Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

APPENDIX

Suppleme	Supplementary Table 1. Cannabis and urologic cancer symptom management										
Author	Symptom	Cancer	Methods	Participants	Intervention	Outcome	Results				
		type (s)		and setting		measures					
Brisbois et al ³⁴	Anorexia	Bladder, renal, prostate, testicular	-Randomized, double-blind placebo- controlled pilot study -N=21 total -n=5 UC	-Advanced cancer patients with a score of 2 or more on Taste and Smell Survey -Two arms: THC or placebo -Canada	-Patients were given 2.5 mg THC or placebo once daily for the first three days and twice daily on the fourth day, after which they could increase to a maximum of 20 mg/day for 18 days	-Assessment at baseline and 18 days after treatment using multiple questionnaires	-73% of THC patients reported an increase overall appreciation of food compared to placebo (30%) -55% of patients said THC "made food taste better' compared to placebo (10%) (p=0.04) -64% of THC treated patients had increased appetite, while 05% in the placebo group reported a decrease or no change (20%)				
Einhorn	CIN	Bladder,	-Randomized,	-Patients	-Patients	-Severity of	-Nausea was				
et al ³²		testicular	double-blind	receiving	received either	nausea and	experienced in				
				combination	10 mg of		both study arms				

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

			crossover study -N=80 total -n=73 UC	chemo- therapy for neoplastic disease -U.S.	prochlor- perazine or 2 mg of nabilone (identically prepared capsules) every six hours as needed, as well as 30 minutes prior to chemotherapy (majority was cisplatin combination chemotherapy)	frequency of vomiting	but was not as severe and prolonged on nabilone (p<0.001) -33% reduction of vomiting on chemotherapy days for patients taking nabilone -After completion of the crossover, 75% of patients indicated preference of nabilone as an antiemetic -Decreased appetite and reduced food intake in 80% of the nabilone group and 90% in prochlorperazine
Fallon et al ²⁵	Pain	Prostate, bladder, kidney, other GU (unspec- ified)	-Double-blind, randomized, placebo- controlled phase 3 trial -N=399 total	-Patients were adults with advanced incurable stage of cancer and a clinical	-Patients were randomized to Sativex (THC (27 mg/mL): CBD (25 mg/mL) or placebo for an	-Efficacy was measured in the percent improvement in average pain NRS score between	-Median percent improvement in average pain NRS of 7.2% in Sativex group compared to 9.5% in placebo

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

			-n=61 UC	diagnasia af	initial tituation	baseline to the	(maon different
			-11=01 UC	diagnosis of	initial titration	end of	(mean difference
				cancer-	period up to 14		-1.84%, CI 6.19,
				related pain	days	treatment	1.50,p=0.274)
				that was not	-Patients started	-Safety and	-No significant
				alleviated by	with one spray	tolerability	treatment
				opioid	and gradually		differences in
				therapy	increased by		worst pain NRS
				-Austria,	one additional		score, sleep
				Bulgaria,	spray per day		disruption NRS
				Germany,	for 10 days,		score, percent
				Hungary,	followed by		improvement in
				India, Israel,	stable 4-day		average pain
				Italy,	dose		-Over 68% of
				Lithuania,			Sativex patients
				Poland,			reported an
				Romania,			adverse effect
				Spain,			
				Taiwan,			
				U.K.			
Fallon et	Pain	Prostate,	-Double-	-Patients from	-Patients were	-Mean change	-Mean pain
al^{25}		bladder,	blind,	the parent	randomized to	from the	scores increased
		kidney,	randomized,	study who	Sativex (THC	randomized	to 3.7 from 3.2
		other GU	placebo-	demonstrated	(27 mg/mL):	baseline to the	in the Sativex
		(unspec-	controlled	an	CBD (25	end of	group and the
		ified)	phase 3 trial,	improvement	mg/mL) or	treatment in	placebo group
		illeu)	_ ·	of 15% or	placebo for 5		-No significant
			two-part withdrawal		weeks	average pain NRS score	treatment
				more on	WEEKS		
			design	NRS pain		-Safety and	differences in
			-N=206 total	scale		tolerability	worst pain NRS
			-n=45 UC	-Belgium,			score, sleep
				Bulgaria,			disruption NRS
				Czech			

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

				Republic, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, U.K., U.S.			score, average pain NRS
Heim et al ³⁰	CIN	Testicular, prostate	-Randomized crossover study -N=57 total -n=5 UC	-Patients with various advanced cancers without primary chemotherapy; had high emetic potential -Germany	-Either 10 mg of metoclopramide or 0.5 mg of levonantradol an hour before chemotherapy and 2 and 6 hours after	-Efficacy was evaluated by a standard questionnaire before chemotherapy and 2, 6, and 24 hours after	-62% of patients had less nausea with levonantradol compared to 11% of metoclopramide therapy -140 episodes of vomiting were reported in the levonantradol group and 301 in metoclopramide -71% of patients complained of side-effects (somnolence, dizziness, "drunkenness") with levonantradol

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Johnson	Pain	Prostate	-Followup	-Patients who	–Patients were	-Efficacy and	-Appetite was found to be better in the levonantradol group -Improvement in
et al ²⁴			RCT -N=43 total -n=7 PCa	were previously in the two-week parent RCT In 21 study sites in the U.K. and 1 in Belgium	randomized to self-titrating a spray of THC: CBD(2.7 mg:2.5 mg) or THC (2.7 mg). -A maximum of 8 sprays in a three-hour period, and a maximum of 48 sprays/day	safety of the oromucosal spray	pain with time as there was a decrease in "pain severity" and "worst pain" scores from baseline -Commonly reported adverse effects with THC/CBD spray were dizziness, vomiting, nausea, dry mouth, somnolence, and confusion -20 patients receiving THC/CBD combination spray experienced at least one serious adverse effect

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Johnson	Doin	Prostate	Daubla	Dotionto with	Dation to your	Change in noin	during the study, but only 3 were considered medication- related
Johnson et al ²²	Pain	Prostate	-Double-blind, placebo- controlled RCT -N=177 -n=24 PCa	-Patients with moderate to severe cancerrelated pain -Patients using strong opioids at least once a week -Patients with a pain severity score greater than 4 on a 0–10 NRS	-Patients were randomized to self-titrating a spray of THC: CBD (2.7 mg:2.5 mg) or THC (2.7 mg) for 2 weeksA maximum of 8 sprays in a three-hour period, and a maximum of 48 sprays/day	-Change in pain from baseline measured on NRS -The use of breakthrough analgesia -Secondary endpoints: the use of opioid background medication, patient assessment of sleep quality, nausea, memory, concentration, and appetite over the previous 24 hours	-Approximately twice as many patients in the THC:CBD group had an NRS reduction from baseline of at least 30% compared with THC (24%) and placebo (21%) and reduced breakthrough analgesics. ORs for THC: CBD vs. placebo were 2.81 (95% CI 1.22, 6.50; p=0.006) and 1.10 for THC vs. placebo (95% CI 0.44, 2.73; p=0.28) -More patients in the THC:CBD reduced breakthrough

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Lichtman	Pain	Prostate,	_Double-	-Adults with	–Patients were	–Percent	doses, while the placebo group increased their doses (p=0.004) Reduction in appetite score for patients in both THC: CBD and THC groups (-0.59 vs. 0.24, p=0.016 and -0.59 vs. 0.06, p=0.056) Sativex patients
et al ²³	ram	bladder, kidney, other GU (unspec- ified)	blind, RCT -N=397 -n=72 UC	advanced incurable stage of cancer and a clinical diagnosis of cancer- related pain that was not alleviated by opioid therapy -U.S., Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia,	randomized to receive Sativex (THC [27 mg/mL]:CBD [25 mg/mL]) or matching placebo Self-titrate for 14 days and then continue at stable dose for 3 weeks	improvement between baseline and end of treatment in average pain on NRS score -Average pain score, worst pain score, and sleep disruption	had a median pain improvement of 10.7% while 4.5% in placebo, resulting in treatment difference of 3.41% (95% CI 0.00–8.16, p=0.0854) -Sativex did not improve average pain NRS scores (p=0.253), worst pain NRS score (p=0.678), but

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

				Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, U.K.			improved sleep NRS score (p=0.027)
Niederle et al ³¹	CIN	Testicular	-Crossover study -N=20	-20 non-seminoma testicular cancer patients undergoing cisplatin therapy were given nabilone or alizapride during the first or second course of chemotherapy —Germany	-On days 1–5, hospitalized patients were given nabilone (2 mg) or alizapride (150 mg) 2 hours before chemotherapy and at intervals in the afternoon and evening and observed	-Therapeutic and adverse effects of both drugs were evaluated in daily questionnaires	-Frequency and severity of nausea were significantly reduced with nabilone compared to alizapride (p<0.01) - 50% of patients expressed preference for nabilone compared to 35% for alizapride -Nabilone patients experienced adverse effects of drowsiness, hypotension, and dry mouth -Patients reported food intake was

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Pawasarat et al ²¹	Pain	UC (unspec- ified)	-Retrospective chart review -N=232 total -n=49 UC	-2 arms: cannabis users (n=137 [22 UC]) and non-cannabis users (n=95 [27 UC]) -NJ, U.S.	-This study did not capture the frequency and dosing of cannabis or the time frame of evaluation	-Assessed pain through daily opiate consumption and ESAS scores in sections of pain, physical, and emotions	slightly better with nabilone Opioid consumption increased by 23% for patients on opioids who were not prescribed cannabis (p=0.004), while remaining constant in patients taking opioids and using cannabis as adjunct therapy ESAS pain
Portenoy	Pain	Prostate	-Randomized,	-Patients had	– Sativex (THC	-Assessed	scores worsened in the non-cannabis group while remaining unchanged in the cannabis group -Low (1-4
et al ²⁶	Tam	Trostate	placebo- controlled, graded-dose trial -N=263 -n=44 PCa	to have active and chronic pain that was moderate or severe	(27 mg/mL): CBD (25mg/mL) 1- week titration, and 4 weeks of	average pain and worst pain in the last 24 hours, pain disruption in sleeping	sprays) and medium (6–10 sprays) led to a significant improvement in average daily

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

				despite the lack of a stable opioid regimen —Randomized into three different dose ranges of oromucosal spray —North America, Europe, Latin America,	stable dosing based on 1 of 3 dose groups (low, medium, high)	patterns, and doses of breakthrough pain killers -Assessed quality of life through selected questionnaires	pain compared to placebo from baseline to end of study (p=0.008 and p=0.0035) The high dose (11–16 sprays) was not well- tolerated and had multiple side effects
Strasser	Anorexia	UC	–Multicenter,	South Africa -Adult	–After baseline	-Appetite	-THC:CBD
et al ³³		(unspecified)	phase 3, double-blind, placebo- controlled RCT study -N=243 -n=161 UC & GI	patients with advanced incurable cancer that were candidates for appetite stimulation and had involuntary weight loss of >5%. Patients were split into	assessment, patients received either THC:CBD (2.5 mg:1 mg), 2. of THC, or placebo for 6 weeks -Patients received a two- week supply of capsules to take twice before lunch and	change from baseline to week 6, measured through a visual analog scale and Anorexia- Cachexia EORTC QLQ- C30 module -Change in QOL from	increased appetite by 75%, THC by 60% and placebo by 72% placebo (p=0.068) – All arms showed a 5% improvement on the EORTC QLQ-C30 score until week 2, followed by another 5%

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Wadaat	CIN	Drostata	Double	three arms: THC:CBD, THC, or placeboGermany	dinner	baseline to week 6	improvement until week 6 with placebo, steady state with THC and worsening by 2.5% with THC:CBD. -No differences between three groups for appetite, quality of life, mood, or nausea
Wada et al ²⁹	CIN	Prostate, bladder, testicular	-Double- blind, randomized, crossover trial -N=114 -n=10 UC	-Patients were given a capsule the preceding evening of chemotherapy, the morning of, and every 12 hours until the end of treatment -U.S.	-Nabilone (1–2 mg) or matching placebo	-Safety and efficacy -Patients rated their nausea on a scale of 0 (none) to 3 (severe) daily	-Nabilone patients had 4.19 vomiting episodes per day compared to 7.08 on placebo (p<0.001) -Average nausea rating on nabilone vs. placebo was 1.22/3 and 1.96/3, (p<0.001); 61% of patients experienced less

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

			nausea while on nabilone -70% of patients preferred nabilone over placebo
			(p<0.001) (22% favored placebo and 8% had no preference)

CBD: cannabidiol; CI: confidence interval; CIN: chemotherapy-induced nausea; EORTC: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer; ESAS: Edmonton Symptom Assessment System; GI: gastrointestinal; GU: genitourinary; NRS: numerical rating scale; OR: odds ratio; PCa: prostate cancer; RCT: randomized controlled trial; THC: Delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol; UC: urological cancer; QOL: quality of life.

Taneja S, et al. Use of cannabis in urological cancer patients: A review to evaluate risk for cancer development, therapeutic use, and symptom management

Search strategy

The search strategy contained the following keywords and combinations: "testicular cancer OR germ cell tumor OR prostate cancer OR penile cancer OR bladder cancer OR kidney cancer OR renal carcinoma OR prostatic neoplasms OR urinary bladder neoplasms OR testicular neoplasms OR ureteral neoplasms OR kidney neoplasms OR urological neoplasms" AND "cannabis OR marijuana OR marihuana OR cannabinoids OR cannabidiol OR delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol OR dronabinol OR nabilone OR nabiximols OR tetrahydrocannabinol". A second search was completed for the use of cannabis for urologic cancer-related symptom management and utilized the above keywords AND "cancer pain OR chemotherapy induced nausea OR cachexia OR anorexia OR nausea OR vomiting".