer risk of overdose (9). For example, there have been
249 case reports of psychosis-related suicide as a result of excessive edible consumption (23). Other
250 research has shown a significant increase in hospitalizations among young children less than 10
251 years of age (incidence rate ratio 7.49; 95% confidence interval 5.92 – 9.48) due to accidentally
252 exposure of cannabis edibles since legalization (24).

253 The risks of making higher doses of THC available in edible form needs to be weighed
254 against the risks of indirectly encouraging access to such products through unlicensed market.
255 Edible products available on the unlicensed market often contain much higher doses of THC per
256 serving and are not easily distinguished from generic candy or food. Additionally, package labels

257 may not clearly indicate the cannabis contents and the packaging can be made to be more
258 attractive (9), especially to children, often replicating commonly marketed candy. These
259 unregulated products may be more likely to lead to unintentional exposures among adults,
260 children and pets. Any move towards increasing THC potency available in regulated cannabis
261 edibles should be paired with additional safety mechanisms such as restrictions on visually
262 appealing packaging and child friendly flavors (24) and strong public health education
263 campaigns.

264 Though the amount of THC per package can be much higher in legalized US states, the
265 maximum dosage per serving (referred to as a discrete unit in Canada) is more aligned, with the
266 exception of Michigan. Maximum doses per serving are 10 mg THC in Canada and many US
267 states, although some states limit further to 5 mg per serving. This regulation on serving size
268 ensures a common understanding of the amount of THC per unit, and reduces the chance of
269 accidentally taking larger amounts, and these smaller doses can be easily split for those who seek
270 less than a 10mg dose. Limits to serving size are likely more effective at preventing accidental
271 overdose rather than package limitations (25).

272 In Canada, a nuanced approach is required to evaluate the risks and benefits of increasing
273 package limits for THC content. To maximize safety, further learnings from jurisdictions in the
274 United States can be explored. For example, one regulatory feature that has been employed in
275 Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Nevada is to imprint the THC symbol onto each cannabis edible,
276 making it recognizable when it is out of the package (25). With the cannabis edible market
277 expanding and its subsequent implications for public health and safety, comprehensive public
278 education is also needed to improve public understanding the effects of cannabis edibles, proper
279 storage, and other strategies to protect consumers and prevent accidental exposure.

280 *4.1 Limitations*

281 There are several inherent limitations to the discrete choice methodology. These include
282 ordering effect, hypothetical bias and framing effect (13). Strategies to mitigate against these can
283 be found in the supplementary detailed methods. While this study was informed by qualitative data
284 collected from edible cannabis consumers within the Canadian cannabis market the lack of access
285 to higher potency THC products overpowered all other relevant attributes. It would not be fair to
286 say the changes to THC limits alone would shift the bulk of purchases to the licensed market.
287 Replicating this study in the United States where package limits are set to 100 mg (the preferred
288 THC content identified in this current DCE), would help us to understand the attributes of
289 importance in an environment where products available in the licensed market more closely align
290 with those on the unlicensed market. Additionally, product attributes are not the only relevant
291 factors in purchase decisions. Retailer attributes also play a role (11). These could include
292 proximity, customer support, marketing and promotions or availability of product information.
293 Future publications using data from this survey will focus on exploring retailer attributes.
294 Considering these studies together would provide a more complete picture of consumers decision
295 making process. Finally, while every effort was made to capture a representative sample of edible
296 cannabis consumers, the population in the sample does have a higher education and income than
297 the average Canadian population, and predominantly identify as Caucasian. Preferences for people
298 if minority races, or lower socioeconomic status may not be truly reflected in this data.

299 **5. Conclusion**

300 This study demonstrated that regulated cannabis edibles are not meeting the needs of about
301 a third of the consumer population; and this segment of the population tends to consist of the more

302 experienced users who purchase and consume cannabis more frequently and in larger quantities.
303 These consumers purchase cannabis on the basis of THC potency and prefer the packages with
304 higher THC content. As a result, these consumers are willing to make trade-offs with purchasing
305 a regulated product to get an unregulated product containing more THC. Although increasing the
306 THC content allowed in each package of cannabis edibles might boost sales of regulated products,
307 the public health implications of such a change remain unclear and warrants further investigation.

308

309 **Acknowledgements**

310 The authors received financial support for conduct of the research from the Canadian Institutes of
311 Health Research (Grant No. RN407334 - 429120) and the Canadian Centre of Substance Use and
312 Addiction for the Partnerships for Cannabis Policy (Grant Nos. RN407334 – 429120 and B2 –
313 RESGRL 413-10-9633) inclusive of this research.

314

315 **References**

316

317 1. Branch LS. Consolidated federal laws of Canada, Cannabis Act [Internet]. Oct 17, 2020.

318 Available from: <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-24.5/>

319 2. Canada H. Canadian cannabis survey 2017 - Summary [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2021 Sep 2].

320 Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/drugs-health-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2017-summary.html)
321 [products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2017-summary.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2017-summary.html)

322 3. Canadian Cannabis Survey 2019 - Summary [Internet]. Service Canada; 2019 [cited 2020

323 Aug 24]. Available from: [324 \[canada/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2019-\]\(https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2019-summary.html\)
325 \[summary.html\]\(https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/publications/drugs-health-products/canadian-cannabis-survey-2019-summary.html\)](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

326 4. Canadian Cannabis Survey 2021: Summary [Internet]. Service Canada; 2021 [cited 2022

327 Aug 11]. Available from: [328 \[medication/cannabis/research-data/canadian-cannabis-survey-2021-summary.html\]\(https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-medication/cannabis/research-data/canadian-cannabis-survey-2021-summary.html\)](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-</p></div><div data-bbox=)

329 5. Hammond D, Rynard V, Wadsworth E, Goodman S. Analysis of drivers of the illicit

330 cannabis market: Findings from the International Cannabis policy study: 2019 – 2020.

331 University of Waterloo; 2021.

332 6. Krauss MJ, Rajbhandari B, Sowles SJ, Spitznagel EL, Cavazos-Rehg P. A latent class

333 analysis of poly-marijuana use among young adults. *Addict Behav.* 2017 Dec;75:159–65.

- 334 7. Jones CB, Meier MH, Pardini DA. Comparison of the locations where young adults smoke,
335 vape, and eat/drink cannabis: Implications for harm reduction. *Addict Behav Rep.* 2018 Sep
336 12;8:140–6.
- 337 8. Allen JA, Davis KC, Duke JC, Nonnemaker JM, Bradfield BR, Farrelly MC. New product
338 trial, use of edibles, and unexpected highs among marijuana and hashish users in Colorado.
339 *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2017 Jul 1;176:44–7.
- 340 9. Wang GS, Roosevelt G, Heard K. Pediatric Marijuana Exposures in a Medical Marijuana
341 State. *JAMA Pediatr.* 2013 Jul 1;167(7):630–3.
- 342 10. Canada H. Reduce your risk: Choose legal cannabis [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Aug 12].
343 Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-medication/cannabis/personal-use/reduce-risk-choose-legal.html)
344 [medication/cannabis/personal-use/reduce-risk-choose-legal.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/drugs-medication/cannabis/personal-use/reduce-risk-choose-legal.html)
- 345 11. Donnan J, Shogan O, Bishop L, Najafizada M. Drivers of purchase decisions for cannabis
346 products among consumers in a legalized market: a qualitative study. *BMC Public Health.*
347 2022 Feb 21;22(1):368.
- 348 12. Von Winterfeldt D, Fischer GW. Multi-Attribute Utility Theory: Models and Assessment
349 Procedures. In: Wendt D, Vlek C, editors. *Utility, Probability, and Human Decision Making:*
350 *Selected Proceedings of an Interdisciplinary Research Conference, Rome, 3–6 September,*
351 *1973 [Internet]. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands; 1975 [cited 2022 Mar 8]. p. 47–85.*
352 *(Theory and Decision Library).* Available from: [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1834-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1834-0_3)
353 [0_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-010-1834-0_3)

- 354 13. Janssen EM, Hauber AB, Bridges JFP. Conducting a Discrete-Choice Experiment Study
355 Following Recommendations for Good Research Practices: An Application for Eliciting
356 Patient Preferences for Diabetes Treatments. *Value Health*. 2018 Jan 1;21(1):59–68.
- 357 14. Donnan J, Shogan O, Bishop L, Swab M, Najafizada M. Characteristics that influence
358 purchase choice for cannabis products: a systematic review. *J Cannabis Res*. 2022 Feb
359 1;4(1):9.
- 360 15. Donnan JR, Johnston K, Coombs M, Najafizada M, Bishop LD. Exploring Consumer
361 Preferences for Cannabis Vaping Products to Support Public Health Policy: A Discrete
362 Choice Experiment. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy* [Internet]. 2023 Apr 15 [cited 2023 Apr
363 24]; Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40258-023-00804-w>
- 364 16. Donnan JR, Johnston K, Najafizada M, Bishop LD. Drivers of Purchase Decisions Among
365 Consumers of Dried Flower Cannabis Products - A Discrete Choice Experiment. *J Stud*
366 *Alcohol Drugs*. 2023 May 18;
- 367 17. de Bekker-Grob EW. Discrete Choice Experiments in Health Care [Internet]. Erasmus
368 Universiteit Rotterdam; 2009. Available from: [http://www.sandy-](http://www.sandy-campbell.com/sc/KTC_Module_3_files/KTC%20Module%203%20%E2%80%93%20de%20Bekker%E2%80%93Grob%202009.pdf)
369 [campbell.com/sc/KTC_Module_3_files/KTC%20Module%203%20%E2%80%93%20de%20Bekker%E2%80%93Grob%202009.pdf](http://www.sandy-campbell.com/sc/KTC_Module_3_files/KTC%20Module%203%20%E2%80%93%20de%20Bekker%E2%80%93Grob%202009.pdf)
- 370
- 371 18. Nylund KL, Asparouhov T, Muthén BO. Deciding on the Number of Classes in Latent Class
372 Analysis and Growth Mixture Modeling: A Monte Carlo Simulation Study. *Struct Equ*
373 *Model Multidiscip J*. 2007 Oct 23;14(4):535–69.

- 374 19. Weller BE, Bowen NK, Faubert SJ. Latent Class Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *J Black*
375 *Psychol.* 2020 May 1;46(4):287–311.
- 376 20. Deloitte Canada. Deloitte Canada. 2021 [cited 2021 Jun 1]. Seeding new opportunities:
377 Listening to Canada’s cannabis consumer. Available from:
378 [https://www2.deloitte.com/ca/en/pages/consumer-business/articles/listening-to-canadas-](https://www2.deloitte.com/ca/en/pages/consumer-business/articles/listening-to-canadas-cannabis-consumer.html)
379 [cannabis-consumer.html](https://www2.deloitte.com/ca/en/pages/consumer-business/articles/listening-to-canadas-cannabis-consumer.html)
- 380 21. Goundar P, Macaulay T, Szafron M. A comparative analysis of laws on recreational cannabis
381 edibles between Canada and the United States of America. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2021 Aug
382 1;94:103191.
- 383 22. Wadsworth E, Driezen P, Hammond D. Retail availability and legal purchases of dried
384 flower in Canada post-legalization. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2021 Aug;225:108794.
- 385 23. Subritzky T, Pettigrew S, Lenton S. Issues in the implementation and evolution of the
386 commercial recreational cannabis market in Colorado. *Int J Drug Policy.* 2016 Jan 1;27:1–
387 12.
- 388 24. Myran D, Tanuseputro P, Auger N, Konikoff L, Finkelstein Y. Edible Cannabis Legalization
389 and Unintentional Poisonings in Children | *NEJM.* *N Engl J Med.* 2022;387:757–9.
- 390 25. Doran N, Papadopoulos A. Cannabis edibles: Behaviours, attitudes, and reasons for use.
391 *Environ Health Rev [Internet].* 2019 [cited 2022 Jul 25];62(2). Available from:
392 <https://pubs.ciphi.ca/doi/full/10.5864/d2019-011>
- 393

Figure 1. Edible Cannabis Sample Choice Task

You are purchasing an edible cannabis product with THC. Which of the following 2 items would you choose?

While some options may not seem possible, assume both options are available as presented.

(1 of 8)


	Option 1	Option 2
Type of Edible	A Candy (e.g. chocolate bar, gummy, mint)	A Savory product (e.g. pretzels, trail mix)
Price for Package	\$10 <small>It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .</small>	\$15
Amount of THC in package	5 mg	50 mg
Cannabis Taste	Mild/moderate cannabis taste	Strong cannabis taste
Package Information	Detailed information: Producer, THC and/or CBD milligrams, nutritional information, strain, terpenes, growth & supply chain info	No info on the package
Consistency of THC level across servings	Exactly the same	Unknown
Product Recommendation	Is recommended in online reviews	Self selected without input from others
Regulated by	Yes	No
		
	Select	Select

Figure 2: Venn diagram depicting group membership from the latent class model



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.09.20.23295824>; this version posted September 22, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](#) .