

Meeting Minutes

HB 21-1317 Third Meeting of the Scientific Review Council

April 26, 2022; 11am-1pm MT

General Remarks and Welcome

- Dr. Chris Urbina, Chair of the Scientific Review Council (SRC), called to order the third meeting of the SRC on April 26, 2022, at 11 am MT.

Scientific Review Council Introductions and Update on Conflicts of Interest

- The Chair conducted a roll call for both the Council and the Colorado School of Public Health project team members.
- Dr. Archana Shrestha was introduced as this was her first SRC meeting appearance
- The following Council members were present and introduced:
 - Greg Kinney
 - Joseph Schacht
 - Chris Urbina
 - Kent Hutchinson
 - Paula Riggs
 - Archana Shrestha
 - Erica Wymore
 - Susan Calcaterra
 - Lesley Brooks
 - David Brumbaugh
- The following Council members were absent:
 - Kennon Heard, with advanced notice and apologies
- The following SPH team members were present and introduced:
 - Jonathan Samet
 - Greg Tung
 - Sam Wang
 - Lisa Bero
 - Tianjing Li
 - Ashley Brooks-Russell
 - Rosa Lawrence
 - Kelsey Phinney
 - Louis Leslie
 - Additional team members recognized as in attendance:
 - Muky Rittiphairoj
 - Christi Piper
 - Jean-Pierre Oberste
- The following SPH team members were absent:
 - Meghan Buran, with advanced notice and apologies
- Chair Chris Urbina provided an introduction to the new member of the Council: Dr. Archana Shrestha. She will be filling the Council role of Neurologist.

- Changes to COI forms for any Council members
 - None
- Review of agenda with Council
 - Agenda shown on screen for the panelists (Council and Colorado SPH) as well as public attendees.
- No questions for Chair Chris Urbina.

Review of Meeting Minutes and Response to SRC Recommendations

- Dr. Jonathan Samet reminded everyone in attendance that meeting minutes and the response to SRC recommendations are available on the website under the resources tab.
- No questions for Dr. Jonathan Samet.

Progress Update

- Dr. Jonathan Samet provided a review of the charge to the Colorado School of Public Health and the research questions for the review.
- Dr. Tianjing Li provided a progress-to-date report.
 - Since the last meeting on January 24, 2022, the research team has screened all 46,000 studies for eligibility.
 - 789 studies have been included in the systematic scoping review and their characteristics will be documented and data extracted.
 - The research team has documented the characteristics for ~one third of the studies and the protocol for data extraction is being completed.
 - Once data extraction is complete, the team will assess the risk of bias and then conduct narrative and quantitative synthesis.
- No questions for Dr. Jonathan Samet and Dr. Tianjing Li.

Challenges to Classification of Exposures and Outcomes

- Dr. Tianjing Li provided an overview of the approach to classification of exposures in data extraction.
 - Some of the key issues relating to exposure concern how papers categorize or report the potency of THC and the frequency of use.
 - Dr. Tianjing Li asked the SRC if they had suggestions on how to normalize or standardize the exposure descriptions.
 - Dr. Li did not receive specific suggestions from the SRC at this time.

Questions:

- Dr. Erica Wymore asked if the example studies were the ones included in the review and if the research team was keeping track of the reasons for exclusion.
 - Dr. Tianjing Li said the examples of studies were the ones included in the review and the research team is keeping track of the reasons for exclusion.
 - Dr. Erica Wymore noted the heterogeneity of exposures reported in cannabis research.
 - Dr. Joseph Schacht warned that we should be cautious regarding the falsification of precision with such a broad body of literature.

- Dr. Greg Kinney echoed Dr. Schacht’s sentiment.
 - Dr. Sam Wang asked the SRC if we need to report the findings we see in the literature based on exposure and potency or be more detailed in our findings.
 - Dr. Schacht said it's worth trying to categorize and combine specific subsets of research, but the research team should not feel obligated to do that for all ~800 papers.
 - Dr. Lisa Bero asked about blood levels of cannabinoids and whether they were considered a gold standard in the field compared to self-reported exposure.
 - Dr. Greg Kinney said the research team should record the number of studies that report blood levels.
- Dr. Tianjing Li provided an overview of the approach to classification of outcomes and the exposures-outcomes association in data extraction.
 - One key issue is when no exposure-outcome association is measured in the studies.
 - Wilsey et al. (2016) is considered the “perfect study,” which is a highly controlled randomized controlled trial.

Comments:

- Chair Chris Urbina said that by collecting information on gaps in literature, we could point out more research that needs to be done to the legislature.
 - Dr. Erica Wymore agreed with Dr. Urbina and said the inability to quantify exposure consistently is an enormous limitation.
- Rosa Lawrence, professional research assistant at the Center for Bioethics and Humanities, presented early findings from the full-text screening regarding exposures and outcomes.

Questions:

- Dr. Susan Calcaterra asked if there had been any thought or discussion about making a hierarchy of data when reporting the findings.
 - Dr. Lisa Bero explained that Figure 3 gives us an idea of how to group by potency but highlighted that we are hoping to get feedback from the SRC on how to group findings and what to prioritize in our reporting of the information.
- Dr. Erica Wymore asked if the research team has defined “high potency” and made a reference to the Di Forti et al. Paper that said 14% THC was “high potency.”
 - Dr. Bero said that once we get all of the data, we can set a specific cutoff for “high potency.”
 - Dr. Lisa Bero showed that many of the studies do not assess above 14% potency.
 - Dr. Schacht said how the Di Forti article is a good example of the ambiguity in the research and that we don’t want to suggest false precision.

- Dr. Lisa Bero presented on how the research team is collecting study characteristics

Questions:

Chair Chris Urbina asked if the studies have reported on race, ethnicity, and age.

- Dr. Lisa Bero explained that many report on age, but very few report on race and ethnicity.
- Dr. Jonathan Samet said the research team can highlight the gaps the research team finds in the study characteristics, especially regarding disparities

Introduction to Evidence Maps and Planned Approach

- Dr. Lisa Bero presented on evidence maps and the planned approach, with the caveat that all figures are made with dummy data, not actual data
- Rosa Lawrence presented on the Tableau dashboard of study results that will be publicly available, currently using dummy data
- Question to the SRC: what are the questions or queries to evidence map?
 - The SRC did not propose specific questions or queries to evidence map at this time.

Questions:

- Dr. Susan Calcaterra asked how frequently the database will be updated with new literature?
 - Dr. Lisa Bero said it will depend on resources, but usually living databases have an automatic search that is run every few weeks and then new studies are screened to be added.
 - Dr. Jonathan Samet said the work of keeping it up to date is substantially less expensive than the initial funding required to build it. There will be a lot of emerging information that should be available for everybody.
- Dr. David Brumbaugh asked if this work will be descriptive or if it will be used as a way to focus future systematic literature reviews by assessing the quantity and quality of evidence within any of the outcome domains.
 - Dr. Lisa Bero said we need to descriptively describe the entire evidence map, but then we can synthesize groups of studies and we will need the SRC's help in deciding which topics to dive into

Comments:

- Dr. Greg Kinney suggested that we aggregate how the public is trying to use it by recording the queries as a way to guide future studies

Educational Campaign Update

- Dr. Jonathan Samet presented on the educational campaign and how initial planning has started over the past month on the approach, design, and implementation of the educational campaign

- No comments or questions for Dr. Jonathan Samet.

General Remarks & Discussion

Questions:

- Dr. Lesley Brooks asked if the data allows us to make any comments on regional or geographic location characteristics or trends?
 - Dr. Tianjing Li said the team is capturing the regions so that they could possibly plot all characteristics by region.

Comments:

- Dr. Jonathan Samet highlighted that many studies do not capture race, ethnicity, and other important demographic characteristics. One of the values will be pointing out the deficiencies that exist.
- Dr. Lesley Brooks said ideally, we could collect zip code level data, but it would be nice to at least capture geographic location.
- Dr. Jonathan Samet pointed out that models/frameworks for this kind of research exist in tobacco studies.

Next Meeting Timing and Closing Remarks

- Dr. Jonathan Samet presented on next steps, including the fact that the initial review findings and recommendations are due to the State legislature on July 1, 2022.
- No questions for Dr. Jonathan Samet.

Discussion of Next Meeting Point and Conclusion of Meeting

- Chair Chris Urbina asked about SRC meeting(s) leading up to the July 1 report.
- Dr. Jonathan Samet suggested two meetings: one in May after initial data extraction is complete, and another in June to discuss the findings and the report, and the SRC may need a working meeting to create recommendations
 - One question is whether to host in-person meetings in the future or keep the virtual format to limit travel time.
- Chair Chris Urbina proposed a virtual meeting in May
 - Rosa Lawrence said the Tableau dashboard can be updated in real-time as we extract study characteristics, but only for use among the SRC until it is completed and cleaned
 - We can look at all extracted data in May, but we do need to clean the data and make sure it is representative of the data we have
 - We will send out a Doodle poll to set a meeting date for the end of May
- Chair Chris Urbina proposed an in-person meeting in June
 - Dr. Susan Calcaterra seconded
 - All present SRC members raised their hand indicating that they could make this work
 - Caveat: there are meetings out of state in May and June that might limit in person attendance
 - Bobbi Ortega and Kelsey Phinney will send out a Doodle poll to set a meeting date for the end of May

- Reminder that any SRC members and the public can comment on the website at any time.