

1 United States' qualifying conditions compared to evidence of the 2017 National Academy of
2 Sciences Report

3 Elena L. Stains^{1*}, Amy L. Kennalley, MBS¹, Maria Tian, MBS¹, Kevin F. Boehnke², Chadd K.
4 Kraus, DO, DrPH, MPH³, Brian J. Piper, PhD^{1,4}

5 ¹Department of Medical Education, Geisinger Commonwealth School of Medicine, Scranton, PA

6 ²Department of Anesthesiology, Chronic Pain and Fatigue Research Center, University of
7 Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA

8 ³Department of Emergency and Hospital Medicine Lehigh Valley Health Network, Allentown,
9 PA

10 ⁴Center for Pharmacy Innovation and Outcomes, Geisinger, Danville, PA

11

12 *corresponding author:

13 estains@som.geisinger.edu (ELS)

14 Manuscript Number of Words: 3266

15 Abstract Number of Words: 246

16 Number of Figures: 6

17 Number of Tables: 1

18 Number of Supplementary Tables/Figures: 1

19 **Conflicts of Interest:** The work was completed with software from the National Institute of
20 Environmental Health Sciences [T32-ES007060-31A1]; BJP is supported by the Health
21 Resources Services Administration [D34HP31025] and was (2019-21) part of an osteoarthritis
22 research team supported by Pfizer and Eli Lilly. This work was supported by Ascend Wellness
23 and the Geisinger Academic Clinical Research Center (Grant number 004). They had no role in
24 the design of the study or the publication decision.

25 A preliminary report of this work was previously published on MedRxiv, 5/10/23. Doi:
26 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.01.23289286>

27 **Ethics:** This report was approved by the IRB of Geisinger as exempt.

28 **Key Words:** medical marijuana, certifying conditions, chronic pain, glaucoma, cancer, Crohn's
29 Disease

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 **Abstract**

38 **Objective:** To compare the 2017 National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine
39 (NAS) report to state medical cannabis (MC) laws defining approved qualifying conditions (QC)
40 from 2017 to 2024 and to determine if there exist gaps in evidence-based decision making.

41 **Methods:** The 2017 NAS report assessed therapeutic evidence for over twenty medical
42 conditions treated with MC. We identified the QCs of 38 states (including Washington, D.C.)
43 where MC was legal in 2024. We also identified the QCs that these states used in 2017. QCs
44 were then categorized based on NAS-established level of evidence: substantial/conclusive
45 evidence of effectiveness, moderate evidence of effectiveness, limited evidence of effectiveness,
46 limited evidence of ineffectiveness, and no/insufficient evidence to support or refute
47 effectiveness. This study was completed between January 31, 2023 through May 20,
48 2024. **Results:** Most states listed at least one QC with substantial evidence—80.0% of states in
49 2017 and 97.0% in 2024. However, in 2024 only 8.3% of the QCs on states' QC lists met the
50 standard of substantial evidence. Of the 20 most popular QCs in the country in 2017 and 2024,
51 one only (chronic pain) was categorized by the NAS as having substantial evidence for
52 effectiveness. However, seven (ALS, Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, glaucoma, Huntington's
53 disease, Parkinson's disease, spastic spinal cord damage) were rated as either ineffective or
54 insufficient evidence. **Conclusion:** Most QCs lack evidence for use based on the 2017 NAS
55 report. Many states recommend QCs with little evidence, such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
56 (ALS), or even those for which MC is ineffective, like depression. There have been insufficient
57 updates to QCs since the NAS report. These findings highlight a disparity between state-level
58 MC recommendations and the evidence to support them.

59

60 **Abbreviations**

61 MC, medical cannabis; NAS, National Academy of Sciences; QC, Qualifying Conditions; US,
62 United States

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78 **Introduction**

79 As of 2024, 37 states and the District of Columbia, representing 73% of the United States
80 (US) population, have legislation for medical cannabis (MC) (1). Each state determines the
81 qualifying conditions (QCs) that allow patients to receive recommendation for MC by providers.
82 QCs range widely between states, and commonly include conditions such as chronic pain,
83 anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (2). In 2019-2020, 2.5% of Americans
84 reported using cannabis for medical needs, compared to 1.2% in 2013-2014, representing a
85 12.9% annual increase (1).

86 Like any pharmaceutical agent, there are potential clinical benefits and harms associated
87 with MC and research into therapeutic uses of MC continues to evolve (3,4). This presents a
88 potential public health challenge, as the societal and political acceptance of the drug might be
89 moving faster than scientific understanding. One consideration for patients is cost—MC is not
90 covered by Medicare, Medicaid, or private insurance and therefore is an out-of-pocket expense
91 for most (although Pennsylvania recently implemented a Medical Marijuana Assistance Program
92 to help pay the cost of MC and card fees for eligible patients) (5). One study conducted among
93 medical cannabis dispensary patients in New England reported that many were spending over
94 two-thousand dollars per year (3). There is also concern about drug interactions, particularly
95 involving CYP3A4, with the prescription formulations of tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and
96 cannabidiol (6). While lethal overdose from cannabis is extremely rare, there are rare but serious
97 case-reports of fatalities involving cardiac events, and considerable societal and human costs
98 associated with cannabis hyperemesis syndrome (7–9).

99 The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) published a
100 report in 2017 on the evidence, or lack thereof, for the therapeutic effects of MC for over twenty

101 conditions (10). This landmark report involved reviewing more than 10,700 abstracts and has the
102 potential to be a guide for states looking for a scientific guidance for approving QCs (10).
103 However, it has not always been used for this process, with states reportedly making the decision
104 to include QCs by also incorporating expert opinion, evidence, and public wishes (11,12). The
105 state of Delaware allows citizens to petition to add QCs and approves such conditions based on
106 two main factors: “(1) the medical condition or treatment is debilitating and (2) marijuana is
107 more likely than not to have the potential to be beneficial to treat or alleviate the debilitation
108 associated with the medical condition or treatment (13).”

109 The process that states have applied thus far has resulted in a gap between the QCs
110 recommended by states and the evidence to support MC use for those conditions. For example,
111 of Pennsylvania’s 24 QCs in 2024, the NAS indicates that only two (8.3%), “severe chronic or
112 intractable pain” and “neuropathies,” had conclusive or substantial evidence that cannabinoids
113 were effective while 25%, including Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis, glaucoma, epilepsy,
114 Huntington’s disease, Parkinson’s disease, and opioid use disorder, were categorized as
115 conditions for which cannabinoids were not shown to be effective (14). Other studies have
116 incorporated the 2017 NAS report to comment on public policy (14,15), but none have analyzed
117 how QCs of every state compare to the evidence in the NAS report.

118 In this report, we detail the past and present QCs of all states in which MC was legal
119 from 2017 to 2024. We map the evidence of each QC and exhibit that QCs with substantial
120 evidence on average make up less than a tenth of each states’ list. Our analysis shows that not
121 only do states’ lists of QCs exhibit a discordance with the available evidence, but states have not
122 progressed to high-evidence QC lists over time. This revelation exposes a deficit in evidence-

123 based recommendations for MC use in public policy. Through the findings in this research, we
124 can guide safer, more informed public health legislation for patients.

125 **Methods**

126 **Procedures**

127 QCs were collected for each of the 37 states and the District of Columbia where MC was legal in
128 the United States as of April 2023 when analyses began. Data for those states that had MC policy
129 in April 2023 was updated for 2024, but states that created MC policy since April 2023 were not
130 added to our analysis. Two states, Kentucky and Georgia, had legislation to allow a low-THC
131 form of MC for certain conditions, but were excluded from this analysis. For ease of reporting,
132 we classified the District of the Columbia as a state, making 38 “states” with MC in 2024. This
133 information was verified by comparison to each state’s medical cannabis program (see:
134 Supplemental Appendix for references). We used an internet archive tool to collect the QCs for
135 each state in 2017 (16). Of the 38 states with legalized MC in 2024, 31 had legalized MC in
136 2017. The NAS report was published in 2017, making that the first year of our data collection
137 (10). Our objective was to compare states’ QCs at the time of publication of the NAS report to
138 subsequent years and to identify whether states updated their QC lists to align with the most up-
139 to-date evidence.

140 The NAS report was used as our “gold standard” of evidence because it is a comprehensive
141 review of available evidence for twenty of the most popular QCs in the country. The NAS
142 committee that created the report considered over 10,000 systematic reviews and primary
143 studies. The final report contains over 400 pages of summary of evidence for both the benefits
144 and harms of MC (10).

145 Ten states (CA, DC, LA, ME, MD, MA, MO, NY, OK, VA) in 2024 included “blanket
146 statements” that permitted provider discretion to recommend MC for any condition that they
147 deemed necessary. These statements were not counted as QCs and were not included in a state’s
148 total number of QCs. Five states (DC, ME, NY, OK, VA) had no QCs whatsoever, allowing full
149 discretion to certifying providers.

150 Each condition was divided into the categories established by the NAS report:
151 conclusive/substantial evidence of effectiveness (e.g. chronic pain), moderate evidence of
152 effectiveness (e.g. improved sleep outcomes for certain conditions), limited evidence of
153 effectiveness (e.g. PTSD), limited evidence of ineffectiveness (e.g. glaucoma), and
154 no/insufficient evidence to support or refute effectiveness (e.g. epilepsy) (10) (Table 1A).

155 QCs that only partially fit into the NAS-established categories, when taken exactly as written,
156 were categorized as “partial” (Table 1B). For example, 93.4% of states list “cancer” as a QC and
157 although there are several applications of MC for cancer listed in the NAS report (e.g. antiemetic
158 for chemo induced nausea/vomiting, cancer-associated anorexia cachexia syndrome, chronic
159 pain associated with cancer) each had a different level of evidence. Because it was broad, cancer
160 and other broad QCs were categorized as partial. As any other QC, each “partial” QC counted as
161 one in the QC count.

162 Many states listed QCs that were not studied in the NAS report (e.g. Crohn’s disease) and these
163 were categorized as “N/A.”



164 **Data analysis**

165 Chi-square was completed with GraphPad Prism to analyze differences ($p < 0.05$) in QCs of each
166 category across years 2017 to 2024 (17) (Supplemental Table 1). Figures were prepared with
167 Prism (v10.0) and heatmaps were constructed using HeatMapper (17).

168 **Results**



169 **Summary of QCs, 2017 and 2024**

170 Thirty-one states (including the District of Columbia) had legalized MC in 2017. The number of
171 QCs varied five-fold between states (Min = 8 in Alaska, Colorado, Maryland, and
172 Massachusetts, Max = 40 in Illinois) with a mean of 14.7 (Fig 1).



174 **Figure 1.** Number of approved Qualifying Conditions (QC) for medical cannabis (MC) per state
175 in 2017. The District of Columbia was not displayed due to lack of QC list. States that did not
176 have medical cannabis in 2017 are shown in grey.

177 In 2024, 38 states had legalized MC. The average number of QCs in a state was 18.7. Overall,
178 states in the western US had fewer QCs than those in the Midwest. There was a ten-fold
179 difference in QCs between the state with the fewest (South Dakota, 5) and the most (Illinois, 52)
180 (Fig 2). Ten states included with their list of QCs the ability of providers to recommend MC at
181 their discretion—while five (District of Columbia, Maine, New York, Oklahoma, Virginia) left the
182 decision to the discretion of the provider, requiring no QCs whatsoever.



184 **Figure 2.** Number of approved Qualifying Conditions (QC) for medical cannabis (MC) per state
185 in 2024. The District of Columbia, Maine, New York, Oklahoma, and Virginia were not
186 displayed due to lack of QC list. States that did not have medical cannabis in 2024 are shown in
187 grey.


188

189 **Evidence of QCs, 2017 and 2024**



190 In 2017, most (80.0%) states with a QC list had at least one QC with substantial evidence (Fig
191 3A). However, only 6.8% of the country's QCs met the standard of substantial evidence. In
192 contrast, 90.0% of states listed one or more QCs with limited evidence of ineffectiveness (Fig
193 3B).

194

a.





b.





197 **Figure 3.** Percent of each state’s qualifying conditions (QC) that had substantial evidence of
198 effectiveness (a) and limited evidence of ineffectiveness (b) in 2017 according to the National
199 Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS). The District of Columbia was not
200 displayed due to lack of QC list. States that did not have medical cannabis in 2017 are shown in
201 grey.

202 In 2024, 97.0% states with a QC list had at least one QC with substantial evidence of
203 effectiveness (Fig 4A), but only 8.3% of states’ QCs met the standard of substantial evidence.
204 Ninety-one percent of states listed one or more QCs with limited evidence of ineffectiveness (Fig
205 4B), most commonly glaucoma.

a.



b.




208 **Figure 4.** Percent of each state’s qualifying conditions for medical cannabis that had substantial
209 evidence of effectiveness (a) and limited evidence of ineffectiveness (b) in 2024 according to the
210 National Academy of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) (10). The District of
211 Columbia, Maine, New York, Oklahoma, and Virginia were not displayed due to lack of QC list.
212 States that did not have medical cannabis in 2023 are shown in grey.

213 In 2024, the majority (90.9%) of states had at least one QC that was not in the NAS report.
214 Twenty-eight percent of the country’s QCs were not included in the NAS report, and 37.2% were
215 a partial fit.

216 **Changes to QCs since 2017**

217 Of the states with MC in 2017, 20.0% listed a higher percentage of QCs with substantial
218 evidence in 2024, but another 33.3% listed a lower percentage. Half (46.7%) recommended a
219 lower percentage of ineffective QCs by 2023, and only 6.7% recommended a higher percentage
220 (Fig 5).




221

222 **Figure 5.** Number of total qualifying conditions (QC) in all states in 2017 and 2024. Each year is
223 divided into and color-coded by percent of QCs in each of the National Academy of Sciences
224 (NAS) established categories. States that had no QCs, only blanket statements (District of
225 Columbia, Maine, New York, Oklahoma, and Virginia), were excluded.


226 In a chi-squared analysis, we found a significant increase of those QCs not studied by the NAS
227 report. These QCs increased from 97 in 2017 to 171 in 2024. QCs labeled “partial” significantly
228 increased from 195 to 229. There was no significant difference between the number of QCs with
229 substantial evidence between 2017 and 2024 (Supplemental Table 1). This was also true of the

230 other categories of evidence (moderate/limited evidence, evidence of ineffectiveness, and
231 insufficient evidence). Of the 20 most popular QCs in the country in 2017 and 2024, one only
232 (chronic pain) was categorized by the NAS as having substantial evidence for effectiveness (10).
233 However, seven (ALS, Alzheimer's disease, epilepsy, glaucoma, Huntington's disease,
234 Parkinson's disease, spastic spinal cord damage) were rated as either ineffective or insufficient
235 evidence (Fig 6).

a.



b.



237 **Figure 6.** Percentage of states that include the mentioned QCs in their list in 2017 (a) and 2024
238 (b). Each QC is color-coded by its National Academy of Sciences (NAS) evidence rating.

239 **Discussion**

240 In our analyses, we show that the majority of QCs (91.7%) that states use to qualify patients for
241 MC recommendation do not align with evidence for benefit (10). Most states recommend QCs
242 for which the effects of MC have not been well-studied—ALS, Parkinson’s, opioid dependence—
243 or are known to some degree to be ineffective—Alzheimer’s, glaucoma, and Huntington’s (10).
244 When comparing QCs from 2017 (the time of publication of the NAS report) to 2024, there are
245 no data to suggest that states have updated their recommendations based on the evidence in the
246 NAS report. In fact, based on our chi-squared analysis, the only types of QCs that have
247 significantly increased are those not reported on by the NAS report, and those more vaguely
248 titled QCs that we labeled partial.

249 Other sources of evidence-based medicine have also been ignored by states. For example, since
250 2009 the American Glaucoma Society has stated that MC is *not* recommended for glaucoma due
251 to “its side effects and short duration of action, coupled with a lack of evidence that it use alters
252 the course of glaucoma (18).” The Parkinson’s Foundation released the following consensus
253 statement in 2020 on MC for Parkinson’s disease (PD): “Given the lack of any clear data
254 supporting the use of cannabis in PD, the Foundation does not endorse their use for PD
255 symptoms or to modify disease progression (19).” Despite these clear statements against MC
256 from leading professional and advocacy organizations, many states continue to recommend MC
257 for those diseases.

258 According to our data, states added QCs to their lists over time from all categories. However,
259 there was no evidence that states revised and updated QC lists according to levels of available
260 evidence. The non-significant results of the time analysis suggest that changes in the number of
261 QCs with substantial evidence over time is more likely due to other, to be determined, factors
262 besides an evidence-based alignment. The changes in QC categories over time (Fig 6) may
263 suggest that states had decreased the percentage of ineffective QCs between 2017 and 2024.
264 However, not one state removed QCs from their list during that period. In this way, states only
265 lowered their percentage of QCs labeled ineffective by dilution.

266 Although most listed QCs do not have substantial evidence of effectiveness, according to a study
267 of 19 states in 2022, the most commonly reported use for MC was chronic pain (20). Used by
268 48.4% of patients, chronic pain does fall under the category of substantial evidence (20). The
269 second most common (14.2%), anxiety, was marked as partial in our analysis, with the NAS
270 report citing “limited evidence of effectiveness for anxiety symptoms in individuals with social
271 anxiety (10,20).” The third most common (13.0%), PTSD, had limited evidence of effectiveness
272 (10,20).

273 States recommending QCs that are ineffective is a potential public health concern. First, the
274 money patients spend on MC, which, according to one study, averaged 3,064 \$US/year in 2018,
275 may be better utilized on more evidence-based interventions (3). Second, the prescription
276 formulations of THC and CBD, the most abundant components of the *Cannabis sativa* plant,
277 have known drug interactions (6). Third, cannabis potentially possess adverse effects and safety
278 concerns. States have been challenged to incorporate traffic safety laws into the growing
279 landscape of legalized cannabis. Colorado law attempts to control driving under the influence of
280 cannabis by creating a blood THC level (five nanograms of THC per milliliter of blood) over

281 which drivers can be prosecuted for impaired driving, even though the National Institute of
282 Justice found that body fluid levels of THC cannot accurately or reliably predict level of
283 impairment (21,22). The NAS report includes evidence for harms of MC which found that
284 smoking cannabis increases risk for respiratory symptoms and chronic bronchitis episodes (10).
285 They also reported on substantial evidence of an association between cannabis use and
286 development of schizophrenia (although see (23)), and moderate evidence of increased social
287 anxiety disorder, increased suicidal ideation, and increased episodes of mania in bipolar disorder
288 with regular use (10). In some rare but serious cases, cannabis use could even result in cardiac
289 death and hyperemesis syndrome (7–9). The cost (3), interactions (6), and adverse effects (7–10)
290 of MC should be taken seriously and evidence-based medicine should always be a priority.
291 However, due to the rarity of life-threatening adverse events, it must be noted that even with
292 these potential dangers, MC remains a relatively safe option in the world of pharmaceuticals.

293 Our time analysis showed that the number of QCs with “partial” fit to NAS-established evidence
294 categories increased significantly from 2017 to 2024. However, the *percentage* of partial QCs
295 decreased. “Partial” was the largest category in both 2017 (44% of QCs) and 2024 (37%). Those
296 within this category partially fit into one or more categories, each varying in level of evidence.
297 For example, 94% of states include some variation of “HIV or AIDS” in their QC list. We
298 classified this QC as partial because the NAS report found that there was limited evidence of
299 effectiveness specifically for “increasing appetite and decreasing weight loss in HIV/AIDS” (10).
300 The NAS report searched for evidence of cannabis’s effect on specific symptoms of diseases, the
301 way scientific research on cannabis is reported. Because lawmakers, not clinicians, are creating
302 states’ QC lists, their lists often simply state diseases, which could encompass a range of
303 pathophysiology, symptoms, and treatments. Another issue that arises is different disease states

304 being lumped together. For example, one Hawaii QC reads “persistent muscle spasms, including
305 those characteristic of multiple sclerosis or Crohn’s Disease.” Although both diseases may
306 generate muscle spasms, those spasms are of very different etiologies and involve different organ
307 systems—skeletal muscle versus enteric muscle. The un-scientific nature of creating QCs creates
308 a vague process for certifying providers to work from, rather than a scientific and research-based
309 approach that uses existing nomenclature (e.g. the International Classification of Diseases or the
310 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders).

311 The NAS report is a snapshot of the accumulated evidence of medical science on MC in 2017.
312 As a variety of QCs are investigated, new evidence will emerge for use of MC. The NAS report
313 concluded insufficient evidence for epilepsy, although in 2018 the FDA approved Epidiolex, a
314 cannabidiol used for certain seizure disorders (24). This is the first and only CBD product
315 approved by the FDA. In some cases, more current research supports the findings in the NAS
316 report. For example, chronic pain was rated by the NAS report to be one of few conditions for
317 which MC has substantial evidence of effectiveness (10). In a 2022 systematic review, high
318 THC-to-CBD ratio products were found to have a moderate effect on pain symptoms, and
319 another in the same year found both dronabinol and nabiximols, which are MC products, to have
320 moderate evidence of therapeutic effect for chronic pain (25,26). Conclusions made by the NAS
321 report for other QCs similarly remain true. A 2020 systematic review found “potential” effect of
322 cannabis for PTSD but labeled those studies as small and having “methodological weaknesses”
323 (25,27). Another systematic review found a positive effect of MC for PTSD but could not come
324 to a conclusion on the value of evidence (28). These results uphold the NAS report’s finding that
325 evidence for beneficial effects of MC for PTSD is limited. However, a Canadian study that used
326 a patient self-reported survey to assess MC effects on PTSD found that patients felt an average of

327 49% better after six weeks of treatment (29). This real-world evidence has the unique benefit that
328 participants in this study were using the range of MC products that are accessible to patients on
329 the market. New information like this should be taken together with the finding of the NAS
330 report and be incorporated into states' determination of QCs rather than replacing established
331 accumulation of evidence. Overall, while the NAS report (10) reflects evidence at the time it was
332 published, it largely mirrors many of the more recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses, as
333 well as the 2023 Mayo Clinic report on medical marijuana (4,25,30,31).

334 **Limitations**

335 Based on the nature of the data, it was difficult to create an objective analysis. As discussed, not
336 every QC exactly matches a condition or symptom studied by the NAS report. Therefore, the
337 authors had to make their own decisions about which categories those states fit in to. For
338 example, New Hampshire adds a qualifier to its list that for each QC to count, that condition
339 must also include "at least one of the following: agitation of Alzheimer's disease, cachexia,
340 chemotherapy-induced anorexia, constant or severe nausea, elevated intraocular pressure,
341 moderate to severe insomnia, moderate to severe vomiting, seizures, severe pain, severe
342 persistent muscle spasms, wasting syndrome." Of course, each of those extra symptoms could be
343 its own QC with its own level of evidence, making it difficult to separate the listed QC from the
344 extra symptoms required to be included.

345 Partial QCs were especially difficult, and we would classify the need for a partial category as a
346 limitation of this work. However, the partial category also emphasizes our conclusion that QC
347 list creation, being handled by politicians and not medical practitioners, lacks an objective and
348 scientific process.

349 **Conclusion**

350 In conclusion, this report provides valuable insight into the disconnect between data and medical
351 practice and may be used to inform future policy decisions. It is possible that states are using
352 other information to guide their QCs, including voter initiatives and public opinion (32), which
353 may explain why the legislation seems to be moving faster than evidence. As new research is
354 completed, those findings should be added to the foundation that the NAS report has provided.

355

356

357

358

359

360 **References**

- 361 1. Rhee TG, Rosenheck RA. Increasing Use of Cannabis for Medical Purposes Among U.S.
362 Residents, 2013-2020. *Am J Prev Med.* 2023 Sep;65(3):528–33.
- 363 2. NORML. Medical Marijuana Laws [Internet]. Available from:
364 <https://norml.org/laws/medical-laws/>
- 365 3. Piper BJ, Beals ML, Abess AT, Nichols SD, Martin MW, Cobb CM, et al. Chronic pain
366 patients' perspectives of medical cannabis. *Pain.* 2017 Jul;158(7):1373–9.

- 367 4. Solmi M, De Toffol M, Kim JY, Choi MJ, Stubbs B, Thompson T, et al. Balancing risks
368 and benefits of cannabis use: umbrella review of meta-analyses of randomised controlled
369 trials and observational studies. *BMJ*. 2023 Aug 30;e072348.
- 370 5. Department of Health [Internet]. [cited 2024 Mar 3]. Medical Marijuana Assistance
371 Program (MMAAP). Available from:
372 [https://www.health.pa.gov:443/topics/programs/Medical%20Marijuana/Pages/MMAAP.as](https://www.health.pa.gov:443/topics/programs/Medical%20Marijuana/Pages/MMAAP.aspx)
373 [px](https://www.health.pa.gov:443/topics/programs/Medical%20Marijuana/Pages/MMAAP.aspx)
- 374 6. Lexicomp: Evidence-Based Drug Referential Content. Lexicomp Drug Interactions:
375 Dronabinol. Available from: [www.uptodate.com/drug-](http://www.uptodate.com/drug-interactions/?search=dronabinol&topicId=9394&source=responsive_topic#di-analyze)
376 [interactions/?search=dronabinol&topicId=9394&source=responsive_topic#di-analyze](http://www.uptodate.com/drug-interactions/?search=dronabinol&topicId=9394&source=responsive_topic#di-analyze)
- 377 7. Hartung B, Kaufenstein S, Ritz-Timme S, Daldrup T. Sudden unexpected death under
378 acute influence of cannabis. *Forensic Sci Int*. 2014 Apr;237:e11–3.
- 379 8. Patel M, Sathya Narayanan R, Peela AS. A Case of a Patient With Cannabis
380 Hyperemesis Syndrome Along With Recurrent Nephrolithiasis. *Cureus* [Internet]. 2023
381 Apr 5 [cited 2023 Oct 15]; Available from: [https://www.cureus.com/articles/142401-a-](https://www.cureus.com/articles/142401-a-case-of-a-patient-with-cannabis-hyperemesis-syndrome-along-with-recurrent-nephrolithiasis)
382 [case-of-a-patient-with-cannabis-hyperemesis-syndrome-along-with-recurrent-](https://www.cureus.com/articles/142401-a-case-of-a-patient-with-cannabis-hyperemesis-syndrome-along-with-recurrent-nephrolithiasis)
383 [nephrolithiasis](https://www.cureus.com/articles/142401-a-case-of-a-patient-with-cannabis-hyperemesis-syndrome-along-with-recurrent-nephrolithiasis)
- 384 9. Schreck B, Wagneur N, Caillet P, Gérardin M, Cholet J, Spadari M, et al. Cannabinoid
385 hyperemesis syndrome: Review of the literature and of cases reported to the French
386 addictovigilance network. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2018 Jan;182:27–32.
- 387 10. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (U.S.), editor. The health
388 effects of cannabis and cannabinoids: the current state of evidence and recommendations
389 for research. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2017. 468 p.

- 390 11. Hanson K. How Four States Incorporated Public Health and Cannabis Policy: A Case
391 Study [Internet]. The National Conference of State Legislatures; 2022 Aug. Available
392 from: <https://documents.ncsl.org/wwwncsl/Health/NCSL-PH-and-Cannabis-Policy.pdf>
- 393 12. Ohio Medical Marijuana Control Program [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 13]. Available
394 from: <https://medicalmarijuana.ohio.gov/faqs>
- 395 13. 4470 State of Delaware Medical Marijuana Code [Internet]. [cited 2023 Dec 13].
396 Available from:
397 [http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title16/Department%20of%20Health%20and](http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title16/Department%20of%20Health%20and%20Social%20Services/Division%20of%20Public%20Health/Health%20Systems%20Protection%20(HSP)/4470.shtml#1058727)
398 [%20Social%20Services/Division%20of%20Public%20Health/Health%20Systems%20Pr](http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title16/Department%20of%20Health%20and%20Social%20Services/Division%20of%20Public%20Health/Health%20Systems%20Protection%20(HSP)/4470.shtml#1058727)
399 [tection%20\(HSP\)/4470.shtml#1058727](http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title16/Department%20of%20Health%20and%20Social%20Services/Division%20of%20Public%20Health/Health%20Systems%20Protection%20(HSP)/4470.shtml#1058727)
- 400 14. Hirsch AG, Wright EA, Nordberg CM, DeWalle J, Stains EL, Kennalley AL, et al.
401 Dispensaries and Medical Marijuana Certifications and Indications: Unveiling the
402 Geographic Connections in Pennsylvania, USA. *Med Cannabis Cannabinoids*. 2024 Feb
403 20;7(1):34–43.
- 404 15. Boehnke KF, Gangopadhyay S, Clauw DJ, Haffajee RL. Qualifying Conditions of
405 Medical Cannabis License Holders in the United States. *Health Aff Proj Hope*. 2019
406 Feb;38(2):295–302.
- 407 16. Wayback Machine. Internet archive: digital library of free & borrowable books, movies,
408 music & wayback machine [Internet]. Available from: <https://archive.org/>
- 409 17. GraphPad Prism. (9.3.1.).
- 410 18. About Us - American Glaucoma Society [Internet]. [cited 2024 Feb 9]. Available from:
411 <https://www.americanglaucomasociety.net/about/statements>

- 412 19. Parkinson's Foundation Consensus Statement on the Use of Medical Cannabis for
413 Parkinson's Disease [Internet]. Parkinson's Foundation; 2020. Available from:
414 https://www.parkinson.org/sites/default/files/documents/medical_cannabis_statement_fin
415 [alv2_5.pdf](https://www.parkinson.org/sites/default/files/documents/medical_cannabis_statement_fin_alv2_5.pdf)
- 416 20. Boehnke KF, Sinclair R, Gordon F, Hosanagar A, Roehler DR, Smith T, et al. Trends in
417 U.S. Medical Cannabis Registrations, Authorizing Clinicians, and Reasons for Use From
418 2020 to 2022. *Ann Intern Med.* 2024 Apr 9;
- 419 21. Driving and traveling | Colorado Cannabis [Internet]. [cited 2024 Apr 15]. Available
420 from: <https://cannabis.colorado.gov/legal-marijuana-use/driving-and-traveling>
- 421 22. Field Sobriety Tests and THC Levels Unreliable Indicators of Marijuana Intoxication |
422 National Institute of Justice [Internet]. [cited 2024 Apr 15]. Available from:
423 [https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/field-sobriety-tests-and-thc-levels-unreliable-indicators-](https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/field-sobriety-tests-and-thc-levels-unreliable-indicators-marijuana-intoxication)
424 [marijuana-intoxication](https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/field-sobriety-tests-and-thc-levels-unreliable-indicators-marijuana-intoxication)
- 425 23. Elser H, Humphreys K, Kiang MV, Mehta S, Yoon JH, Faustman WO, et al. State
426 Cannabis Legalization and Psychosis-Related Health Care Utilization. *JAMA Netw*
427 *Open.* 2023 Jan 3;6(1):e2252689.
- 428 24. Commissioner O of the. FDA. FDA; 2018 [cited 2024 Apr 15]. FDA Approves First
429 Drug Comprised of an Active Ingredient Derived from Marijuana to Treat Rare, Severe
430 Forms of Epilepsy. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-drug-comprised-active-ingredient-derived-marijuana-treat-rare-severe-forms)
431 [announcements/fda-approves-first-drug-comprised-active-ingredient-derived-marijuana-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-drug-comprised-active-ingredient-derived-marijuana-treat-rare-severe-forms)
432 [treat-rare-severe-forms](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-approves-first-drug-comprised-active-ingredient-derived-marijuana-treat-rare-severe-forms)

- 433 25. Bilbao A, Spanagel R. Medical cannabinoids: a pharmacology-based systematic review
434 and meta-analysis for all relevant medical indications. *BMC Med.* 2022 Aug
435 19;20(1):259.
- 436 26. McDonagh MS, Morasco BJ, Wagner J, Ahmed AY, Fu R, Kansagara D, et al. Cannabis-
437 Based Products for Chronic Pain: A Systematic Review. *Ann Intern Med.* 2022
438 Aug;175(8):1143–53.
- 439 27. McKee KA, Hmidan A, Crocker CE, Lam RW, Meyer JH, Crockford D, et al. Potential
440 therapeutic benefits of cannabinoid products in adult psychiatric disorders: A systematic
441 review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *J Psychiatr Res.* 2021
442 Aug;140:267–81.
- 443 28. Sarris J, Sinclair J, Karamacoska D, Davidson M, Firth J. Medicinal cannabis for
444 psychiatric disorders: a clinically-focused systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry.* 2020
445 Dec;20(1):24.
- 446 29. Cahill SP, Lunn SE, Diaz P, Page JE. Evaluation of Patient Reported Safety and Efficacy
447 of Cannabis From a Survey of Medical Cannabis Patients in Canada. *Front Public Health.*
448 2021 May 20;9:626853.
- 449 30. The Editors of Mayo Clinic. *Medical Marijuana: the science and the benefits.* Meredith
450 Operations Corporation; 2023.
- 451 31. Allan GM, Finley CR, Ton J, Perry D, Ramji J, Crawford K, et al. Systematic review of
452 systematic reviews for medical cannabinoids: Pain, nausea and vomiting, spasticity, and
453 harms. *Can Fam Physician Med Fam Can.* 2018 Feb;64(2):e78–94.

454 32. Schlag AK, Zafar RR, Lynskey MT, Athanasiou-Fragkouli A, Phillips LD, Nutt DJ. The
455 value of real world evidence: The case of medical cannabis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022 Nov
456 3;13:1027159.

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466 **Table 1.** Categories of evidence established by the 2017 National Academies of Sciences,
 467 Engineering, and Medicine (NAS) report (a). Common state qualifying conditions for medical
 468 cannabis that were deemed “partial” due to broad wording, compared with evidence found by
 469 NAS (b) (10).

470

471 **a.**

**National Academies of
 Sciences categories of
 evidence**

Conditions/symptoms

Conclusive or Substantial evidence of effectiveness	For the treatment of chronic pain in adults As antiemetics in the treatment of chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting For improving patient-reported multiple sclerosis spasticity symptoms
Moderate evidence of effectiveness	Improving short-term sleep outcomes in individuals with sleep disturbance associated with obstructive sleep apnea syndrome, fibromyalgia, chronic pain, and multiple sclerosis
Limited evidence of effectiveness	Increasing appetite and decreasing weight loss associated with HIV/AIDS Improving clinician-measured multiple sclerosis spasticity symptoms Improving symptoms of Tourette syndrome Improving anxiety symptoms, as assessed by a public speaking test, in individuals with social anxiety disorders Improving symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder
Limited evidence of a statistical association	Better outcomes (i.e., mortality, disability) after a traumatic brain injury or intracranial hemorrhage
Limited evidence of ineffectiveness	Improving symptoms associated with dementia Improving intraocular pressure associated with glaucoma Reducing depressive symptoms in individuals with chronic pain or multiple sclerosis
No/insufficient evidence to support or refute effectiveness	Cancers, including glioma Cancer-associated anorexia cachexia syndrome and anorexia nervosa Symptoms of irritable bowel syndrome

Epilepsy
Spasticity in patients with paralysis due to spinal cord injury
Symptoms associated with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis
Chorea and certain neuropsychiatric symptoms associated with Huntington’s disease
Motor system symptoms associated with Parkinson’s disease or the levodopa-induced dyskinesia
Dystonia
Achieving abstinence in the use of addictive substances
Mental health outcomes in individuals with schizophrenia or schizophreniform psychosis

472

473 **b.**

Qualifying Condition	NAS evidence related to this condition
Anxiety	Limited evidence for: anxiety symptoms in those with social anxiety
Cachexia	Limited evidence for: increased appetite and decreased weight loss in HIV/AIDS. Insufficient Evidence for: anorexia/cachexia syndrome in cancer
Cancer	Conclusive/substantial evidence of effectiveness for: chronic pain in cancer, chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting. Insufficient evidence for: cancer regression, cancer-associated anorexia/cachexia syndrome.
HIV or AIDS	Limited evidence of effectiveness for: increased appetite and decreased weight loss in HIV/AIDS
Multiple Sclerosis	Substantial evidence for: patient-reported MS spasticity, chronic pain due to MS. Moderate evidence for: improved short term sleep outcomes for MS. Limited evidence for: clinician-measured MS spasticity. Limited evidence of ineffectiveness for: depressive symptoms due to MS.
Nausea	Conclusive evidence for: chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting.
Seizure	Insufficient evidence for: Epilepsy
Severe and persistent muscle spasms	Substantial evidence for: patient-reported MS spasticity. Limited evidence for: clinician-measured MS spasticity. Insufficient evidence for: spasticity due to paralysis due to spinal cord injury, dystonia, Parkinson's disease motor system symptoms or levodopa-induced dyskinesia.

474