

Effects of Chronic, Heavy Cannabis Use on Executive Functions

Rebecca D. Crean, PhD, Susan F. Tapert, PhD, Arpi Minassian, PhD, Kai MacDonald, MD, Natania A. Crane, BA, and Barbara J. Mason, PhD

Abstract: This case describes the clinical course of a cannabis-dependent individual entering a 12-week abstinence-based research program. The case illustrates the effects of chronic, heavy cannabis use on executive functions at 3 time points: (1) 12 hours of abstinence; (2) 4 weeks of abstinence; and (3) 12 weeks of abstinence. It is followed by discussions by 2 clinical psychologists and a psychiatrist. The findings described here have important clinical implications, because executive functions have a vital role in treatment participation and in sustaining recovery. It should be of particular interest to clinicians who work with people with cannabis use disorders.

Key Words: cannabis, executive functions, cognitive impairment, neuropsychological assessment, marijuana

(*J Addict Med* 2011;5: 9–15)

CASE DESCRIPTION

Presenting Complaint

AZ is a college-educated, 28-year-old, single, employed, White, non-Hispanic female, living at home with her parents. She presented to our abstinence-based research program with a 13-year history of marijuana use. Recently, she was demoted from her position as a full-time emergency medical technician to a driver after testing positive for marijuana and for tampering with the urine sample. To resume employment as an emergency medical technician, she is required to remain drug free and provide regular negative drug screens for a period yet to be determined by the review board. The 12-week research program required twice-weekly visits with observed urine collection for drug screening to

monitor abstinence and assessments of health status, mood, and every-day functioning. Neuropsychological assessments were also conducted at the beginning of the program, at week 4, and at the end (week 12) of the program.

History of Presenting Complaint

AZ reported that she began using marijuana occasionally at the age of 14 years; however, for the past 9 years, she has smoked more steadily, consuming on average 2 g daily. According to AZ, she began having marijuana-related problems, affecting her family and social relationships, at the age of 21 years. Her last period of abstinence was 2 years ago and lasted for 7 months. Since then, she tried unsuccessfully to quit or cut down on multiple occasions. She reported using increasingly larger amounts of marijuana since she first began smoking to obtain the desired effect and spending several hours a day smoking marijuana or recovering from its effects. She reported that she previously was very social and active with her friends; however, over the past year, she has reduced her social interactions to use marijuana. She continues to use marijuana despite having persistent problems with her friendships and employment. She noted experiencing withdrawal symptoms when cutting down or stopping usage, including difficulty sleeping, decreased appetite, irritability, and mood changes. When asked about other substance use, she denied using tobacco but admitted to using psychedelics and cocaine, each on one occasion, at the age of 17 years. Within the past year, she was prescribed opiates for back pain for 1 week because of an injury while exercising. She reports drinking 3 alcoholic drinks approximately 2 times per week. Urine drug screening did not reveal the presence of other drugs of abuse at intake.

Medical History

AZ's medical history was unremarkable, except for an appendectomy in 2003. She was not taking any prescription or over-the-counter medications, herbs, or supplements. Results from a physical examination, functional magnetic resonance imaging, electrocardiogram, blood chemistry, complete blood count with differential, and urinalysis at intake did not reveal any medical conditions that might place her at risk for cognitive impairment. She had no history of neurologic disorders or exposure to toxins.

Psychological and Family History

AZ denied any mental health problems or a family history of psychological problems, with the exception of her

From the Committee on the Neurobiology of Addictive Disorders (R.D.C., N.A.C., B.J.M.), The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla; Department of Psychiatry (S.F.T., A.M.), University of California, San Diego, La Jolla; and Private Practice (K.M.), San Diego, CA.

Received for publication December 14, 2010; accepted December 22, 2010. The authors declare no conflict of interests.

Send correspondence and reprint requests to Barbara J. Mason, PhD, Committee on the Neurobiology of Addictive Disorders, The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 North Torrey Pines Road, TPC-5, La Jolla, San Diego, CA 92037. E-mail: mason@scripps.edu

Supported by the NIH grant P20 DA024194.

Copyright © 2011 American Society of Addiction Medicine

ISSN: 1921-0629/11/0501-0009

DOI: 10.1097/ADM.0b013e31820cdd57

biological father who had a history of alcohol abuse. She denied any history of learning disabilities or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. She reported meeting all developmental milestones related to physical, language, and cognitive skills.

Mental Status Examination

AZ arrived on time, dressed in clean attire, and was alert and oriented to person, place, date, and time. Her gait was steady with no evidence of impaired coordination. She denied any changes in appetite or weight. She reported sleeping normally and feeling rested on waking. Her mood was euthymic, and her attitude was appropriate for the testing environment. Eye contact was appropriate during the testing and interview. Thought processes were logical, linear, and goal directed. She denied having any thoughts of suicide or homicide, or experiencing hallucinations. Her conversational speech was unremarkable. She seemed to comprehend instructions, and she was able to complete all of the evaluations. Testing effort appeared optimal throughout the neuropsychological assessments; therefore, test results are considered valid and seem to represent an accurate assessment of her cognitive abilities. Her premorbid intelligence quotient was estimated as 110 based on the verbal subtest of the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III (WAIS-III) and the Wide Range Achievement Test-IV (WRAT-IV).

Diagnostic Classification

The Structured Clinical Interview for the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, fourth edition (DSM-IV) (American Psychiatric Association, SCID, 1994; First et al., 1996) was conducted at intake to establish DSM-IV criteria for cannabis dependence and to rule out major psychiatric disorders, including schizophrenia and depressive and anxiety disorders. The DSM-IV requires 3 of 7 criteria be present to receive a diagnosis of cannabis dependence. AZ met 7 of 7 criteria and, therefore, met conditions for a current diagnosis of cannabis dependence (with physiological dependence) and met no additional criteria for significant psychiatric disorders. The Beck Depression Inventory-II (Beck et al., 1996) and Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Spielberger, 1983) confirmed the absence of clinically significant mood or anxiety symptoms.

Clinical Research Protocol

On the basis of the aforementioned diagnostic classification, AZ was eligible to participate in our 12-week abstinence-based contingency management clinical research protocol where participants are initially paid \$25 for a urine drug screen showing no new drug use, with payment increasing in \$5 increments for evidence of no new use based on observed urine drug testing. This protocol was reviewed and approved by The Scripps Research Institute's Institutional Review Board. AZ provided written informed consent to participate, which gave us her permission to publish the results in a confidential, unidentifiable manner. In keeping with an effort to preserve confidentiality, alterations have been made in identifying characteristics that are clinically not relevant. After admission to our 12-week, research-based program, AZ was required to make twice-weekly visits for observed urine collection for drug testing to monitor

abstinence and to assess her health status, mood, and every-day functioning. Her vitals and breath alcohol level, which was consistently zero, were monitored at each visit. She reported drinking 3 alcoholic drinks approximately 2 times per week throughout the program. Urine drug testing did not reveal the presence of new marijuana use or other drugs of abuse at any time point. AZ did not receive any additional care or treatment and did not attend any self-help groups during the 12-week program.

Tests and Assessments

Neuropsychological assessments were conducted at the start of the program, at week 4, and at the end of the program (week 12) and included select subtests from the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III (Wechsler, 1999); the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (Delis et al., 2001), the Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery (Robbins et al., 1994); and the Wide Range Achievement Test-IV (Wilkinson and Robertson, 2006) (Table 1).

COURSE OF EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS OVER MONITORED ABSTINENCE

Baseline Neuropsychological Evaluation (12 Hours After Last Marijuana Use)

AZ was tested approximately 12 hours after her last use of marijuana. She showed no deficits in attention or concentration. Her performance on decision-making and risk taking tasks revealed that her ability to make correct choices was intact, and her risk taking was conservative, particularly as tasks increased in difficulty. AZ did, however, display deficits in performance on tasks related to inhibition. Specifically, she was unable to stop herself from responding to stimuli despite receiving negative feedback for her performance. AZ also had difficulty with a task assessing emotional regulation in which she was unable to distinguish neutral stimuli from affectively charged positive and negative stimuli. Working memory also was impaired; AZ made more errors as the task increased in difficulty; however, the strategy she used to complete the task was efficient and within the normal range. Finally, deficits were noted on tasks of verbal fluency; in particular, her verbal production was low for her age and education level. In summary, AZ's performance, 12 hours post marijuana use, was characterized by intact attention and concentration, and decision-making skills. However, AZ displayed deficits in the mildly impaired range (20th–25th percentile) when compared with adults of similar age and education in inhibition and emotional regulation, and comparable deficits in working memory and verbal fluency.

4-Week Neuropsychological Evaluation

AZ provided observed urine samples twice each week. Urine drug testing confirmed continued abstinence from marijuana and other substances of abuse. AZ was reassessed with the same neuropsychological battery at week 4 as given at baseline. Attention and concentration continued to be intact. However, although AZ's decision-making and risk taking seemed intact at baseline, deficits were noted after 4 weeks of abstinence. Her ability to select the correct solution on these

TABLE 1. Neuropsychological Assessments and Percentile Ranges Reported in the AZ Case Study at Intake and Weeks 4 and 12 of Monitored Abstinence*

Test	Task Description	AZ's Baseline Percentile Rank (%)	AZ's Week 4 Percentile Rank (%)	AZ's Week 12 Percentile Rank (%)
CANTAB				
Affective Go-No Go	Inhibition of prepotent responding to affective stimuli	20–25	20–25	14–20
Cambridge Gambling Task	Decision-making and risk taking outside a learning context	50–60	20–25	16–18
Delayed Matching to Sample	Immediate and delayed visual memory	50–60	50–60	50–60
Intra/Extra Dimensional Shift†	Attend to complex stimuli, then shift when instructed	22–25	Not done	Not done
Paired Associates Learning	Visuospatial association and conditional learning	50–60	50–60	50–60
Spatial Working Memory	Spatial working memory and strategy	Memory: 20–25	Strategy: 20–25	Strategy: 20–25
D-KEFS				
Verbal Fluency Test	Word generation within parameters, switching	21–24	14–16	10–15
Trail Making Test	Motor speed, sequencing, cognitive flexibility, and inhibition	20–25	20–25	25–28
Color-Word Interference Test	Resistance to prepotent responding	18–20	14–16	14–16
WAIS-III				
Digit Span	Auditory attention, concentration	50	75	84
Vocabulary†	Premorbid functioning and general intellect	50	Not done	Not done
WRAT-IV-Reading†	Premorbid functioning and achievement	50	Not done	Not done

*Reference ranges for percentile ranks shown are: superior, >90%; above average, 75%–90%; high average, 65%–75%; general average range, 25%–75%; low average, 25%–35%; mildly impaired, 16%–25%; moderately impaired 5%–16%; and severely impaired, <5%.

†The protocol stipulated that these tasks be administered only at baseline.

CANTAB, Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery; D-KEFS, Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System; WAIS-III, Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-III; WRAT-IV, Wide Range Achievement Test-IV.

tasks was in the mildly impaired range (20th–25th percentile), and she took greater risks when making decisions. Despite some improvement on tasks of inhibition and impulsivity, she continued to display generally poor inhibitory control, with performance in the moderately impaired range (14th–16th percentile). She continued to have difficulty identifying neutral from positive and negative affective stimuli, despite taking much longer to respond than at baseline. The baseline deficits noted in performance on tasks of working memory (despite adequate strategy) had improved after 4 weeks of abstinence; however, AZ now used a much less efficient strategy to complete these tasks, with strategy scores now in the mildly impaired range (20th–25th percentile). Her verbal fluency deficits continued to persist and actually worsened to the moderately impaired range (14th–16th percentile), compared with her performance at baseline. In summary, although some initial deficits resolved, particularly in working memory abilities, other deficits in executive functioning continued to persist, and, in some cases, worsened after 4 weeks of abstinence with her overall performance in the mildly to moderately impaired range on tasks of inhibition, decision-making, emotional regulation, and verbal fluency compared with adults of similar age and education.

12-Week Neuropsychological Evaluation

After 12 weeks of monitored abstinence from marijuana and other drugs of abuse, AZ completed a final neuropsychological evaluation using the same battery as before. As

with the previous evaluations, no deficits were observed in attention and concentration, and AZ's performance on working memory tasks continued to be intact, although she still relied on a relatively inefficient strategy for completing the task. However, AZ continued to demonstrate poor decision-making and increased risk taking, and these deficits worsened at 12 weeks compared with her performance at 4 weeks of abstinence, increasing from mildly impaired to the moderately impaired range (16th–18th percentile). Similarly, deficits in emotional regulation and her ability to distinguish neutral from positive and negative stimuli also continued to deteriorate from the mildly impaired to moderately impaired range (14th–20th percentile). Deficits noted on tasks of inhibition and impulsivity remained the same relative to her week-4 assessment. Verbal fluency continued to be impaired (10th–15th percentile), and, moreover, her performance worsened from the previous assessment. In summary, the neuropsychological assessment of executive functions after 12 weeks of abstinence showed continued and worsening impairments in decision-making and verbal fluency to the moderately impaired range, as well as greater risk taking tendencies, impulsivity, and emotional dysregulation.

OVERALL SUMMARY

AZ presented to our abstinence-based, research program with a 13-year history of heavy marijuana use and disciplinary actions from her employer for a positive drug

test for marijuana. Twice-weekly observed urine testing confirmed that she remained abstinent from all drugs of abuse throughout the 12-week program. Baseline neuropsychological testing revealed intact attention and concentration, and intact decision-making and risk taking. However, performance on inhibition, emotional regulation, working memory, and verbal fluency tasks revealed deficits in the mildly impaired range.

After 4 weeks of abstinence, attention and concentration remained intact, and working memory deficits resolved; however, deficits emerged in decision-making and risk taking in the moderately impaired range. When performing tasks to assess working memory, she now demonstrated an inefficient strategy, which was not evident at baseline. Verbal fluency continued to deteriorate over time. Indeed, all the executive functioning deficits noted at week 4 in inhibition, decision-making, emotional regulation, and verbal fluency not only continued to persist but also worsened after 12 weeks of abstinence, ranging from the mildly (20th–25th percentile) to the moderately (10th–16th percentile) impaired range when compared with adults of similar age and educational level.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 1994.
- Beck AT, Steer RA, Brown GK. Manual for the Beck Depression Inventory-II. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation, 1996.
- Delis D, Kramer J, Kaplan E. Manual for the Delis-Kaplan Executive Function System (D-KEFS). San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation, 2001.
- First MB, Spitzer RL, Gibbon M, et al. Structured Clinical Interview for Axis I DSM-IV Disorders, Patient Edition. New York: B.R. Department, New York State Psychiatric Institute, 1996.
- Robbins TW, James M, Owen AM, et al. Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated Battery (CANTAB), a factor analytic study of a large sample of normal elderly volunteers. *Dementia* 1994;5:266–281.
- Spielberger CD. State-Trait Anxiety Inventory for Adults. Redwood City, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc., 1983.
- Wechsler D. Wechsler Abbreviated Scale of Intelligence. San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation, 1999.
- Wilkinson GS, Robertson GJ. Wide Range Achievement Test 4 (WRAT4) Professional Manual. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, 2006.
- generally improve with continued abstinence. Deficits in learning, memory, attention, processing speed, and executive functioning associated with marijuana use (Solowij et al., 2002) tend to resolve with prolonged abstinence (Pope et al., 2001), although small, persistent effects of marijuana use may be seen in learning and memory (Bolla et al., 2002; Grant et al., 2003). Because this young woman started marijuana use as an adolescent, she may be particularly vulnerable to the effects of prolonged exposure, when compared with someone who started as an adult, particularly in the domains of problem solving, attention, learning and memory, and psychomotor speed (Ehrenreich et al., 1999; Harvey et al., 2007; Lane et al., 2007; Medina et al., 2007).
- The deficits in this case represent either premonitory abnormalities or persistent marijuana exposure-related impairments in executive functioning. Although her working memory improved with abstinence, the overall profile seems to represent a decline in functioning, given the individual's prior educational and occupational achievements and estimated intelligence quotient. The stability of deficient performances on tests of risk taking, decision-making, processing emotional information, and inhibition suggests either persistent effects on frontal-subcortical circuits produced by chronic heavy use or executive functioning deficits that may predate marijuana use. The fact that working memory improved fits with other studies (Hanson et al., 2010), suggesting that performance increases among chronic users in this domain after several days to weeks of sustained abstinence. The neural substrates of such transient cognitive deficits are described in neuroimaging studies, including potentially altered cerebral blood flow. Studies of chronic cannabis-using adults have shown neurovascular system abnormalities, which may affect neuronal activity and neurocognitive functioning. After adult users attain prolonged abstinence, most studies have found decreased cerebral blood flow in brain areas important for cognition, such as the prefrontal cortex (Block et al., 2000; Lundqvist, 2005). In addition, adolescent marijuana users with more than a month of abstinence showed reduced neural response in prefrontal cortices, compared with recent users (Schweinsburg et al., 2008, 2010).

This case raises several prevention and intervention implications. Many chronic cannabis users report experiencing cognitive, mood, and sleep problems when they abstain from usage. It may be helpful for these users to understand that some of these problems will remit with several weeks of abstinence. In the case report, improvements were observed in working memory and, to a lesser extent, with inhibition tasks. Clinicians working with cannabis-dependent individuals can infer from these findings that although cannabis use can seem to have less salient negative consequences than other illicit drugs, there are notable cognitive disadvantages and changes in mood, sleep, and appetite. In addition, as learning, information processing, and inhibitory systems can remain impaired throughout the early weeks of cessation, patients may require repeated exposures to new information or concepts before they are able to deeply encode and incorporate the new material. Also note that irritable mood, a hallmark of cannabis withdrawal, coupled with inhibitory

COMMENTARY BY SUSAN TAPERT, PHD

This case conference summarizes a cannabis-dependent 28-year-old woman who entered a 12-week abstinence-based outpatient research program. In many ways, this young woman is a fairly representative case of cognitive functioning in chronic heavy cannabis use. The exception is that verbal memory (Pope et al., 2001; Grant et al., 2003; Medina et al., 2007) and attentional deficits (Tapert et al., 2002; Medina et al., 2007) were not observed, even soon after abstinence was achieved. Notable advantages this individual has in favor of a positive prognosis (and for serving as a good case of study) are that unlike the general population of individuals meeting cannabis dependence criteria, she had no other complicating substance use, psychiatric disorders, or medical problems and was able to remain abstinent for at least 12 weeks.

Individuals with a chronic history of marijuana use tend to exhibit difficulties in various cognitive domains, which

deficits, may spark outbursts or induce feelings of frustration in patients more frequently during this time. Fortunately, many of these symptoms continue to improve with sustained abstinence, and many users report clearer thinking and improved memory after abstaining from cannabis for several weeks.

REFERENCES

- Block RI, O'Leary DS, Hichwa RD, et al. Cerebellar hypoactivity in frequent marijuana users. *Neuroreport* 2000;11:749–753.
- Bolla KI, Brown K, Eldreth D, et al. Dose-related neurocognitive effects of marijuana use. *Neurology* 2002;59:1337.
- Ehrenreich H, Rinn T, Kunert HJ, et al. Specific attentional dysfunction in adults following early start of cannabis use. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1999;142:295–301.
- Grant I, Gonzalez R, Carey CL, et al. Non-acute (residual) neurocognitive effects of cannabis use: A meta-analytic study. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2003;9:679–689.
- Hanson KL, Winward JL, Schweinsburg AD, et al. Longitudinal study of cognition among adolescent marijuana users over three weeks of abstinence. *Addict Behav* 2010;35:970–976.
- Harvey MA, Sellman JD, Porter RJ, et al. The relationship between non-acute adolescent cannabis use and cognition. *Drug Alcohol Rev* 2007;26:309–319.
- Lane SD, Cheek DR, Tcheremissine OV, et al. Response perseveration and adaptation in heavy marijuana-smoking adolescents. *Addict Behav* 2007;32:977–990.
- Lundqvist T. Cognitive consequences of cannabis use: Comparison with abuse of stimulants and heroin with regard to attention, memory and executive functions. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav* 2005;81:319–330.
- Medina KL, Hanson KL, Schweinsburg AD, et al. Neuropsychological functioning in adolescent marijuana users: Subtle deficits detectable after a month of abstinence. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2007;13:807–820.
- Pope HG Jr, Gruber AJ, Hudson JI, et al. Neuropsychological performance in long-term cannabis users. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2001;58:909.
- Schweinsburg AD, Nagel BJ, Schweinsburg BC, et al. Abstinent adolescent marijuana users show altered fMRI response during spatial working memory. *Psychiatry Res* 2008;163:40–51.
- Schweinsburg AD, Schweinsburg BC, Medina KL, et al. The influence of recency of use on fMRI response during spatial working memory in adolescent marijuana users. *J Psychoactive Drugs* 2010;42:401–412.
- Solowij N, Stephens RS, Roffman RA, et al. Cognitive functioning of long-term heavy cannabis users seeking treatment. *JAMA* 2002;287:1123–1131.
- Tapert SF, Granholm E, Leedy NG, et al. Substance use and withdrawal: Neuropsychological functioning over 8 years in youth. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc* 2002;8:873–883.

COMMENTARY BY ARPI MINASSIAN, PHD

The case of AZ illustrates what is becoming a growing realization in the fields of mental health and neurosciences—that cannabis, once considered a relatively benign drug, can have sustained adverse effects on thinking and social and occupational functioning. AZ's cognitive deficits after 12 weeks of abstinence are more or less consistent with findings in the literature using similar abstinence time frames, as reviewed by Crean et al. The existing research is less helpful in predicting what AZ's cognitive profile might be after an extended period of abstinence, for example, a year and beyond. If we were to rely on the findings of Lyons et al. (2004), who studied cannabis users abstinent for at least 1 year, we have reason to be hopeful that AZ's difficulties with impulsivity and disinhibition may eventually resolve. Conversely, her initiation of marijuana use when her brain was still in its formative years may confer a disadvantage

in terms of full recovery of her executive functions. A repeated neuropsychological evaluation after a longer period of recovery from cannabis dependence will assist us in determining whether she continues to show decision-making problems that may impact her occupational functioning in the long-term.

In terms of treatment of AZ's addiction, Crean et al. raise the concern that although psychological treatments for cannabis dependence typically involve cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT)-like approaches, the cognitive sequelae of cannabis use may compromise the individual's understanding and application of CBT-based interventions. CBT approaches, however, are successfully used, and in fact now recommended by most clinical guidelines for the treatment of schizophrenia patients (Rathod et al., 2010), a population that arguably has greater cognitive impairment than cannabis users and relatively more prominent deficits in the domains of attention and executive function. For example, McQuaid et al. (2000) developed an effective CBT-based intervention that simplified essential cognitive-behavioral and social skills training concepts for older patients with schizophrenia. A similarly modified intervention may be effective with individuals recovering from cannabis dependence.

Motivational interviewing (MI) is another popular psychotherapeutic technique for eliciting behavior change and has been widely used to treat addictions and a range of problematic health behaviors (Rubak et al., 2005). In a nonjudgmental manner, the MI clinician would encourage AZ to explore the costs and benefits of her behavior and to assess her readiness for change (Miller and Rollnick, 1991). Importantly, relapse (resumption of the unwanted behavior) is an expected event in the MI-dictated stages of behavior change, and thus, AZ may be counseled to anticipate it and learn how to resume her preparation once again for relapse prevention. MI-based techniques have been shown to be more effective than an education-only intervention in decreasing cannabis use in regularly using adults (Stephens et al., 2007).

Finally, as AZ resides with her parents and since change of any kind can stress a family system, family-based interventions may maximize the likelihood of her successful abstinence. AZ's therapist may elect to periodically include her parents in therapy sessions. Her clinician can then better understand and potentially modify the role of AZ's family in her addiction, and her abstinence, from a substance that has been harmful to her brain and her everyday functioning.

REFERENCES

- Lyons MJ, Bar JL, Panizzon MS, et al. Neuropsychological consequences of regular marijuana use: A twin study. *Psychol Med* 2004;34:1239–1250.
- McQuaid JR, Granholm E, McClure FS, et al. Development of an integrated cognitive-behavioral and social skills training intervention for older patients with schizophrenia. *J Psychother Pract Res* 2000;9:149–156.
- Miller W, Rollnick S. *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People to Change Addictive Behavior*. New York: The Guildford Press, 1991.
- Rathod S, Phiri P, Kingdon D. Cognitive behavioral therapy for schizophrenia. *Psychiatr Clin North Am* 2010;33:527–536.
- Rubak S, Sandbaek A, Lauritzen T, et al. Motivational interviewing: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Gen Pract* 2005;55:305–312.
- Stephens RS, Roffman RA, Fearer SA, et al. The Marijuana check-up: Promoting change in ambivalent marijuana users. *Addiction* 2007;102:947–957.

COMMENTARY BY KAI MACDONALD, MD

The unfortunately ubiquitous case presented here clearly documents the neurocognitive and neurodevelopmental impact of marijuana dependence. As is so often the case with marijuana addiction, these often less-recognized consequences—the “negative symptoms” of addiction—are at least as functionally impactful as the “positive symptoms,” so often identified with other common addictions (such as driving under the influence with alcohol and psychosis with amphetamine). Thus, although less recognized, the effects of marijuana dependence on cognition have significant implications for treatment, as highlighted below.

The first addiction-related negative symptom in this individual’s life is contained in the first sentence of her presentation, which intuitively—in its description of this 28-year-old college graduate’s lack of social relationships and ongoing domiciliation with her parents—the shadow that her decade-long dependence on marijuana has cast on her psychosocial development. Although it may seem a stretch to suggest that being single and living with one’s parents at age 28 years is a consequence of marijuana addiction, it is not a long stretch. The featured review’s documentation of marijuana-related executive function impairments includes deficits in decision making and emotional regulation, impairments which may derail attainment of important psychosocial milestones. Furthermore, this assertion is in keeping with the well-documented marijuana-related general malaise and impairments in educational advancement (Brook et al., 2008). In actuality, the patient’s sole achievement on the developmental path toward adult relationships and independence is her employment, which hangs by a thread. A concerning thread, at that her “demotion” to “driver,” is oddly chosen, given the data suggesting that marijuana induces dose-dependent impairments in driving (Weinstein et al., 2008). In any case, this vignette gives one pause to consider—given that one-third of this individual’s brain maturation and personal development had occurred during chronic, heavy smoking—the extent to which the executive function impairments documented in the review have obscured her developmental path toward age-appropriate extraparental relationships and independence. If only this risk had been forcefully conveyed to her and her caregivers at the age of 14 years, when she first disappeared into the fog.

On this note, and in reference to the ever-younger age of initiation of marijuana use documented in the featured review, it behooves clinicians to remember that adolescence is an evolutionarily conserved transitional stage in human development, involving reorientation and activation of new social and motivational tendencies. These new proclivities incline individuals toward independence, autonomy from parents, increasing involvement in peer and romantic relationships and, importantly, the acquisition and learning of skills and knowledge relative to adult social roles (Forbes and Dahl, 2010; Casey et al., 2008). In light of the evidence that marijuana has broad and deleterious effects on different components of executive function, we should educate parents and patients about the developmental abridgments and broader psychosocial consequences of effects, especially dur-

ing adolescence, a critical transitional stage on the path toward adulthood.

Turning back to the case, 2 other treatment-related aspects of this individual’s addiction deserve mention, those involving detoxification and recovery. To start with the acute detoxification phase, it is mentioned in the case report that the individual experienced withdrawal symptoms such as insomnia, decreased appetite, irritability, and mood dysregulation. These symptoms are in keeping with clinical experience and the well-documented, multifaceted, moderate-to-severe withdrawal symptoms reported by marijuana-addicted adolescents (Vandrey et al., 2005) and adults (Budney et al., 2001). Evidence-based pharmacotherapy of marijuana withdrawal—indeed for all the phases of treatment of marijuana addiction—lags far behind other drugs of abuse. When treating marijuana withdrawal with medications, it is important to consider the cognitive side effects of the prescribed medications, the clinical question of length of disability (ie, how long should the withdrawing patient be off work/excused from cognitive responsibilities?), and how long to wait to initiate long-term treatment for another condition (depression and insomnia).

A final treatment-related issue highlighted by this case is the postacute or maintenance phase of recovery: it is in this phase that we see the long-lasting effects of marijuana dependence. This case clearly shows the insidious nature of marijuana dependence. That is, a full 12 weeks after stopping marijuana use, the individual still exhibits demonstrable brain-based impairments, some of which are actually increasing. From a variety of functional contexts, including work and education, 3 months is a long time. One wonders further about the impact of these impairments had she been in a treatment-focused program for her addiction, and how her impaired executive function would impact her ability to attend, understand, and benefit from the educational and psychosocial components such a program would offer.

Furthermore, no mention is made of maintenance medication treatment of marijuana dependence. This is not uncommon; to date, there are no guidelines or studies to support maintenance medication for marijuana dependence. Still, this lack of evidence is in sharp contrast to the ever-widening array of well-tolerated and effective options for maintenance medication treatment of alcohol and opiate dependence disorders. Some progress has been made in elucidating the neural substrates of marijuana craving (Fibey et al., 2009), and a few medications have shown modest efficacy in this phase of treatment (Benyamina et al., 2008) (including, interestingly, cholinergic treatments targeting cannabis-related cognitive impairments (Sofuoglu et al., 2010)). That said, the current paucity of data impedes the executive function and decision-making of practitioners curious about ongoing pharmacological support in this phase of recovery.

To my mind, the major clinical implications of the information in the featured review and the case presented here are educational: disabusing one of the notion that the effects of chronic, heavy marijuana use on executive functions are either benign or short lived. Although evidence of the deleterious impact of chronic, heavy marijuana use on executive function in healthy individuals and on psychosis-

prone individuals is growing (McGrath et al., 2010), clinicians need more studies elucidating marijuana's impact on adolescent developmental milestones, on adult executive function, and more evidence-based treatments for the different phases of marijuana addiction. The above case and review shed valuable light on the long shadow this drug casts on critical developmental stages and brain functions.

REFERENCES

- Benyamina A, Lecacheux M, Blecha L, et al. Pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy in cannabis withdrawal and dependence. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2008;8:479-491.
- Brook JS, Stimmel MA, Zhang C, et al. The association between earlier marijuana use and subsequent academic achievement and health problems: A longitudinal study. *Am J Addict* 2008;17: 155-160.
- Budney AJ, Hughes JR, Moore BA, et al. Marijuana abstinence effects in marijuana smokers maintained in their home environment. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2001;58:917-924.
- Casey BJ, Jones RM, Hare TA. The adolescent brain. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2008;1124:111-126.
- Filbey FM, Schacht JP, Myers US, et al. Marijuana craving in the brain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2009;106:13016-13021.
- Forbes EE, Dahl RE. Pubertal development and behavior: Hormonal activation of social and motivational tendencies. *Brain Cogn* 2010; 72:66-72.
- McGrath J, Welham J, Scott J, et al. Association between cannabis use and psychosis-related outcomes using sibling pair analysis in a cohort of young adults. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2010;67:440-447.
- Sofuoglu M, Sugarman DE, Carroll KM. Cognitive function as an emerging treatment target for marijuana addiction. *Exp Clin Psychopharmacol* 2010;18:109-119.
- Vandrey R, Budney AJ, Kamon JL, et al. Cannabis withdrawal in adolescent treatment seekers. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2005;78:205-210.
- Weinstein A, Brickner O, Lerman H, et al. A study investigating the acute dose-response effects of 13 mg and 17 mg Delta 9-tetrahydrocannabinol on cognitive-motor skills, subjective and autonomic measures in regular users of marijuana. *J Psychopharmacol* 2008;22:441-451.