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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for the treatment of spasticity in patients with Multiple Sclerosis?

2. What are the evidence-based guidelines associated with delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for the treatment of spasticity in patients with Multiple Sclerosis?

KEY FINDINGS

Three systematic reviews, five randomized controlled trials, and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for the treatment of spasticity in patients with Multiple Sclerosis.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, Embase, Medline, The Cochrane Library, University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2006 and April 25, 2016. Internet links were provided, where available.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that the Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
SELECTION CRITERIA

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials and evidence-based guidelines.

Three systematic reviews, five randomized controlled trials, and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for the treatment of spasticity in patients with Multiple Sclerosis. No relevant health technology assessments were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Three systematic reviews were identified.\(^1\)\(^-\)\(^3\) In one systematic review, delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol was determined as probably effective for patient-centered measures of spasticity for patient with Multiple Sclerosis (MS).\(^1\) The authors of another systematic review reported that a significantly greater number of patients whose spasticity was treated with delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol were responders to treatment and showed more improvement than those who received placebo.\(^2\) The authors of a third systematic review reported that delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol was generally well tolerated.\(^3\) Adverse events were common but were mostly reported to be of mild to moderate severity.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^3\)

Five relevant randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were identified.\(^4\)\(^-\)\(^8\) The authors of one study confirmed the clinical benefit of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol for MS-spasticity.\(^4\) Another study reported that time to treatment failure was significantly greater in the treatment group when compared to controls.\(^5\) One study treated patients with delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol as an add-on treatment and those patients achieving more than 20% improvement in spasticity were then enrolled into a subsequent RCT.\(^6\) After four weeks of treatment, 47.6% of subjects achieved a greater than 20% improvement in symptoms.\(^6\) In a RCT examining patients with spasticity not controlled with current treatment,\(^7\) the per protocol analysis found the change in the numeric rating score of spasticity and the responder analyses were both significantly greater in the treatment group when compared to placebo. The
authors reported that the drug was generally well tolerated and the adverse events reported were mild to moderate. A primary analysis of the intention-to-treat population of another RCT found that spasticity control was significantly greater with delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol.

The American Academy of Neurology recommends that clinicians may offer delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol spray to reduce the symptoms of spasticity, though it may not be effective for improving objective spasticity measures. The National Institute of Health and Care Excellence recommends clinicians not offer delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol/cannabidiol spray as it is not considered to be cost-effective for the indication.
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