The endocannabinoid system and neuropathic pain
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Abstract

The research of new therapeutic strategies for neuropathic pain represents a major current priority. Important drawbacks to advance in the development of these therapies are the limited translational value of the animal models now available and the elucidation of the complex neuronal and immune pathophysiological mechanisms underlying neuropathic pain. One of the neurotransmitter systems participating in neuropathic pain control that has recently raised a particular interest is the endocannabinoid system. This system is highly expressed in neurons and immune cells, and plays a crucial role in the development of neuropathic pain. Preclinical studies have provided important findings revealing the potential interest of the endocannabinoid system for neuropathic pain treatment. These studies have reported the analgesic effects of cannabinoid agonists in multiple neuropathic pain models and have identified specific targets within this system to develop more effective and safe analgesic compounds. However, further studies using more relevant neuropathic pain animal models are required to confirm these interesting results. Several clinical studies suggest that cannabinoids significantly reduced neuropathic pain, although most of these trials fail the required standards of quality. The different pain patient populations include in the systematic reviews also make difficult to get adequate conclusions. Therefore, additional clinical trials that consider an adequate number of patients, use active treatments as controls and longer duration of administration are required to have an adequate profile of the effectiveness and safety of cannabinoids in neuropathic pain.
Introduction

Chronic neuropathic pain is a devastating pain syndrome affecting 7 to 10% of the general population [40], with higher incidence in aged people [14]. Neuropathic pain patients have lower labor productivity, use more health resources and are more likely to develop mental disorders compared to other chronic pain sufferers [57]. It has been estimated that cost related to neuropathic pain could amount to as much as $160 billion per year only in USA, which represents approximately one quarter of all chronic pain costs [36]. An important limitation at the present moment is the absence of effective treatment for neuropathic pain. Indeed, tricyclic antidepressants, serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors and anticonvulsants constitute the first line treatment for neuropathic pain [4]. However, the efficacy is only modest and the number of patients needed to treat for 50% pain relief is estimated in 3 to 9.4 [32]. Topical capsaicin and lidocaine are second choice agents with discrete efficacy recommended for peripheral neuropathies, and other treatments such as opioids or botulinum toxin-A are weakly recommended because of side effects or poor evidence of efficacy [32]. Therefore, the research of new therapeutic strategies for neuropathic pain represents a major current priority.

Significance and limitations of the animal models

The existence of appropriate animal models is crucial for understanding the biological basis of the different diseases. The limited translational value of the animal models currently available to investigate neuropathic pain represents an important drawback to advance in understanding the pathophysiological mechanisms involved and to
develop new therapeutic strategies. Neuropathic pain is characterized by the presence of spontaneous pain and signs of sensory loss, which can sometimes be accompanied by gain of function, i.e. allodynia and hyperalgesia. Sensory manifestations are often associated to emotional and cognitive alterations. A number of disorders affecting the somatosensory system have been modeled to investigate neuropathic pain, although the most common neuropathic pain models mimic traumatic injuries to the nervous system (Table 1). Injury and disease-based models are successful reproducing allodynia and hyperalgesia associated to neuropathic pain [49,93]. Although allodynia and hyperalgesia are important complaints affecting up to 64% of the patients, the cardinal symptom of neuropathic pain is spontaneous pain that affects 96% of patients [8], and it has not been evaluated in appropriate animal models until recently. Direct measures of spontaneous pain, such as changes in facial expression, locomotor activity or rearing are transient in models of peripheral neuropathic pain, and have not been widely used to evaluate drug efficacy [55,71,107]. Recent operant self-medication paradigms or conditioned place preference tests are promising indirect measures useful to evaluate both the rewarding effect of pain relief and the abuse potential of candidate drugs [70,78].

Neuropathic pain is more common in old people and women [7,14]. However, most basic research studies have been performed only in young male rodents, although this tendency is changing partially due to failure of clinical trials [20]. Recent works taking into account these important experimental conditions have found striking differences depending on sex and age [60,106].
Sleep disturbances (37-60% prevalence), emotional disorders (33-42% prevalence), cognitive impairment (11.4% prevalence), pain-related fear or deficits in social behavior [57,89,98,105] are important co-morbid manifestations of neuropathic pain that should also be evaluated in animal models. These alterations and their pharmacotherapy may be independent of hyperalgesia and allodynia [27] and an additional effort must be made to evaluate them in basic research studies. Taking into account not only the nociceptive manifestations, but also the emotional and the cognitive consequences of neuropathic pain will allow to embrace the complexity of neuropathic pain syndromes and should improve the translational value of animal models.

In addition, a frequent problem of neuropathic pain animal models is the interpretation of results without considering the timing of treatment. Indeed, most failures in phase-II clinical trials are due to lack of efficacy (50%) or to drug toxicity (25%) [47]. Therapeutic efficacy could be different when the consequences of the injury to the nervous system are not fully developed, which could lead to overestimations of the results [25]. Using appropriate animal models to elucidate the mechanisms of action of the candidate drugs, establishing clinically-validated targets, and finding correlation between the alleviation of neuropathic pain and the inhibition of the proposed target should increase the predictability of these models and facilitate the understanding of the neurobiological mechanisms underlying this syndrome.
Pathophysiological mechanisms

The pathophysiological mechanisms underlying neuropathic pain include complex peripheral and central sensitization processes mainly involving neurons and immune cells. Peripheral nerve injury involves damage of primary afferents and recruitment of immune cells releasing cytokines, nerve growth factor, and other signaling substances [100]. Nerve fibers develop ectopic activity and become hyperexcitable and pharmacologically dysfunctional. Several specific changes at the peripheral level could underlie this nerve sensitization, including dysregulation and/or redistribution of potassium and voltage-gated sodium channels [54,110,129], increase functionality of purinergic receptors [19] and calcium channel subunit α2δ1 [10], and reductions in opioid receptor expression [82]. In contrast, an enhancement of cannabinoid receptors has been reported at the peripheral and spinal level during neuropathic pain [68,128].

After peripheral nerve injury, heightened firing from primary afferents render postsynaptic spinal cord neurons hyperexcitable, mainly through activation of glutamate receptors [58]. Loss of GABA and glycinergic interneurons and a change in the polarity of GABA/glycinergic transmission also contribute to this activation [34,69]. Serotonergic, noradrenergic, opioid and cannabinoid bulbo-spinal neurons constitute a descending inhibitory input over the spinal cord dorsal horn under these pathological conditions [83,93]. Important adaptive changes also occur in other somatosensory areas, such as thalamus and somatosensory cortex [38,69]. However, plastic changes are increasingly reported in brain areas involved in emotional and
cognitive aspects of neuropathic pain, including cingulate cortex, amygdala, hippocampus, prefrontal cortex or nucleus accumbens [16,76,79].

Immune mechanisms are also highly intertwined during neuropathic pain. Nerve growth factor, chemokine ligands and leukotriene-b4 released by primary afferents and denervated Schwann cells rapidly attract neutrophil granulocytes and resident macrophages to the injured site. Immune cells increase the levels of pro-inflammatory mediators facilitating re-growth and repairing, but also promoting peripheral sensitization [100]. In the dorsal root ganglia, activated satellite glial cells contribute to neuronal sensitization [113,120]. This is accompanied by disruption of the nerve-blood barrier by matrix metalloproteases and vascular endothelial growth factor [61,100] and infiltration of circulating macrophages and lymphocytes.

In the spinal cord, neuronal damage is followed by microglial cell activation through purinergic, toll-like or BDNF receptors. Microglia phagocyte cell debris and release numerous inflammatory mediators [9]. These spinal cord immune responses are modulated by the endocannabinoid system (ECS) during neuropathic pain [90,91]. Increasing evidence also suggests an important role for astrocytes in advanced stages of neuropathic pain, through release of pro-nociceptive mediators [18,67]. Finally, oligodendrocyte damage can impair axonal repairing, reflected in alterations in conduction velocity and neuropathic pain phenotype [37]. Immune/glial response may be similar in limbic system areas, and may participate in the emotional-like manifestations of neuropathic pain [97,127].
One of the neurotransmitter systems involved in the pathophysiology of neuropathic pain that has recently raised a particular interest for the development of new therapeutic strategies is the ECS. This system is highly expressed in neurons and immune cells that are crucial for the development of neuropathic pain.

**The endocannabinoid system**

The ECS plays a key role in pain control and the physiopathology of neuropathic pain. It is integrated by the cannabinoid receptors, their endogenous ligands and the enzymes involved in the synthesis and degradation of these ligands. At least two different cannabinoid receptors, CB1 receptor (CB1R) and CB2 receptor (CB2R) have been identified. Both receptors are seven transmembrane domain receptors coupled to inhibitory G proteins and their distribution and physiological role are quite different [85]. CB1R are highly expressed in central nervous system (CNS) neurons [26], whereas CB2R are mainly located in immune cells [73], although they are also expressed in CNS neurons [103]. The most important endogenous ligands for cannabinoid receptors are N-arachidonylethanolamine (anandamide) and 2-arachidonoylglycerol (2-AG) [85]. These endocannabinoids are synthesized from cell membrane phospholipids mainly post-synaptically acting as retrograde messengers that regulate the release of multiple presynaptic neurotransmitters, and are inactivated by re-uptake mechanisms followed by enzymatic degradation [126]. 2-AG is synthesized from diacylglycerol by diacylglycerol lipase and is primarily metabolized by monoacylglycerol lipase (MAGL) [28]. Anandamide is synthesized
from the phosphatidylethanolamine by the action of N-acyltransferase and phospholipase D and is mainly degraded by fatty-acid amide hydrolase (FAAH) [65].

The ECS plays a crucial role in the inhibitory control of the nociceptive stimuli by acting at peripheral, spinal and supra-spinal levels (Figure 1). At the periphery, CB1R located in nociceptive terminals inhibit nociceptive transmission, whereas CB2R located in immune cells and keratinocytes reduce the release of pronociceptive agents [44]. CB1R are expressed in the dorsal root ganglia and in nociceptive and non-nociceptive sensitive terminals in the spinal cord dorsal horn, where they inhibit neurotransmitter release and pain transmission [75]. CB2R in the spinal cord modulate the immune responses leading to neuronal sensitization during chronic pain [88,91]. At the supraspinal level, CB1R inhibit ascending nociceptive transmission, mainly at the thalamus level, modify the emotional pain component acting at the limbic system and cortical areas, and activate the descending inhibitory pathway through the inhibition of GABA release in the periaqueductal gray and rostral ventral medulla [75,112].

**Preclinical studies on endocannabinoid system and neuropathic pain**

Animal studies have provided important findings revealing the role of the ECS in the pathophysiology of neuropathic pain and its potential interest to identify new pharmacological tools for neuropathic pain treatment. These studies have mainly used genetically modified mice with selective mutations in specific ECS components and pharmacological agents that modify the ECS activity (Table 1).
Several studies have demonstrated that the constitutive deletion of CB1R did not significantly modify the manifestations of neuropathic pain in mice [75]. In contrast, the selective CB1R deletion in peripheral nociceptors enhanced neuropathic pain manifestations and reduced the analgesic effects of systemic cannabinoid agonists underlying the role of peripheral CB1R in neuropathic pain [2]. However, the constitutive suppression of CB1R enhanced anxiety- and depressive-like behavior promoted by chronic neuropathic pain suggesting a prominent role in these emotional manifestations [92]. The constitutive deletion of CB2R generates a clear enhancement of neuropathic pain manifestations revealed by a mirror image of pain in the contralateral unaffected side [91]. In agreement, the over-expression of CB2R in the CNS attenuates neuropathic pain manifestations [91]. An immune response involving microglia and interferon-\(\gamma\) release seems responsible of these CB2R-mediated effects [90]. The endocannabinoids that could be involved in these mechanisms have not been yet clarified. Indeed, the development and expression of neuropathic pain was not modified in FAAH and MAGL knockout mice [75,99], CB1 desensitization could underlie the absence of antinociceptive effects in MAGL knockout mice [99].

Pharmacological studies revealed that non-selective cannabinoid agonists as well as selective CB1R and CB2R agonists induced antinociceptive effects in multiple animal models of neuropathic pain [75], whereas the acute blockade of CB1R or the inverse CB2R agonism produce pro-nociceptive effects [93,104](Table 1). Most of the studies have reported these effects on classical animal models of evoked allodinia and/or hyperalgesia. However, few studies have used animal models evaluating more relevant aspects of neuropathic pain [93]. Thus, recent studies have revealed that non
selective cannabinoid agonists reduce the cognitive impairment associated to diabetic neuropathy [24] and selective CB2R agonists reduced the depressive-like behavior [43] and alleviate spontaneous neuropathic pain in an operant model of self-medication [39]. Interestingly, these CB2R agonists are devoid of the cannabimimetic effects of CB1R agonists [74].

The blockade of endocannabinoid re-uptake and the pharmacological inhibition of FAAH produce antinociceptive effects that did not develop tolerance in neuropathic pain models [99], although these effects were less consistent than in chronic inflammatory pain models [50][96], and some contradictory results have been reported depending on the experimental conditions [59]. In contrast, MAGL inhibition produced clear antinociceptive effects in neuropathic pain models, which underwent tolerance with CB1R desensitization after repeated treatment. Both FAAH and MAGL inhibitors produced limited cannabimimetic effects [46,99].

Therefore, preclinical studies have underlined the interest of the ECS for neuropathic pain treatment and have identified new possible approaches to obtain effective analgesic responses minimizing the classical side effects related to CB1R agonists. However, the majority of studies have just evaluated the modification of the nociceptive sensitization associated to neuropathic pain. Most of these promising results must be confirmed in more relevant models of neuropathic pain allowing to evaluate the spontaneous pain manifestations, sleep disturbances, emotional and cognitive impairments that are crucial in this complex pain syndrome. Additional efforts must also be done to match the age and sex of the animal samples and time
schedule of the experimental treatments with the real clinical conditions. In particular, further studies including these experimental conditions would be necessary to identify the potential interest that has risen from the recent results obtained with CB2R agonists and MAGL/FAAH inhibitors.

**Cannabinoids and neuropathic pain treatment in humans**

In agreement with the preclinical data, the analgesic effects of Cannabis sativa derivatives have also been reported in humans. Cannabis sativa contains around 70 phytocannabinoids and the main psychoactive component is $\Delta^9$-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). Cannabis sativa has been used for pain treatment more than 20 centuries ago in ancient China, Greece, Rome, Israel and India [48]. More recently, cannabis use has been reported in population-based studies of patients with multiple pain syndromes, including neuropathic pain [84,117]. In the last twenty years, several cannabinoid preparations were available for neuropathic pain, including oral dronabinol and nabilone, as well as cannabis extracts to be administered by oromucosal, inhaled and vaporized route [118].

Early systematic reviews reported that cannabinoids were not better than codeine in controlling pain without advocating their widespread use[15]. However, the number of patients was limited and few randomized clinical trials (RCTs) were analyzed including multiple pain syndromes. They analyzed several clinical trials, but only one considered neuropathic pain and advised that more RCTs should be carried out to evaluate the efficacy of cannabinoids. More recent systematic reviews have identified the existence of moderate analgesic effects of cannabinoids compared with placebo as
well as an improvement in sleep, without serious adverse effects, and concluded that the cannabinoids were modestly effective and safe in neuropathic pain [62][64]. However, the only systematic review of cannabinoids in neuropathic pain has been recently published [12]. This study reviewed thirteen high-quality RCTs and suggested that cannabinoids provide analgesia in neuropathic pain patients who are refractory to other treatments. Another recent review included six trials with marijuana in 325 patients with neuropathic pain and concluded that it may be useful, although some significant side effects, such as addiction and worsening of psychiatric illnesses should be taken into account [41]. The authors also suggest that new studies were needed to evaluate the consequences of long-term treatments and to establish the best form of drug administration. In contrast, a recent meta-analysis that has considered nine clinical trials with the oromucosal administration of nabiximols (1:1 mixture of THC and cannabidiol) concluded that this cannabinoid formulation has only weak recommendations for its use in neuropathic pain.

Clinical research on cannabinoids has widely increased in the last fifteen years. New designs, larger-scale studies, higher doses and change of route of administration have allowed to accumulate evidences to clarify if cannabinoids have an opportunity as analgesics. Given the information available, we have separately considered the analysis of clinical trials depending how cannabinoids were administered in neuropathic pain: orally (mainly nabilone and dronabinol), smoked or vaporized (marijuana) and oromucosal (THC plus cannabidiol)

Clinical trials with orally administered cannabinoids
The main oral cannabinoids used with medical purposes were ajulemic acid (CT3, a major metabolite of THC with CB1R activity), cannabidiol, dronabinol, levonantradol, nabilone and THC (Table 2). A moderate evidence supports the use of these cannabinoids in chronic pain and spasticity [122]. Only a RCT with CT3 has been published with neuropathic pain patients of varying etiologies and demonstrated its effectiveness in reducing pain without causing cannabinoid-like CNS side effects [53]. Dronabinol was studied in three RCTs. No beneficial effect was seen in a pilot study with titrating dosing in refractory neuropathic pain [5], whereas modest effects were observed in neuropatic pain patients with spinal cord injury and a third clinical trial reported that dronabinol was no more effective than active placebo in a crossover study with only seven adults [94]. Experience with nabilone in neuropathic pain is scarce. A study comparing dihydrocodeine with nabilone reported that the second was less effective and with a worst safety profile [35]. However, this study was criticized in the grounds of patient drop out, and because alldynia and sympathetic dysfunction were over-represented in these patients [21]. A trial in painful diabetic neuropathy showed that nabilone relieved symptoms and improved disturbed sleep and overall quality of life when compared to placebo [109].

**Clinical trials with smoked and vaporized cannabis**

The most traditional way of consuming cannabis is by smoking because their effects are more rapid. However, the use of this route of administration is complicated for the high risk of abuse and respiratory side effects. Several studies have provided evidences on the efficacy of smoked cannabis in neuropathic pain, such as HIV
associated neuropathy [1,30], central and peripheral neuropathic pain [123,124] and post-traumatic or post-surgical neuropathic pain [117]. The analgesic effects were clear but moderate, whereas the adverse effects were frequent although not severe [15,66]. This pharmacological profile has led to the endorsement of these cannabinoids for second-line use in the treatment of central neuropathic pain by European Federation of Neurological Societies [6]. No difference in terms of efficacy could be seen between the different cannabinoids and smoked cannabis has been advised to be used only in severe neuropathic pain not responding to pharmaceutical cannabinoids and other analgesics [52].

**Clinical trials with oromucosal spray and Sativex**

New ways of delivering cannabinoids have been developed to improve bioavailability and minimize side effects. The most recent has been a 1:1 mixture of the natural phytocannabinoids THC and cannabidiol in the form of oral mucosal spray (Nabimixols or Sativex). This device has been used in several clinical trials controlled with placebo in neuropathic pain and its beneficial effect has been revealed in multiple sclerosis central pain [95], brachial plexus avulsion [11], neuropathic pain after peripheral injury [42,80,81,102,114] and diabetic neuropathy [101]. The THC/CBD association as add-on treatment may also improve neuropathic pain associated to multiple sclerosis resistant to other treatment [56]. However, a recent meta-analysis concluded that this formulation of THC/CBD has only weak recommendation for neuropathic pain treatment [32]. A recent, single and pilot study has compared nabiximols with placebo in patients with...
chemotherapy-induced pain [63]. No global differences were seen, although six patients experienced significant decreases on pain compared with placebo. Given the difficulties of relieving this type of pain, authors concluded that these results merit a further full RCT.

Caveats of clinical trials

In spite of these interesting findings obtained in the RCTs, clinical research on cannabinoids in pain has been hampered by some limitations that include the small sample size, the lack of differentiation of pain syndromes and cannabinoid responders, the absence of an adequate assessment of the clinical importance of the observed effects, the safety profiles, the characterization of adverse events and the long-term consequences of treatments [12]. The blinding of the studies, due to the psychotropic effects of cannabinoids, is also an important limitation to adequately perform RCTs. The efficacy in multiple sclerosis patients where pain has an important spastic component also improved by cannabinoids complicates the final interpretation of the analgesic effects [36].

In addition, anecdotal reports are usually a consequence of the use of smoked marijuana adding difficulties to the interpretation of results and the clarification of the effect of each different cannabinoids. Indeed, the complex interactions among the cannabinoid contained in marijuana are not fully known and may contribute to the final effectiveness of marijuana. Some individual cannabinoids, such as nabilone and
dronabinol, have shown some potential interest as analgesics, although their efficacy in pain patients seems lower than the alleged effects of marijuana [23].

**Safety concerns and benefit/risk ratio**

One of the most important barriers to the clinical use of cannabinoids arises from concerns on its safety profile. This may be a consequence of the reputation of these compounds in recreational use, even when their toxicity is clearly low compared with other drugs. Indeed, clinical trials have shown that cannabinoid adverse events are not frequent or more severe than those of other centrally acting analgesics [116].

Repeated worries have been expressed on the possibility of chronic use of cannabinoids. The possibility of addiction, the risk of psychotic disorders or exacerbation of previous psychiatric diseases have been invoked to justify the restriction of the use of these drugs. Other cannabinoid side effects related to mental health include symptoms of depersonalization, derealization, irrational panic and paranoia, amotivational syndrome as well as cannabis withdrawal syndrome, which consists of anxiety, irritability, physical symptoms and decreases in appetite/weight loss [125]. However, most of the evidences of these cannabinoid adverse effects come from their recreative use. The possible risks of cannabinoids on mental health must be particularly taken into consideration in long-term treatments with needs for close monitorization and appropriate exclusion criteria considering the previous psychiatric history of the patients. Additional concerns have been raised from the possibility of detrimental effects of cannabinoids in brain development in young patients [23] or the possibility to reduce the olfactory acuity [115].
The combined number of patients needed to obtain 50% relief with cannabinoids in neuropathic patients is 3.4 [33], which may justify its potential use provided the safety is adequate. This safety/risk ratio must be always considered for every possible patient.

**Future perspectives**

New strategies for using cannabinoids more efficiently include the selective targeting of CB1R and CB2R, the inhibition of endogenous cannabinoid uptake and metabolism in selected tissues, the harnessing of cannabinoid-opioid synergies, and the delivery of cannabinoids by improved strategies [118]. Indeed, several selective CB2R agonists and MAGL/FAAH inhibitors have shown promising analgesic activity in preclinical models of neuropathic pain [46,74]. However, these promising results must be confirmed in more relevant animal models of neuropathic pain with experimental conditions closer to the clinical conditions. The widely reported synergistic effects between cannabinoid and opioid compounds [75] also open interesting possibilities to be explored in future clinical trials.

Spray preparations with a mix of THC and cannabidiol have given new perspectives on the use of cannabinoids in humans until then limited by the moderate efficacy of oral cannabinoids and safety of smoked marijuana. However, more RCTs are needed to explore a dose escalation in patients given the present relative low dose of the combinations. The use of cannabidiol has also opened the possibility of the use of other phytocannabinoids in neuropathic pain treatment [31]. New devices that deliver cannabinoids more efficiently opens promising approaches. Thus, a novel portable
thermal-metered-dose inhaler that allows the administration of a single cannabis dose has been recently developed showing a uniform pharmacokinetic profile and a significant reduction of pain in neuropathic patients [29].

**Concluding remarks**

Preclinical studies have widely reported the potential interest of cannabinoids in neuropathic pain treatment. CB2R, FAAH and MAGL have also been recently identified as novel targets within the ECS to develop more selective compounds devoid of the classical cannabimimetic side effects. In agreement with these preclinical data, some systematic reviews and meta-analyses have shown that cannabinoids allow modest pain reduction but its analgesic effect may be offset by potentially serious harms; additionally, further high quality studies are needed to establish the duration of the treatment and the optimal route of administration. However, the different pain patient populations included in the systematic reviews make difficult to get adequate conclusions. Use of orally administered cannabinoids fails to provide adequate relief, whereas smoked or vaporized marijuana seems more effective. Safety is not an important concern in acute treatments, although terms of mental health risk must be taken into consideration mainly for chronic use. Recently, the Canadian Pain Society has advanced cannabinoids to third-line agents in the management of chronic neuropathic pain based in the results of the last published RCTs [72]. However, they advised a close monitoring mainly with long-term treatments and the contraindication in patients with previous history of psychosis. Large scale RCTs that consider an adequate number of patients, use active treatments as controls and longer
duration of administration are required to have an adequate profile of the effectiveness and safety of cannabinoids in neuropathic pain.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Model</th>
<th>Principle of the model</th>
<th>Cannabinoid Behavioral Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traumatic models - peripheral nerve injury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Constriction Injury</td>
<td>3-4 loose ligatures around sciatic nerve [22]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R and CB2R agonists, cannabinoid-reuptake and FAAH*/MAGL inhibitors reduced thermal and mechanical nociception. Acute rimonabant (selective CB1R antagonist) showed pro-nociceptive effects. CB2R agonist showed anti-depressant effect [93]. Intrathecal CB1R/CB2R, but not CB2R agonist inhibited mechanical nociception [13]. FAAH and MAGL KO mice showed unaltered nociception; Wild-type mice developed tolerance to antinociception after repeated treatment with high doses of MAGL but not with FAAH inhibitors [99]. A CB1R positive allosteric modulator reduced mechanical sensitivity [45].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Sciatic Nerve Ligation (Seltzer Model)</td>
<td>Tight ligation of cranial 1/3 of sciatic nerve [22]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R, CB2R agonists, cannabinoid-reuptake and FAAH*/MAGL inhibitors reduced thermal and mechanical nociception. CB2R KO mice showed contralateral hypernociception. Rimonabant and CB2R inverse agonists induced pro-nociceptive effects [93,104]. CB1R KO mice showed enhanced anxiety and depression-like behavior [92].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Nerve Ligation / Transection</td>
<td>L5-L6 ligation / transection [22,93]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R, CB2R agonists, cannabinoid-reuptake and FAAH*/MAGL inhibitors reduced thermal and mechanical nociception. Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist-mediated antinociception and motor impairment were abolished in CB1R KO mice. Treatment with CB1R antagonist enhanced CB2R-mediated antinociception [87,93]. MAGL KO and WT mice showed similar mechanical and thermal nociception [17].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saphenous Nerve Injury</td>
<td>Saphenous nerve partial ligation, demyelination or constriction with two loose ligatures [93]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist suppressed thermal and mechanical nociception [93].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orofacial pain, Trigeminal neuralgia</td>
<td>Two loose ligatures around infraorbital nerve [49]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist reduced mechanical nociception, without developing tolerance [93].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spared Nerve Injury</td>
<td>Transection of tibial and common peroneal nerves [22]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonists suppressed thermal and mechanical nociception, an effect reduced in mice lacking CB1* in nociceptors [93]. A CB2R agonist maintained an operant behavior associated to spontaneous pain relief and inhibited mechanical nociception [39] MAGL KO and WT mice showed similar mechanical nociception [86].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciatic Nerve Axotomy</td>
<td>Ligation and transection of sciatic nerve [22]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibial Nerve Injury</td>
<td>Axotomy of tibial branch of sciatic nerve [93]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R attenuated thermal and mechanical nociception [93].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traumatic models - spinal cord injury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord Clip-compression injury</td>
<td>Compression of T6-T8 segment with microaneurysm clip [93]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist suppressed mechanical nociception [93].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight drop/contusive spinal cord injury</td>
<td>Drop of a weight onto exposed spinal cord [49]</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist suppressed thermal nociception [3].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal hemisection</td>
<td>Hemisection cranial to L1 dorsal root [49]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-induced models</td>
<td>Viral neuropathy</td>
<td>Chemically-induced models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streptozocin-induced diabetic neuropathy</td>
<td>Post-herpetic neuralgia</td>
<td>Sciatic inflammatory Neuropathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-induced neuropathy</td>
<td>HIV-related neuropathy</td>
<td>Excitotoxic Spinal cord Injury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic dietary ethanol consumption [49]</td>
<td>Perineural HIV-gp120 administration [49]</td>
<td>Spinal administration of excitatory aminoacids [49]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemotherapy-induced neuropathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated administration of Paclitaxel, Vincristine, Oxaliplatin, Cisplatin [22,49]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-retroviral-induced neuropathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalcitabine, didanosine, stavudine administration [49,51,93]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R, CB1R and CB2R agonists suppressed mechanical sensitivity. THC enhanced analgesic effect of morphine. A mixed agonist reversed cognitive impairment [93].</td>
<td>Mixed CB1R/CB2R agonist and FAAH inhibitor reduced mechanical and cold sensitivity [77,93]</td>
<td>FAAH inhibitor reduced mechanical sensitivity [93].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#: Demonstrated through genetic approach. <strong>Abbreviations</strong>: CFA, complete Freund’s adjuvant. FAAH, fatty acid amide hydrolase. MAGL, monoacylglycerol lipase. CB1R, CB1 receptor. CB2R, CB2 receptor. THC, tetrahydrocannabinol. HIV, human immunodeficiency virus. HIV-gp120, envelope glycoprotein GP120 of the HIV envelope. TNF-alpha, tumor necrosis factor alpha.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Summary of randomized clinical trials assessing analgesic efficacy of cannabinoids in neuropathic pain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors (year)</th>
<th>Study design (patients)</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Agent and daily dose</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Result(s)</th>
<th>Adverse events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karst et al. (2003)</td>
<td>Crossover (24)</td>
<td>Chronic Np</td>
<td>CT3 40 mg -80 mg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 week</td>
<td>CT3 &gt;P</td>
<td>Minor. tiredness and dry mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Svendsen et al. (2004)</td>
<td>Crossover (24)</td>
<td>Central Np in MS</td>
<td>D, up 10 mg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3 weeks</td>
<td>D&gt;P</td>
<td>AEs were higher during the active treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Crossover (96)</td>
<td>Chronic Np</td>
<td>N, up 2 mg</td>
<td>Dc, up 240 mg daily</td>
<td>14 weeks</td>
<td>Dc&gt;N</td>
<td>No serious AEs but slightly side effects with dihydrocodeine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rintala et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Crossover (7)</td>
<td>Np after spinal cord injury</td>
<td>D,5 mg</td>
<td>Dp (25 mg)</td>
<td>28 days</td>
<td>D=Dp</td>
<td>Dry mouth, constipation, fatigue and drowsiness for both drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toth et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Parallel (26)</td>
<td>Diabetic Np</td>
<td>N 1-4 mg</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>8 weeks</td>
<td>N&gt;P</td>
<td>Minor AEs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smoked and vaporized administration

| Authors (year)       | Study design (patients) | Indication            | Agent and daily dose | Control | Duration | Result(s) | Adverse events                                      |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|                      |         |          |           |                                                     |
| Abrams et al. (2007) | Parallel (55)           | HIV-Np                | C smoked (3.56%)     | P       | 5 days   | C>P       | Mild serious effects, minimal psychoactive effects  |
| Wilsey et al. (2008) | Crossover (38)          | Central and peripheral Np | C smoked (3.5%, 7%)  | P       | 6 h sessions | C>P  | Minimal psychoactive effects                         |
| Ware et al. (2010)   | Crossover (23)          | Post-traumatic chronic Np | C smoked (2.5%, 6%, 9.4%) | P       | 14 days  | C>P       | No serious AEs                                      |
| Ellis et al. (2009)  | Crossover (34)          | HIV-NP                | C smoked (1%-8%)     | P       | 5 days   | C>P       | No serious AEs                                      |
| Wilsey et al. (2013) | Crossover (39)          | Peripheral Np         | C vaporized (1.29%, 3.53) | P       | 6 h sessions | C>P  | Psychoactive effects were minimal and well tolerated |

Oromucosal spray

| Authors (year)       | Study design (patients) | Indication            | Agent and daily dose | Control | Duration | Result(s) | Adverse events                                      |
|----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|                      |         |          |           |                                                     |
| Wade et al. (2003)   | Crossover (24)          | Peripheral and central Np | CBM (THC/CBD) CBD and THC up 120 mg | P       | 8 weeks  | N>P       | Predictable AEs generally well tolerated            |
| Berman et al. (2004) | Crossover (48)          | Brachial plexus root avulsion | CBM (up THC, 129.6 mg / CBD 120 mg) and THC | P       | 6 weeks  | CBM=T HC=P | Well tolerated with mild to moderate AEs            |
| Rog et al. (2005)    | Parallel (63)           | Central Np in MS      | CBM (up THC, 129.6 mg/CBD,120 mg) | P       | 4 weeks  | CBM>P     | No serious AEs                                      |
| Nurmikko et al. (2007) | Parallel (125)         | Peripheral Np         | CBM (up THC, 21.6 mg / CBD 20 mg) | P       | 5 weeks  | N>P       | No serious AEs                                      |
| Selvarajah et al. (2010) | Parallel (30)         | Diabetic NP           | CBM (THC:CBD 1:1 one pump = 2.5 mg/2.5 mg) | P       | 12 weeks | CBM=P     | Six AE-related withdrawals                          |
| Langford et al. (2013) | Parallel (339)        | Central Np in MS      | CBM (up THC, 32,4 mg / CBM, 30 mg) | P       | 14 weeks | CBM=P     | Less than 10% withdraw in all study groups          |
| Serpell et al. (2014) | Parallel (246)         | Peripheral Np         | CBM (THC/CBD spray)  | P       | 15 weeks | CBM>P     | Treatments were well tolerated                      |
| Lynch et al. (2014)  | Crossover (16)         | Chemotherapy-induced Np | CBM (up THC, 32,4 mg / CBM, 30 mg) | P       | 10 weeks | CBM=P     | Fatigue, dizziness, dry mouth and/or nausea         |

Abbreviations: AEs, adverse events; C, cannabis; CBD, cannabidiol; CBM, cannabis-based medicine; D, dronabinol; Dc, dihydrocodeine; Dp, diphenhydramine; MS, multiple sclerosis; Nb, nabilone; Np, neuropathic pain; P, placebo; THC, tetrahydrocannabinol