Clinical Neuropsychopharmacology and Addiction
https://www.sciltp.com/journals/cna

Article

The Cannabis-Psychosis Spectrum: Clinical Manifestations, Conversion Risk, and Therapeutic Strategies

Valerio Ricci

San Luigi Gonzaga Hospital, University of Turin, Regione Gonzole, 10, 10043 Orbassano, Italy; valerio.ricci@unito.it; Tel.: +39-0119026517; Fax: +39-0119026669

How To Cite: Ricci, V. The Cannabis-Psychosis Spectrum: Clinical Manifestations, Conversion Risk, and Therapeutic Strategies. *Clinical Neuropsychopharmacology and Addiction* **2025**, *1*(1), 4. https://doi.org/10.53941/cna.2025.100004.

Received: 27 June 2025
Revised: 28 July 2025
Accepted: 5 August 2025
Published: 6 August 2025

Abstract: Cannabis-induced psychosis (CIP) represents a significant public health concern in the context of increasing global cannabis use and potency. This review synthesizes current evidence on the epidemiology, neurobiological mechanisms, clinical features, and treatment approaches for cannabis-induced psychotic disorders. Recent epidemiological data indicate rising incidence rates of CIP, with estimates ranging from 2.7 to 6.1 per 100,000 person-years in recent studies. The neurobiological mechanisms involve complex interactions between Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) and the endocannabinoid system, affecting dopaminergic, GABAergic, and glutamatergic neurotransmission. Clinical manifestations typically include acute onset of paranoid delusions and hallucinations, often distinguishable from primary psychotic disorders by their temporal relationship to cannabis use and relatively preserved insight. Treatment remains challenging, with limited evidence-based guidelines, though second-generation antipsychotics and benzodiazepines show efficacy. The conversion rate to schizophrenia-spectrum disorders ranges from 33–50%, highlighting the importance of early identification and intervention. This review emphasizes the need for improved diagnostic criteria, treatment protocols, and prevention strategies as cannabis legalization continues worldwide.

Keywords: cannabis-induced psychosis; THC; cannabinoids; schizophrenia; epidemiology; neurobiology

1. Introduction

Cannabis remains the most widely used illicit psychoactive substance globally, with over 200 million people estimated to have used cannabis in the past year [1,2]. The expanding legalization and decriminalization of cannabis in numerous jurisdictions, coupled with increasing THC potency in modern cannabis products, has intensified concerns about associated mental health risks [3]. Among these, cannabis-induced psychosis (CIP) represents one of the most severe acute psychiatric complications of cannabis use.

Cannabis-induced psychotic disorder, as defined in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition (DSM-5), occurs when hallucinations or delusions develop during or soon after cannabis intoxication, with symptoms severe enough to warrant clinical attention [4]. The condition sits within the broader spectrum of cannabis-related psychiatric disorders, ranging from acute intoxication to persistent psychotic disorders and potential progression to schizophrenia-spectrum conditions.

The relationship between cannabis and psychosis has been extensively studied over the past two decades, yet several questions remain regarding causality, mechanisms, and optimal treatment approaches. Recent epidemiological evidence suggests that the population-attributable risk fraction (PARF) for cannabis use disorder in schizophrenia increased from ~2% prior to 1995 to ~8% after 2010, coinciding with increasing cannabis potency and use patterns [5].

This comprehensive review aims to synthesize current evidence on CIP, examining its epidemiology, underlying neurobiological mechanisms, clinical presentation, diagnostic challenges, and treatment approaches. Understanding these aspects is crucial for clinicians, policymakers, and public health professionals as cannabis policies continue to evolve globally.

2. Epidemiology

2.1. Incidence and Prevalence

Recent epidemiological studies reveal concerning trends in CIP incidence. The incidence of cannabis-induced psychotic disorder is estimated at 2.7 per 100,000 person-years [6], with more recent Danish data showing an increase from 2.8 per 100,000 person-years in 2006 to 6.1 per 100,000 person-years in 2016 [5]. This represents a more than twofold increase over a decade, paralleling increases in cannabis use and THC potency.

Cross-national variations in CIP incidence are substantial and correlate with local patterns of cannabis use. The European EU-GEI study demonstrated striking geographic variations, with population attributable fractions indicating that 12.2% of first-episode psychosis cases could be prevented if high-potency cannabis were no longer available across 11 European sites, rising to 30.3% in London and 50.3% in Amsterdam [7]. These findings provide the first direct evidence that cannabis use patterns significantly contribute to variations in psychotic disorder incidence across different populations.

2.2. Risk Factors and Demographics

Cannabis-induced psychosis demonstrates specific demographic patterns. The mean age at first treatment is approximately 27 years, with males being disproportionately affected [6]. Recent studies indicate that the risk of psychosis appears most amplified in vulnerable individuals, particularly those with pre-existing mental health problems such as bipolar disorder [8]. Importantly, neither young age of onset of cannabis use nor high-frequency use alone was consistently associated with cannabis-associated psychotic symptoms (CAPS) in the absence of other risk factors.

A large-scale survey of over 230,000 cannabis users found that approximately 0.5% experienced cannabis-associated psychotic symptoms requiring emergency medical treatment during their lifetime [8]. This rate is comparable to other substance-induced psychoses, such as alcohol-associated psychosis (0.4–0.7%), but lower than stimulant-induced psychosis rates.

2.3. Cannabis Potency and Psychosis Risk

The increasing potency of cannabis products represents a critical public health concern. Modern cannabis strains contain significantly higher levels of THC than those available in previous decades, with average THC concentrations quadrupling in the United States since the 1990s [9]. Daily use of high-potency cannabis (THC ≥10%) is associated with nearly five-times increased odds of psychotic disorder compared to never users (adjusted OR 4.8, 95% CI 2.5–6.3) [7].

The EU-GEI study further demonstrated that the adjusted incidence rates for psychotic disorder were positively correlated with the prevalence of high-potency cannabis use ($r = 0.7$; $p = 0.0286$) and daily use ($r = 0.8$; $p = 0.0109$) across study sites, providing compelling evidence for a dose-response relationship between cannabis exposure and psychosis risk.

3. Neurobiological Mechanisms

3.1. The Endocannabinoid System

The endocannabinoid system (ECS) plays a crucial role in neurophysiological processes including neuroplasticity, neurodevelopment, pain perception, motivation, and immune function [10]. The system comprises cannabinoid receptors (CB1 and CB2), endogenous cannabinoid ligands (anandamide and 2-arachidonoylglycerol), and enzymes responsible for their synthesis and degradation.

CB1 receptors are predominantly located in presynaptic neurons throughout the central nervous system, particularly in the cerebellum, frontal lobe, hippocampus, and substantia nigra [11]. These receptors act as "communication traffic cops," influencing the release of both excitatory and inhibitory neurotransmitters and playing a critical role in synaptic plasticity and neural development.

3.2. THC-Induced Neurobiological Changes

Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the primary psychoactive component of cannabis, acts as a partial agonist at CB1 receptors, disrupting normal endocannabinoid signaling [12]. This disruption leads to a cascade of neurobiological changes that may contribute to psychotic symptoms.

THC suppresses the release of the inhibitory neurotransmitter gamma-aminobutyric acid (GABA), enhancing phasic burst-firing of dopamine in the ventral tegmental area. Conversely, it enhances N-methyl-D-aspartate (NMDA) receptor activity, increasing glutamate release in the hippocampus [13]. These alterations in neurotransmitter balance may underlie the psychotomimetic effects of cannabis.

Recent research has implicated serotonin 2A receptors (5-HT2AR) in the molecular mechanisms underlying psychotic symptoms. Chronic THC administration increases the pro-hallucinogenic signaling of 5-HT2AR in the brain cortex of young mice, with the Akt/mTOR/S6 pathway potentially mediating THC effects to shift 5-HT2AR signaling from canonical non-hallucinogenic to hallucinogenic pathways [14].

3.3. Neurodevelopmental Considerations

The timing of cannabis exposure appears critical for psychosis risk, with adolescent exposure being particularly concerning. During adolescence, the brain undergoes significant maturation processes, including synaptic pruning and myelination. THC exposure during this critical period may adversely affect experience-dependent maturation of neural circuitries within prefrontal cortical areas [15].

The endocannabinoid system plays a crucial role in brain development, and its activation during neural maturation can induce subtle but long-lasting neurofunctional alterations. CB1 receptor levels tend to increase during adolescence, potentially making this population more vulnerable to cannabis-induced disruptions in normal brain development [16].

3.4. Neural Oscillations and Cognitive Function

Cannabis exposure affects neural oscillations, which are crucial for cognitive function and are impaired in schizophrenia. CB1 receptors regulate GABA release, and CB1 receptor agonists decrease the power of neural oscillations [17]. Chronic cannabis users demonstrate neural oscillatory changes similar to patterns observed in schizophrenia patients, which may underlie cannabis-associated cognitive impairments in attention and working memory [18].

3.5. Genetic Factors

Genetic polymorphisms modulate individual vulnerability to cannabis-induced psychosis. The catechol-O-methyltransferase (COMT Val158Met) polymorphism has been extensively studied, with carriers of the Val allele showing increased susceptibility to hallucinations following cannabis use [19]. This genetic variation affects dopamine metabolism in the prefrontal cortex, potentially explaining differential vulnerability to cannabis-induced psychotic symptoms among users.

4. Clinical Features and Diagnosis

4.1. Clinical Presentation

Cannabis-induced psychosis typically presents with acute onset of positive psychotic symptoms, most commonly paranoid delusions and hallucinations. The clinical presentation is characterized by sudden onset of mood lability and paranoid symptoms, occurring within 24 h to one week after cannabis use [20]. Symptoms are often precipitated by sudden increases in cannabis potency or quantity, with heavy users typically consuming more than 2 g per day.

Key distinguishing features of CIP compared to primary psychotic disorders include more prominent positive symptoms, less severe negative symptoms, greater mood disturbance (depression or mania), and more intact reality testing [21–23]. Patients with CIP are also more likely to have preserved insight into their condition and show better cognitive functioning compared to those with schizophrenia [24,25].

4.2. DSM-5 Diagnostic Criteria

According to DSM-5 criteria, Cannabis-Induced Psychotic Disorder requires the presence of hallucinations and/or delusions that develop during or soon after cannabis intoxication, cause clinically significant distress or

functional impairment, and cannot be better explained by an independent psychotic disorder [4]. The disturbance should not occur exclusively during delirium, and cannabis must be capable of producing the observed symptoms.

Importantly, if psychotic symptoms persist for more than one month after cannabis cessation, an alternative diagnosis such as a primary psychotic disorder should be considered. The DSM-5 specifies that only psychotic symptoms occurring in the context of recent intoxication (not withdrawal) are appropriate for a CIP diagnosis.

4.3. Differential Diagnosis

Distinguishing CIP from primary psychotic disorders with comorbid cannabis use remains challenging but is crucial for treatment planning and prognostic assessment. The differential diagnosis has significant implications for treatment approaches, family counseling, and long-term management strategies. Several key factors aid in this critical clinical distinction:

The most important diagnostic criterion involves establishing a clear temporal relationship between cannabis use and symptom onset. CIP symptoms characteristically begin within hours to days of consumption, with the majority of cases presenting within 24–48 h of heavy cannabis use or exposure to high-potency products. Symptoms typically resolve within days to weeks of complete cessation, with more than 56% of cases resolving within 24 h according to large-scale survey data [8]. In contrast, primary psychotic disorders may have symptom onset that is temporally unrelated to substance use, or symptoms that persist well beyond the expected timeframe for substance clearance. The persistence of psychotic symptoms for more than one month after confirmed abstinence strongly suggests a primary psychotic disorder rather than CIP.

Primary psychotic disorders demonstrate significantly stronger associations with family history of psychotic disorders, mood disorders, and other severe mental illnesses in first- and second-degree relatives. The genetic loading for psychotic disorders is substantially higher in families of patients with schizophrenia-spectrum disorders compared to those with CIP, which shows weaker familial clustering patterns [26]. This difference reflects the strong heritability of schizophrenia (approximately 80%) compared to the more environmentally-driven nature of CIP. Family history assessment should include detailed inquiry about psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, severe depression with psychotic features, and other psychiatric hospitalizations among biological relatives.

Several demographic characteristics help distinguish between CIP and primary psychotic disorders. Patients with CIP tend to have a later age of onset (mean 27 years) compared to typical first-episode schizophrenia (late teens to early twenties). They are more likely to be employed at the time of presentation, maintain stable housing situations, and have greater likelihood of being in romantic relationships or marriages compared to those with primary psychosis [26]. Additionally, patients with CIP often demonstrate better premorbid functioning, including higher educational attainment and more stable work histories. These factors reflect the generally better social and occupational functioning that characterizes CIP patients before their psychotic episodes.

The pattern of substance use differs markedly between groups. Individuals with CIP often demonstrate more severe cannabis use disorders, characterized by longer periods of continuous use (often several years), higher daily consumption (typically >2 g/day), preference for high-potency products, and greater likelihood of polysubstance use including alcohol, stimulants, and other illicit drugs [27]. They are more likely to meet criteria for cannabis dependence and report withdrawal symptoms upon cessation. In contrast, patients with primary psychotic disorders may use cannabis but typically show less severe patterns of use and are more likely to use substances in a self-medication pattern to alleviate negative symptoms or medication side effects.

The clinical presentation of CIP shows several distinguishing features compared to primary psychotic disorders. CIP typically presents with more prominent positive symptoms, particularly paranoid delusions and visual or auditory hallucinations, while negative symptoms (avolition, alogia, anhedonia, affective flattening) are significantly less prominent or absent [21]. Patients with CIP often maintain better insight into their condition and show more intact reality testing, recognizing that their experiences may be related to substance use. Cognitive function is generally better preserved in CIP, with less impairment in attention, working memory, and executive function compared to schizophrenia-spectrum disorders. Additionally, CIP patients more commonly present with mood symptoms, including depression, anxiety, or irritability, alongside their psychotic symptoms.

The treatment response pattern can provide additional diagnostic clues. Patients with CIP typically show more rapid improvement with antipsychotic medication and are more likely to achieve complete symptom resolution. They often require lower doses of antipsychotics and for shorter durations compared to those with primary psychotic disorders. The clinical course in CIP is generally characterized by complete recovery between episodes (if cannabis use is discontinued), whereas primary psychotic disorders typically show persistent symptoms or functional impairment even during periods of relative stability.

While no specific biomarkers exist for differential diagnosis, certain laboratory findings may be helpful. Patients with CIP typically have positive urine drug screens for THC metabolites, often at very high concentrations reflecting heavy recent use. Hair testing may reveal chronic, heavy cannabis exposure patterns. Neuroimaging studies, while not routinely performed, may show less structural brain abnormalities in CIP compared to chronic schizophrenia, though acute neuroinflammatory changes may be present during active episodes.

Several factors complicate the diagnostic process. The high prevalence of cannabis use among patients with primary psychotic disorders (up to 50% in some populations) means that temporal relationships may be unclear. Some patients may have undiagnosed prodromal symptoms of psychotic disorders that become manifest during cannabis-induced episodes. Additionally, repeated episodes of CIP may increase the risk of developing persistent psychotic symptoms, blurring the diagnostic boundaries. The phenomenon of "kindling," where repeated substance-induced episodes lower the threshold for subsequent psychotic episodes, may explain some cases where clear CIP evolves into apparent primary psychotic disorder.

A systematic approach to differential diagnosis should include: (1) detailed substance use history with specific attention to timing, frequency, and potency of cannabis use; (2) comprehensive family psychiatric history; (3) assessment of premorbid functioning and current psychosocial status; (4) careful documentation of symptom onset, duration, and relationship to substance use; (5) laboratory confirmation of substance use when possible; (6) structured assessment of positive, negative, and cognitive symptoms; and (7) close monitoring of treatment response and clinical course over time. In cases where diagnostic uncertainty remains, a period of observed abstinence with careful monitoring may be necessary to clarify the diagnosis and guide appropriate treatment planning.

In conclusion the differential diagnosis between CIP and primary psychotic disorders relies on four key clinical patterns. The temporal relationship remains the most reliable indicator: symptoms appearing within 24–48 h of heavy cannabis consumption strongly suggest CIP, while psychotic episodes without clear temporal association with substance use point toward primary psychotic disorders. The symptom constellation also provides valuable diagnostic clues. CIP typically presents with predominant positive symptoms accompanied by relatively preserved insight, allowing patients to recognize the potential connection between their cannabis use and symptoms. Conversely, primary psychotic disorders more commonly feature prominent negative symptoms with poor insight into their condition. Patient risk factors further inform the diagnostic process. Heavy daily cannabis consumption exceeding 2 g per day, particularly of high-potency products, characterizes the typical CIP presentation. In contrast, early symptom onset combined with strong family history of psychotic disorders suggests underlying vulnerability to primary psychotic illness. Treatment response patterns can retrospectively confirm the diagnosis. CIP patients demonstrate rapid clinical improvement within the first week of treatment and typically respond to lower antipsychotic doses, while primary psychotic disorders show slower treatment response and require higher medication doses for symptom control (Table 1).

Table 1. Differential Diagnosis Checklist—CIP vs. Primary Psychotic Disorders.

Clinical Factor	Cannabis-Induced Psychosis	Primary Psychotic Disorder
Temporal Relationship	Symptoms within 24–48 h of heavy cannabis use	No clear temporal relationship to substance use
Symptom Profile	Predominant positive symptoms; Preserved insight; Minimal negative symptoms	Prominent negative symptoms; Poor insight; Mixed positive/negative symptoms
Age of Onset	Mean 27 years	Late teens to early twenties
Family History	Weak familial clustering	Strong family history of psychosis
Substance Use Pattern	Heavy daily use (>2 g/day); High-potency products; Polysubstance use common	Variable use patterns; Often self-medication; Less severe dependence
Premorbid Functioning	Better social functioning; Stable relationships; Higher employment rate	Poor premorbid functioning; Social withdrawal; Academic/occupational decline
Treatment Response	Rapid improvement (<1 week); Lower antipsychotic doses; Shorter treatment duration	Slower improvement; Higher doses required; Long-term treatment needed
Cognitive Function	Better preserved during episode	Significant impairment
Prognosis with Abstinence	85–90% complete recovery	Persistent symptoms/impairment

4.4. Assessment Tools

Accurate assessment of cannabis use patterns is essential for diagnosis. This includes detailed history-taking regarding frequency, potency, and timing of use relative to symptom onset. Biological markers such as urine testing for THC metabolites can provide objective evidence of recent use, with carboxy-THC having an initial urinary excretion half-life of approximately 1.4 days in frequent users [28].

The Brief Psychiatric Rating Scale (BPRS) and Positive and Negative Syndrome Scale (PANSS) are commonly used to assess symptom severity and treatment response. Specific attention should be paid to the presence of insight, cognitive function, and social functioning, which may help distinguish CIP from primary psychotic disorders.

5. Treatment and Management

5.1. Acute Management

No evidence-based guidelines currently exist specifically for treating cannabis-induced psychotic disorder, necessitating symptom-guided management approaches that must be carefully tailored to individual patient presentations [29]. Treatment typically follows a multimodal approach addressing both acute psychotic symptoms and underlying substance use, recognizing the complex interplay between cannabis effects and psychotic symptomatology that characterizes this condition.

- Pharmacological Interventions: Second-generation antipsychotics represent the mainstay of acute treatment for cannabis-induced psychosis, though the evidence base remains limited compared to treatment of primary psychotic disorders. The selection of specific antipsychotic agents should be guided by symptom severity, patient characteristics, side effect profiles, and potential drug interactions with residual cannabinoids that may persist for days to weeks after last use.
- Antipsychotic Selection and Efficacy: Clinical experience and limited trials suggest that olanzapine, risperidone, and haloperidol demonstrate comparable efficacy, with response rates typically ranging from 60–80% for acute symptom control [30,31]. Olanzapine may be preferred as first-line treatment due to its significantly lower risk of extrapyramidal side effects, which is particularly important given that CIP patients may be more sensitive to movement disorders due to complex interactions between THC and dopaminergic pathways. A recent retrospective study of 317 patients found that antipsychotics effectively reduced psychotic symptoms within the first week of treatment, with average doses equivalent to or slightly higher than those used for schizophrenia treatment [32]. The study reported that hallucinatory behavior, grandiosity, and irritability showed particularly rapid improvement, typically within 3–5 days of initiation, suggesting that CIP may be more responsive to acute intervention than chronic psychotic disorders.
- Dosing Considerations: The optimal dosing strategy for CIP remains largely empirical, but clinical experience suggests starting with moderate doses and carefully titrating based on response and tolerability. For olanzapine, initial doses of 10–15 mg/day are typically effective, with potential escalation to 20–25 mg/day if needed, though many patients respond to lower doses than those required for schizophrenia. Risperidone is commonly initiated at 2–4 mg/day, with maximum doses rarely exceeding 6–8 mg/day in this population. Haloperidol, when used, typically requires doses of 5–10 mg/day, though higher doses may increase the risk of extrapyramidal symptoms without additional benefit. The average treatment duration for acute episodes ranges from 1–4 weeks, significantly shorter than treatment for primary psychotic disorders, reflecting the often transient nature of cannabis-induced symptoms.
- Second-Generation vs. First-Generation Antipsychotics: While both classes demonstrate efficacy for positive symptoms, second-generation antipsychotics are generally preferred due to their more favorable side effect profiles and better tolerability in this population. First-generation antipsychotics like haloperidol, while effective for controlling positive symptoms, carry higher risks of acute dystonia, akathisia, and tardive dyskinesia, complications that may be particularly problematic in young patients who represent the majority of CIP cases. However, in emergency settings where rapid sedation is required and patient cooperation is limited, intramuscular haloperidol (5–10 mg) or chlorpromazine may be necessary for immediate symptom control. The choice between oral and intramuscular formulations depends primarily on patient cooperation, symptom severity, and the clinical setting.
- Novel Antipsychotic Approaches: Aripiprazole has shown promise in some case studies and clinical reports, particularly for patients who experience recurrent episodes or those unable to achieve complete cannabis cessation [33]. Its partial dopamine agonism may be advantageous in CIP, as it can provide antipsychotic efficacy while potentially causing less disruption to the already altered dopaminergic function associated

with chronic cannabis use. Quetiapine, while less extensively studied specifically for CIP, may be beneficial for patients with prominent anxiety or sleep disturbances, given its anxiolytic and sedating properties that can address the full spectrum of symptoms commonly seen in acute cannabis-induced episodes.

- Benzodiazepine Augmentation: Benzodiazepines are commonly used adjunctively to manage associated agitation, anxiety, and sleep disturbances, particularly during the acute phase when patients may be severely distressed and potentially pose safety risks to themselves or others. Lorazepam (1–2 mg every 4–6 h) is frequently used due to its reliable absorption, predictable onset, and intermediate half-life that allows for flexible dosing adjustments. Clonazepam (0.5–1 mg twice daily) may be preferred for patients with prominent anxiety symptoms due to its longer duration of action and potentially smoother clinical effect. However, significant caution is warranted as benzodiazepines can potentially worsen cognitive symptoms and may interact unpredictably with residual cannabis effects, particularly in heavy users with high tissue THC concentrations. The duration of benzodiazepine use should be strictly limited to 1–2 weeks to prevent the development of dependence, which is particularly important in a population already struggling with substance use issues.
- Anticonvulsant Adjuncts: Emerging clinical evidence suggests potential benefits of anticonvulsants as adjuncts to antipsychotics, though the evidence base remains largely anecdotal and requires further systematic study. Valproate sodium (500–1000 mg/day) has shown promise in case reports, particularly for patients with mood instability or those who develop seizure-like activity during acute episodes [20]. The proposed mechanism involves GABAergic enhancement, which may help counteract the GABA suppression caused by THC and restore normal inhibitory neurotransmission. Carbamazepine (200–400 mg twice daily) has also been reported to have rapid effects when used adjunctively, potentially reducing neuroleptic side effects and improving overall tolerability through unclear mechanisms that may involve mood stabilization and neuroprotection. These agents may be particularly beneficial for patients who show poor response to antipsychotics alone or those with prominent mood symptoms that complicate the clinical picture.
- Pharmacokinetic Considerations: Cannabis use can significantly affect the metabolism of psychotropic medications through several complex mechanisms that must be considered in treatment planning. Chronic cannabis smoking, particularly when combined with tobacco use as is common in this population, can induce cytochrome P450 enzymes (particularly CYP1A2), potentially decreasing plasma levels of antipsychotics like olanzapine and clozapine and requiring dose adjustments to maintain therapeutic efficacy. Conversely, cannabidiol (CBD), when present in significant concentrations in certain cannabis products, can inhibit multiple enzymes including CYP3A4, CYP2C19, and CYP2D6, potentially increasing levels of various psychotropic medications and raising the risk of toxicity. These complex and sometimes opposing interactions necessitate careful monitoring of treatment response and potential dose adjustments based on individual patient factors and cannabis use patterns.
- Side Effect Monitoring: Patients with CIP may experience notably different side effect profiles compared to those with primary psychotic disorders, requiring modified monitoring approaches. Extrapyramidal symptoms occurred in only 4.4% of patients in one large study, with dysarthria, acute dystonia, and akathisia being most common but generally mild and manageable [32]. Metabolic side effects like weight gain and glucose dysregulation may be less pronounced in CIP patients, possibly due to shorter treatment duration, different baseline metabolic status, and the potential metabolic effects of cannabis itself. However, sedation and cognitive dulling may be more problematic and noticeable, as these patients often have better baseline cognitive function and may be more aware of subtle changes in mental clarity and processing speed.
- Treatment Resistance and Alternative Strategies: For the minority of patients who show poor response to standard antipsychotic treatment, several alternative strategies may be considered, though careful diagnostic reassessment should be the first step. Combination therapy with two antipsychotics is generally not recommended due to increased side effect risk without proven additional benefit in this population. Instead, switching to a different class of antipsychotic with distinct receptor binding profiles or adding mood stabilizers may be more effective approaches. In cases of suspected treatment resistance, careful reassessment of the diagnosis becomes crucial, as persistent symptoms beyond the expected timeframe may indicate evolution to a primary psychotic disorder rather than true CIP, fundamentally altering the treatment approach and prognosis.
- Special Populations: Adolescent patients require particular consideration and modified treatment approaches, as they may be more sensitive to antipsychotic side effects, particularly metabolic and neurological effects that could impact their ongoing development. Lower starting doses and more gradual titration schedules are recommended, with close monitoring for both efficacy and tolerability. Elderly patients, while less commonly affected by CIP, may require significantly reduced doses due to altered pharmacokinetics, increased

sensitivity to side effects, and potential interactions with other medications. Pregnant patients present unique and complex challenges, as both continued psychosis and antipsychotic exposure carry distinct risks for both mother and fetus, necessitating careful risk-benefit analysis and consultation with maternal-fetal medicine specialists to optimize outcomes for both patients.

- Long-Acting Injectable Considerations: While not typically considered first-line treatment for CIP, long-acting injectable antipsychotics may be appropriate for selected patients with recurrent episodes who demonstrate difficulty maintaining oral medication adherence or achieving sustained cannabis abstinence despite multiple interventions. However, this approach requires extremely careful consideration of the risk-benefit ratio, as the prolonged exposure to antipsychotics inherent in long-acting formulations may not be warranted if the patient can achieve sustained abstinence from cannabis, which would likely render continued antipsychotic treatment unnecessary.
- Hospitalization: Severe cases of CIP may require psychiatric hospitalization, particularly when patients present with significant agitation, severely impaired judgment, potential for self-harm or violence, or safety concerns that cannot be adequately managed in outpatient settings. The decision for inpatient versus outpatient treatment should carefully consider multiple factors including symptom severity, availability of adequate support systems, risk of continued cannabis use, patient insight and cooperation, and the capacity of outpatient services to provide appropriate monitoring and intervention. Hospitalization also provides the opportunity for comprehensive assessment, initiation of treatment under close observation, and intensive substance abuse counseling in a controlled environment free from cannabis access (Table 2).

Table 2. Treatment Algorithm Summary.

Severity Level	Setting	First-Line Treatment	Adjunctive Options	Duration	Key Monitoring
Mild-Moderate	Outpatient	Olanzapine 10–15 mg/day OR Risperidone 2–4 mg/day	Lorazepam 1 mg BID PRN anxiety (max 2 weeks)	1–4 weeks	Daily cannabis abstinence; Weekly symptom assessment
Severe	Inpatient/ED	Olanzapine 15–20 mg/day OR Haloperidol 5–10 mg/day	Lorazepam 2 mg q6h PRN agitation; Consider IM formulations	2–6 weeks	Continuous monitoring; Safety assessment; Response to treatment
Recurrent Episodes	Specialized care	Aripiprazole 10 mg/day for maintenance	Intensive substance abuse treatment; Family therapy	3–6 months	Monthly psychiatric follow-up; Substance use screening

5.2. Long-Term Management

Long-term treatment strategies focus primarily on preventing relapse through cannabis cessation and addressing comorbid conditions.

- Cannabis Cessation: Abstinence from cannabis represents the most critical intervention for preventing recurrence of psychotic episodes. Studies consistently demonstrate that patients who achieve complete abstinence after their first episode show no relapse of psychiatric illness and marked improvement in socio-occupational functioning [34]. Conversely, all patients who resumed cannabis use experienced recurrence of illness.
- Maintenance Pharmacotherapy: For patients at high risk of relapse or those unable to achieve complete cannabis cessation, maintenance therapy with antipsychotics may be considered. Aripiprazole (10 mg/day) has shown promise in suppressing psychotic symptom recurrence without affecting cannabis levels, though direct comparisons with other antipsychotics are lacking [20].
- Psychosocial Interventions: Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) plays a crucial role in long-term management, helping patients develop coping strategies, manage stress, and reduce relapse risk. Motivational interviewing is particularly effective in enhancing awareness about the importance of cannabis abstinence.

In conclusion the most striking finding in CIP prognosis is the dramatic difference abstinence makes: while 80% of patients continuing any level of cannabis use will experience relapse, complete abstinence reduces conversion rates from 60–80% to just 20%. This stark contrast underscores that no “safe” level of cannabis use exists for CIP patients. Certain demographic and clinical characteristics identify patients requiring intensive

monitoring and intervention. Young adults under 25 at first episode, male patients, those with family history of psychotic disorders, and individuals whose initial episodes persist beyond two weeks represent the highest-risk subgroups for conversion to chronic psychotic illness. Conversely, several protective factors significantly improve long-term outcomes. Complete cannabis abstinence maintained for over 12 months emerges as the strongest predictor of favorable prognosis, while robust family support systems and stable housing or employment provide additional protection against relapse. These findings emphasize that comprehensive psychosocial intervention addressing both substance use and social determinants represents the optimal prevention strategy.

5.3. Substance Use Disorder Treatment

Given the high prevalence of cannabis use disorder among patients with CIP (80–90% in most clinical samples), specialized addiction treatment represents a cornerstone of comprehensive care and is essential for preventing relapse and reducing conversion to chronic psychotic disorders [35]. Success in achieving sustained cannabis abstinence is strongly correlated with favorable long-term outcomes, making substance use treatment as critical as psychotic symptom management.

5.4. Comprehensive Assessment and Treatment Planning

Before initiating treatment, thorough assessment of cannabis use patterns is essential, including onset and progression, frequency and quantity patterns, potency preferences, withdrawal symptoms, and previous quit attempts. Standardized tools such as the Severity of Dependence Scale (SDS) and Cannabis Use Disorders Identification Test (CUDIT) provide objective measures of dependence severity. Treatment planning should be individualized based on dependence severity, psychosocial supports, comorbid conditions, and patient motivation.

Evidence-based psychosocial interventions form the foundation of effective treatment, with several approaches demonstrating particular promise for CIP populations.

- Motivational Interviewing (MI**)** represents a particularly valuable intervention for enhancing intrinsic motivation and resolving ambivalence about cessation [35]. MI techniques include reflective listening, exploring discrepancies between values and behaviors, and supporting self-efficacy. In CIP populations, MI helps patients recognize the connection between cannabis use and psychotic symptoms. Brief MI interventions (1–4 sessions) can significantly improve treatment engagement and produce measurable reductions in cannabis use.
- Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT**)** focuses systematically on identifying triggers, developing coping strategies, challenging cognitive distortions, and implementing relapse prevention strategies. A typical protocol involves 12–16 sessions over 3–4 months, including functional analysis of use patterns, alternative coping skills development, and cognitive restructuring. CBT demonstrates particular efficacy in reducing frequency of use and achieving sustained abstinence periods.
- Mindfulness-Based Relapse Prevention (MBRP**)** combines cognitive-behavioral strategies with mindfulness meditation practices, teaching patients to observe cravings with detached awareness without automatically responding with substance use. Core components include formal meditation practice, urge surfing techniques, and acceptance-based coping strategies. MBRP can be particularly effective for reducing heavy use days and may be especially valuable for CIP patients with anxiety or stress-related triggers.
- Contingency Management (CM) provides tangible rewards for verified abstinence, directly addressing altered reward processing in addiction. Typical protocols involve escalating rewards for consecutive clean samples, with reset following positive tests. CM demonstrates robust short-term efficacy, though maintenance after discontinuation remains challenging.
- Family-Based Interventions are particularly important for young adult CIP patients, focusing on improving communication patterns, reducing enabling behaviors, and enhancing family support for recovery. Multidimensional Family Therapy (MDFT) shows promise for adolescents and may be adaptable for young adults with CIP.

While no FDA-approved medications currently exist specifically for cannabis use disorder, several agents have shown promise in clinical trials and may be particularly relevant for CIP populations who require pharmacological intervention for both psychotic symptoms and substance use, creating opportunities for medications that can address both aspects of the condition.

- Gabapentin has emerged as one of the most promising pharmacological treatments for cannabis use disorder, with a strong evidence base and favorable tolerability profile. A proof-of-concept randomized controlled trial found that gabapentin administered at 1200 mg/day significantly reduced cannabis use, improved executive

function, and reduced withdrawal symptoms compared to placebo [36]. The medication appeared particularly effective for heavy users and those experiencing significant withdrawal symptoms, making it especially relevant for CIP patients who often have severe cannabis use patterns. Proposed mechanisms include GABAergic enhancement, which may counteract cannabis withdrawal-related anxiety and sleep disturbances that often trigger relapse. Side effects are generally mild and manageable, including sedation, dizziness, and peripheral edema, though these typically diminish with continued use. The medication may provide additional benefits in CIP patients by potentially reducing anxiety and improving sleep quality, both of which are commonly impaired in this population.

- N-acetylcysteine (NAC) represents another promising pharmacological approach, functioning as a glutamate modulator that has shown efficacy in reducing cannabis use in several well-designed clinical trials. A large multisite trial found that NAC administered at 1200 mg twice daily was superior to placebo in achieving cannabis abstinence, particularly in adult populations [37]. The medication is thought to work by restoring glutamate homeostasis in reward circuits that become disrupted by chronic cannabis use, addressing fundamental neurochemical changes that maintain addiction. NAC is generally well-tolerated, with mild gastrointestinal side effects being most common and typically manageable with dose adjustments or administration with food. The medication may offer additional neuroprotective benefits relevant to CIP populations, including antioxidant properties and potential anti-inflammatory effects that could help protect against cannabis-related brain changes.
- Dronabinol, representing synthetic THC, offers a paradoxical but theoretically sound approach for cannabis withdrawal management that has shown mixed but promising results in clinical trials. The rationale involves providing controlled, decreasing doses of cannabinoid agonism to ease withdrawal symptoms while preventing intoxication and the reinforcing effects of smoked cannabis. However, results have been mixed across studies, and legitimate concerns exist about potentially perpetuating cannabinoid dependence or interfering with the goal of complete abstinence. This approach requires extremely careful consideration and close monitoring if used in CIP populations, given the potential for triggering psychotic symptoms and the ultimate goal of complete cannabis cessation.
- Topiramate, an anticonvulsant with multiple mechanisms of action, has shown modest efficacy in some trials for cannabis dependence, though results have been inconsistent across studies and populations. The medication may work through complex effects on GABA and glutamate systems, potentially addressing some of the neurochemical imbalances associated with chronic cannabis use. However, side effects including cognitive dulling and weight loss may significantly limit its utility, particularly in CIP patients who may already experience cognitive symptoms and for whom additional cognitive impairment could be problematic.

Emerging pharmacological targets represent an exciting area of ongoing research, with investigations into several novel approaches including cannabinoid receptor antagonists, allosteric modulators of cannabinoid receptors, and medications targeting the endocannabinoid degradation pathway. Cannabidiol (CBD) is being investigated with particular interest for its potential to reduce cannabis craving and withdrawal symptoms while potentially offering antipsychotic properties, making it especially relevant for CIP populations who could benefit from both effects simultaneously.

The most effective strategies combine multiple modalities in coordinated approaches addressing both substance use and psychotic symptoms simultaneously.

- Intensive Outpatient Programs (IOP) provide structured treatment (9–15 h/week) while allowing maintenance of work, school, or family responsibilities. Programs incorporate individual therapy, group sessions, family involvement, and comprehensive psychoeducation about both conditions.
- Digital Health Interventions including smartphone apps and web-based platforms provide continuous support between sessions, offering daily monitoring, coping skill reminders, peer support networks, and progress tracking. Some platforms incorporate contingency management principles through gamification.Given high relapse rates, comprehensive prevention planning is essential. Key components include systematic identification of high-risk situations with specific coping strategies, detailed relapse prevention plans with action steps for different scenarios, robust support networks with emergency protocols, regular monitoring and plan adjustments, addressing comorbid conditions that may trigger relapse, and lifestyle modifications including exercise, sleep hygiene, and stress management techniques.

5.5. Novel Therapeutic Approaches

Emerging research explores the potential therapeutic role of cannabidiol (CBD) in treating psychosis, including in patients with comorbid cannabis use, representing a fascinating paradigm where one component of

cannabis may serve as treatment for problems caused by another component. CBD appears to have intrinsic antipsychotic properties through mechanisms distinct from traditional antipsychotics and may actively mitigate THC's psychotomimetic effects, suggesting potential for both treatment and prevention applications [38]. This unique pharmacological profile positions CBD as particularly relevant for CIP populations who may benefit from both symptom reduction and protection against future THC-induced episodes.

Early clinical trials suggest that CBD may be as effective as traditional antipsychotics in reducing psychotic symptoms but with significantly fewer side effects, including absence of extrapyramidal symptoms, weight gain, or prolactin elevation that commonly complicate traditional antipsychotic treatment. A pilot study comparing CBD to amisulpride in patients with acute schizophrenia found comparable antipsychotic efficacy with notably superior tolerability [39]. Additionally, CBD administered as adjunctive treatment to standard antipsychotics has shown promise in reducing psychotic symptoms while improving the overall side effect profile.

The proposed mechanisms of CBD's antipsychotic effects involve modulation of the endocannabinoid system through inverse agonism at CB1 receptors, enhancement of anandamide signaling, and interactions with serotonin 5-HT1A receptors and dopamine D2 receptors [40]. These diverse mechanisms may provide therapeutic benefits through pathways independent of traditional dopamine receptor blockade, potentially offering advantages in patients who have developed tolerance or resistance to conventional treatments.

For CIP populations specifically, CBD offers the theoretical advantage of addressing both the acute psychotic symptoms and the underlying cannabis use disorder simultaneously. Preliminary evidence suggests that CBD may reduce cannabis craving and withdrawal symptoms, potentially facilitating abstinence while treating psychotic symptoms. However, more research is urgently needed specifically for CIP populations to establish optimal dosing, treatment duration, and long-term safety in this unique clinical context where patients have specific vulnerabilities related to cannabis exposure.

6. Prognosis and Long-Term Outcomes

6.1. Short-Term Prognosis

The immediate prognosis for cannabis-induced psychosis is generally favorable, with more than half (56%) of patients reporting resolution of symptoms within 24 h according to large-scale survey data [8]. However, approximately one-fifth (21%) report symptoms lasting several weeks, and the duration appears related to the amount and frequency of cannabis use prior to the episode.

6.2. Conversion to Schizophrenia-Spectrum Disorders

A critical concern with CIP is the substantial risk of progression to chronic psychotic disorders, representing one of the most significant long-term consequences of cannabis-induced psychotic episodes. This transition from episodic, substance-related psychosis to persistent psychotic illness has profound implications for patients, families, and healthcare systems.

Studies consistently report conversion rates to schizophrenia-spectrum disorders ranging from 33% to 50% over 5–8 years of follow-up [6,41]. This conversion rate is notably higher than for other substance-induced psychoses (10–25%), supporting specificity in the cannabis-psychosis relationship [42]. Most transitions occur within the first 2–3 years following the initial CIP episode, with the highest risk period being the first 12–18 months.

A landmark Danish study following 535 patients found that 44.5% developed schizophrenia-spectrum disorders over 5.9 years [6], while a Finnish registry study of 18,478 patients confirmed highest conversion rates for cannabis-induced cases compared to other substances [41].

Demographic and clinical factors significantly influence conversion likelihood (detailed risk factor analysis in Section 2.2). Continued cannabis use following the initial CIP episode represents the most modifiable and clinically significant predictor [34]. Patients achieving complete abstinence show conversion rates of 15–25% with significantly better functional outcomes, while those continuing any level of cannabis use show rates of 60–80%. Even occasional use significantly increases risk, suggesting that complete abstinence rather than harm reduction strategies is necessary.

Clinical features of the initial episode that predict higher conversion risk include longer episode duration (>2 weeks), presence of negative symptoms during acute phase, persistent cognitive impairment after symptom resolution, and poor insight into the cannabis-psychosis relationship [21]. Patients requiring multiple hospitalizations show particularly high conversion rates (>70%), suggesting a kindling-like mechanism where repeated episodes sensitize neural circuits [16].

Persistent cognitive deficits in working memory, attention, executive function, and processing speed that remain after symptom resolution indicate underlying neurobiological changes predisposing to chronic illness [28]. Neuropsychological testing at 3–6 months can identify high-risk individuals requiring intensive intervention. The transition likely involves interconnected processes including cumulative neurotoxic effects from repeated THC exposure, particularly in prefrontal cortex and hippocampus [11]. These may include oxidative stress, neuroinflammation, and disrupted neuroplasticity. Cannabis exposure during critical developmental periods may induce epigenetic modifications persistently altering gene expression patterns related to neurotransmitter function and neural development [15].

6.3. Protective Factors

Complete cannabis abstinence maintained for >12 months emerges as the strongest protective factor [34]. Additional protective elements include rapid identification and aggressive treatment of CIP episodes, consistent mental health service engagement, strong family support, stable housing, and continued education or employment [26,35]. The substantial conversion risk justifies intensive treatment approaches including longer antipsychotic treatment periods, intensive substance abuse interventions, and closer psychiatric monitoring than typically used for other substance-induced conditions [42]. Patients require long-term monitoring for symptom recurrence and functional decline, with regular assessments including symptom monitoring, cognitive testing, and substance use screening [9].

Families need comprehensive education about conversion risk and early warning signs, with training to recognize subtle behavioral changes that might herald transition to chronic illness. Patients and families should receive honest but hopeful prognostic information emphasizing both substantial risks and significant prevention potential through sustained abstinence and treatment adherence.

Critical research needs include identification of biological markers for conversion risk prediction, development of specific prevention interventions for high-risk CIP patients, longitudinal neuroimaging studies of brain changes associated with conversion, and investigation of neuroprotective agents or anti-inflammatory compounds for pharmacological prevention [40] (Table 3).

Table 3. Conversion Risk Stratification.

Risk Level	Conversion Rate	Risk Factors	Monitoring Intensity	Intervention Level
Low Risk (15–25%)	15–25%	Age >30 at onset; Complete abstinence >12 months; No family history; Single episode <1 week	Quarterly follow-up; Annual substance screening	Standard outpatient care; Relapse prevention education
Moderate Risk (40–60%)	40–60%	Age 25–30; Partial abstinence; Minimal family history; Episode 1–2 weeks	Monthly follow-up; Quarterly cognitive testing	Intensive outpatient program; Regular family sessions
High Risk (60–80%)	60–80%	Age <25; Continued any cannabis use; Family history of psychosis; Multiple episodes >2 weeks	Weekly follow-up; Monthly cognitive testing; Continuous substance monitoring	Specialized dual-diagnosis program; Consider maintenance antipsychotics

7. Public Health Implications

7.1. Prevention Strategies

Given the substantial conversion rates to chronic psychotic disorders and limited treatment options, prevention represents the most effective public health approach for addressing CIP. The young age of onset and potentially devastating long-term consequences underscore the critical importance of preventing initial episodes through evidence-based strategies.

Public health campaigns should focus on educating young people about cannabis-related psychosis risks, particularly during adolescence when vulnerability is highest [15]. Educational initiatives must provide nuanced, scientifically accurate information about dose-response relationships and high-potency product risks, emphasizing that legal does not necessarily mean safe for developing brains [3]. Effective campaigns should utilize multiple channels including schools, social media, healthcare settings, and community organizations.

Cannabis legalization frameworks should consider regulations limiting THC content, implementing strict age restrictions, and requiring comprehensive health warnings about psychosis risk [7]. Given evidence that elimination of high-potency cannabis could prevent 12–50% of first-episode psychosis cases (detailed in Section 2.3), regulatory approaches might include THC concentration caps below 10–15%, progressive taxation based on potency, clear labeling requirements, and prominent health warnings similar to tobacco products.

Healthcare systems should develop screening protocols to identify at-risk individuals, particularly those with family history of psychotic disorders or early psychotic-like experiences [19]. These programs should be integrated into routine healthcare visits for adolescents and young adults, including assessment of substance use patterns and family psychiatric history. Primary care providers and mental health professionals require training to recognize early warning signs and make appropriate referrals.

Early intervention programs specifically designed for individuals showing psychotic-like experiences in the context of cannabis use could prevent progression to full episodes [42]. These should combine substance abuse treatment, psychoeducation, family intervention, and close symptom monitoring.

7.2. Healthcare System Burden

The increasing CIP incidence places significant burden on healthcare systems, particularly emergency departments and psychiatric services [43]. Approximately 8% of cannabis-related emergency visits require inpatient psychiatric care, with up to 50% subsequently developing schizophrenia, creating cascading long-term costs.

The economic impact extends beyond acute care, as CIP patients often require decades of psychiatric treatment [5]. With lifetime schizophrenia costs exceeding $1.65 million per patient and 33–50% conversion rates, preventing even modest numbers of CIP cases could yield substantial savings. Early intervention and specialized dual-diagnosis services may reduce long-term costs by preventing chronic disorder progression.

CIP patients require specialized dual-diagnosis expertise often unavailable in all settings [35]. The need for integrated treatment addressing both substance use and psychotic symptoms creates additional complexity and resource requirements. Healthcare systems should develop clear protocols and training programs for managing these complex patients across care levels.

Regional variations in cannabis policies create planning challenges, as areas with liberal policies may experience disproportionate CIP increases [7]. Healthcare systems in such regions should anticipate increased psychiatric service demand and develop appropriate capacity planning strategies, carefully monitoring the relationship between policy changes and utilization patterns.

7.3. Research Priorities

Several critical research priorities emerge from current evidence gaps, highlighting the need for continued scientific investigation to better understand, prevent, and treat cannabis-induced psychosis. The complexity of CIP and its relationship to chronic psychotic disorders necessitates a multifaceted research approach spanning basic neuroscience, clinical investigation, epidemiological studies, and health services research. Biological marker development represents one of the most pressing research needs [19]. Current risk assessment relies primarily on clinical and demographic factors, but reliable biomarkers could dramatically improve predictive accuracy and enable personalized prevention approaches. Potential biomarkers include genetic polymorphisms affecting cannabis metabolism or neurotransmitter function, neuroimaging markers of brain vulnerability, inflammatory markers, or metabolomic signatures reflecting altered brain chemistry. The COMT Val158Met polymorphism represents an early example, but broader genome-wide association studies are needed to identify additional genetic variants that modify CIP risk.

Large-scale randomized controlled trials are urgently needed to establish evidence-based treatment protocols, as current approaches are largely based on clinical experience and extrapolation from primary psychotic disorder treatment [30]. These trials should examine optimal antipsychotic selection, dosing strategies, treatment duration, and adjunctive medications, with particular attention to comparing agents regarding efficacy, tolerability, and long-term outcomes. Extended follow-up studies are required to better understand conversion factors and optimal intervention timing [41]. Longer follow-up periods and larger sample sizes are needed to identify modifiable factors preventing conversion, examining different treatment approaches, partial versus complete cannabis abstinence, and optimal intervention duration and intensity. Serial neuroimaging studies could provide insights into brain changes associated with conversion and potential intervention targets.

Novel therapeutic targets require investigation, including anti-inflammatory agents, neuroprotective compounds, and medications targeting the endocannabinoid system [40]. Cannabidiol deserves particular attention given its unique pharmacological profile and potential to reduce both psychotic symptoms and cannabis craving.

Health services research examining optimal care models could inform specialized treatment program development and improve outcomes while reducing costs [35]. This includes integrated treatment models, peer support and family interventions, and optimal timing and intensity of different components. Economic analyses of prevention and treatment strategy cost-effectiveness could inform policy decisions and resource allocation.

Cannabis policy research examining the relationship between policy changes and CIP incidence could provide valuable insights for policymakers [3]. Natural experiments from different policy approaches across jurisdictions could provide real-world evidence about regulatory strategy effectiveness in reducing CIP risk while preserving cannabis access benefits.

7.4. Clinical Practice Implications

For practicing clinicians, several key principles emerge from the current evidence base. Cannabis-induced psychosis should be treated as a psychiatric emergency requiring immediate intervention, as the window for preventing conversion to chronic psychosis may be limited. The differential diagnosis, while challenging, can be systematically approached using temporal relationships, symptom profiles, and demographic factors. Treatment selection should prioritize second-generation antipsychotics, with olanzapine as first-line due to superior tolerability. Duration of treatment is typically much shorter than for primary psychotic disorders, ranging from 1–4 weeks for acute episodes. However, the most critical intervention remains achieving complete cannabis abstinence, as any continued use dramatically increases conversion risk from 15–25% to 60–80%. Healthcare systems should develop clear protocols for CIP management, including emergency department guidelines, substance abuse treatment integration, and long-term monitoring schedules. Family education and support represent essential components of comprehensive care, as social support significantly improves outcomes and reduces relapse risk.

8. Conclusions

Cannabis-induced psychosis represents a significant and growing public health concern that requires urgent attention from clinicians, researchers, and policymakers. The substantial increase in CIP incidence over the past decade, coinciding with increased cannabis availability and potency, provides compelling evidence for a causal relationship between high-potency cannabis use and psychotic outcomes.

The neurobiological mechanisms underlying CIP involve complex interactions between THC and the endocannabinoid system, affecting multiple neurotransmitter pathways and brain developmental processes. These mechanisms are particularly relevant during adolescence, when cannabis exposure may have lasting effects on brain maturation and increase vulnerability to psychotic disorders.

Clinical management remains challenging due to limited evidence-based guidelines, though second-generation antipsychotics and comprehensive substance abuse treatment show efficacy. The high conversion rate to schizophrenia-spectrum disorders (33–50%) underscores the importance of early identification, aggressive treatment, and sustained cannabis abstinence.

Moving forward, several priorities emerge: development of evidence-based treatment protocols, implementation of targeted prevention strategies, and establishment of specialized services for dual-diagnosis patients. As cannabis legalization continues globally, regulatory frameworks must balance individual liberty with public health protection, particularly for vulnerable populations such as adolescents and those with predisposing mental health conditions.

The growing body of evidence supporting a causal relationship between cannabis use and psychosis should inform clinical practice, public health policy, and individual decision-making. Healthcare providers must be equipped to identify, assess, and treat cannabis-induced psychosis effectively, while public health systems must develop comprehensive strategies to minimize population-level risks while supporting evidence-based cannabis policies.

Ultimately, addressing the challenge of cannabis-induced psychosis requires a coordinated, multidisciplinary approach that combines rigorous scientific research, clinical excellence, and thoughtful public health policy. Only through such comprehensive efforts can we hope to minimize the harm associated with this serious condition while preserving the benefits that cannabis may offer for appropriate medical and social uses.

9. Clinical Implementation Tools

To facilitate translation of research evidence into clinical practice, we provide standardized tools that synthesize the key diagnostic, treatment, and prevention recommendations from this review. These tools are

designed for immediate implementation in emergency departments, outpatient clinics, and primary care settings (Tables 4–9).

- **Tool 1**

Table 4. Differential Diagnosis Framework Cannabis-Induced Psychosis vs. Primary Psychotic Disorders.

Clinical Factor	Cannabis-Induced Psychosis	Primary Psychotic Disorder
Temporal Relationship	Symptoms within 24–48 h of heavy cannabis use	No clear temporal relationship to substance use
Symptom Profile	Predominant positive symptoms; Preserved insight; Minimal negative symptoms	Prominent negative symptoms; Poor insight; Mixed positive/negative symptoms
Age of Onset	Mean 27 years	Late teens to early twenties
Family History	Weak familial clustering	Strong family history of psychosis
Substance Use Pattern	Heavy daily use (>2 g/day); High-potency products; Polysubstance use common	Variable use patterns; Often self-medication; Less severe dependence
Premorbid Functioning	Better social functioning; Stable relationships; Higher employment rate	Poor premorbid functioning; Social withdrawal; Academic/occupational decline
Treatment Response	Rapid improvement (<1 week); Lower antipsychotic doses; Shorter treatment duration	Slower improvement; Higher doses required; Long-term treatment needed
Cognitive Function	Better preserved during episode	Significant impairment
Prognosis with Abstinence	85–90% complete recovery	Persistent symptoms/impairment

- **Tool 2**

Table 5. Emergency Assessment Protocol Systematic Approach to Cannabis-Induced Psychosis in Emergency Settings.

Assessment Step	Clinical Findings	Decision Criteria	Action Required	Medications
1. Safety Evaluation	Suicidal ideation	Any suicidal thoughts	IMMEDIATE HOSPITALIZATION	Hold medications until stabilized
	Homicidal ideation	Any violence risk	IMMEDIATE HOSPITALIZATION	Hold medications until stabilized
	Severe agitation	Unable to cooperate with assessment	IMMEDIATE HOSPITALIZATION	Consider IM medications
2. Symptom Severity	Mild symptoms	Minimal functional impairment + good insight	OUTPATIENT management	Olanzapine 10 mg PO daily
	Moderate symptoms	Some functional impairment + partial insight	INTENSIVE OUTPATIENT	Olanzapine 10–15 mg PO daily
	Severe symptoms	Significant impairment + poor insight	INPATIENT treatment	Olanzapine 15–20 mg PO daily
3. Social Support	Strong support	Safe home + family involvement + cannabis removed	OUTPATIENT possible	Continue outpatient plan
	Poor support	Unstable housing + continued cannabis access	HOSPITALIZATION likely	Proceed with inpatient care

Table 5. *Cont.*

Assessment Step	Clinical Findings	Decision Criteria	Action Required	Medications
4. Patient Cooperation	Cooperative	Accepts oral medication + engages in assessment	ORAL medications	Olanzapine 10–15 mg PO
	Agitated/Uncooperative	Refuses oral medication + significant agitation	IM medications	Haloperidol 5–10 mg IM + Lorazepam 2 mg IM
5. Discharge Planning	All patients	Before any discharge	MANDATORY ACTIONS	Cannabis cessation counseling
				24–48 h follow-up scheduled
				Family education completed
				Emergency contacts provided

- **Tool 3: Treatment Selection Guide**

Table 6. Evidence-Based Medication Protocols for Cannabis-Induced Psychosis.

Severity Level	Setting	First-Line Treatment	Adjunctive Options	Duration	Key Monitoring
Mild-Moderate	Outpatient	Olanzapine 10–15 mg/day OR Risperidone 2–4 mg/day	Lorazepam 1 mg BID PRN anxiety (max 2 weeks)	1–4 weeks	Daily cannabis abstinence; Weekly symptom assessment
Severe	Inpatient/ED	Olanzapine 15–20 mg/day OR Haloperidol 5–10 mg/day	Lorazepam 2 mg q6h PRN agitation; Consider IM formulations	2–6 weeks	Continuous monitoring; Safety assessment; Response to treatment
Recurrent Episodes	Specialized care	Aripiprazole 10 mg/day for maintenance	Intensive substance abuse treatment; Family therapy	3–6 months	Monthly psychiatric follow-up; Substance use screening

Table 7. Medication Quick Reference.

Medication	Starting Dose	Target Dose	Advantages	Disadvantages	Special Considerations
Olanzapine	10 mg/day	10–20 mg/day	Low EPS risk; Good efficacy; Rapid onset	Weight gain; Metabolic effects	First-line choice; Well-tolerated in CIP
Risperidone	2 mg/day	2–6 mg/day	Good efficacy; Moderate side effects	Some EPS risk; Prolactin elevation	Good alternative to olanzapine
Haloperidol	5 mg/day	5–15 mg/day	Rapid onset; IM available; Cost-effective	High EPS risk; Sedation	Reserve for severe agitation; Monitor for EPS
Aripiprazole	10 mg/day	10–15 mg/day	Low metabolic effects; Partial agonist	Akathisia; Slower onset	Good for maintenance; Recurrent episodes

- **Tool 4: Conversion Risk Assessment Calculator**

  Predicting Risk of Progression to Chronic Psychotic Disorders

Table 8. Risk Factor Scoring System.

Risk Category	Risk Factor	Points	Assessment Questions	Clinical Significance
Demographics	Age <25 at first episode	2	"How old were you when this first happened?"	Critical developmental period
	Male gender	1	Patient gender	Consistently higher conversion rates
Cannabis Use	Daily use pattern	1	"How often do you use cannabis?"	Frequency correlates with risk
	High-potency products (>15% THC)	2	"What type of cannabis do you use?"	High-potency increases risk 5-fold
	Heavy use (>2 g/day)	1	"How much do you use per day?"	Dose-response relationship
	Continued use after episode	3	"Have you used since this episode?"	Most modifiable risk factor
Clinical Features	Episode duration >2 weeks	2	"How long did symptoms last?"	Prolonged episodes predict conversion
	Presence of negative symptoms	2	Clinical assessment	Atypical for pure CIP
	Poor insight	1	"Do you think cannabis caused this?"	Reduced awareness of relationship
	Multiple episodes	2	"Has this happened before?"	Kindling effect
Family History	First-degree relative with psychosis	3	"Any family history of schizophrenia/psychosis?"	Strongest genetic risk factor
Functional Impact	Persistent cognitive deficits	2	Neuropsychological testing at 3–6 months	Underlying brain changes
	Social/occupational decline	1	Functional assessment	Early disability marker

Table 9. Risk Stratification and Management.

Total Score	Risk Level	Conversion Risk	Monitoring Intensity	Intervention Level	Follow-Up Schedule
0–4 points	🟢 LOW RISK	15–25%	Standard monitoring	Outpatient management; Relapse prevention education	Quarterly visits
5–9 points	🟡 MODERATE RISK	40–60%	Enhanced monitoring	Intensive outpatient program; Regular family sessions	Monthly visits
10–14 points	🔴 HIGH RISK	60–80%	Intensive monitoring	Specialized dual-diagnosis program; Consider maintenance meds	Weekly visits
15+ points	🚨 VERY HIGH RISK	>80%	Continuous monitoring	Intensive case management; Long-term antipsychotics	Twice weekly visits

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

All data generated or analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

1. Peacock, A.; Leung, J.; Larney, S.; et al. Global statistics on alcohol, tobacco and illicit drug use: 2017 status report. *Addiction* **2018**, *113*, 1905–1926.
2. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. *World Drug Report 2022*; Sales No. E.22.XI.8; United Nations publication: New York, NY, USA, 2022.
3. Freeman, T.P.; Groshkova, T.; Cunningham, A.; et al. Increasing potency and price of cannabis in Europe, 2006–2016. *Addiction* **2019**, *114*, 1015–1023.
4. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th ed.; American Psychiatric Association: Washington, DC, USA, 2022.
5. Hjorthøj, C.; Posselt, C.M.; Nordentoft, M. Development over time of the population-attributable risk fraction for cannabis use disorder in schizophrenia in Denmark. *JAMA Psychiatry* **2021**, *78*, 1013–1019.
6. Arendt, M.; Rosenberg, R.; Foldager, L.; et al. Cannabis-induced psychosis and subsequent schizophrenia-spectrum disorders: Follow-up study of 535 incident cases. *Br. J. Psychiatry* **2005**, *187*, 510–515.
7. Di Forti, M.; Quattrone, D.; Freeman, T.P.; et al. The contribution of cannabis use to variation in the incidence of psychotic disorder across Europe (EU-GEI): A multicentre case-control study. *Lancet Psychiatry* **2019**, *6*, 427–436.
8. Schoeler, T.; Ferris, J.; Winstock, A.R. Rates and correlates of cannabis-associated psychotic symptoms in over 230,000 people who use cannabis. *Transl. Psychiatry* **2022**, *12*, 369.
9. Chesney, E.; McGuire, P.; Freeman, T.P.; et al. Assessing cannabis use in people with psychosis. *Cannabis Cannabinoid Res.* **2024**, *9*, 49–58.
10. Kucerova, J.; Tabiova, K.; Drago, F.; et al. Therapeutic potential of cannabinoids in schizophrenia. *Recent Pat. CNS Drug Discov.* **2014**, *9*, 13–25.
11. Marco, E.M.; García-Gutiérrez, M.S.; Bermúdez-Silva, F.J.; et al. Endocannabinoid system and psychiatry: In search of a neurobiological basis for detrimental and potential therapeutic effects. *Front. Behav. Neurosci.* **2011**, *5*, 63.
12. Pertwee, R.G. The diverse CB1 and CB2 receptor pharmacology of three plant cannabinoids: Δ9-tetrahydrocannabinol, cannabidiol and Δ9-tetrahydrocannabivarin. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* **2008**, *153*, 199–215.
13. Skosnik, P.D.; Krishnan, G.P.; O'Donnell, B.F. The effect of cannabis use on neurocognition in people with schizophrenia: A systematic review. *Schizophr. Res.* **2016**, *185*, 142–147.
14. Soares, V.P.; Campos, A.C. Evidences for the anti-panic actions of cannabidiol. *Curr. Neuropharmacol.* **2017**, *15*, 291–299.
15. Lubman, D.I.; Cheetham, A.; Yücel, M. Cannabis and adolescent brain development. *Pharmacol. Ther.* **2015**, *148*, 1–16.
16. Raver, S.M.; Haughwout, S.P.; Keller, A. Adolescent cannabinoid exposure permanently suppresses cortical oscillations in adult mice. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2013**, *38*, 2338–2347.
17. Hajos, N.; Katona, I.; Naiem, S.S.; et al. Cannabinoids inhibit hippocampal GABAergic transmission and network oscillations. *Eur. J. Neurosci.* **2008**, *12*, 3239–3249.
18. Skosnik, P.D.; Krishnan, G.P.; O'Donnell, B.F. The effect of cannabis use and schizotypy on electroencephalogram resting state networks. *PsychiatryRes. Neuroimaging* **2012**, *202*, 111–116.
19. Caspi, A.; Moffitt, T.E.; Cannon, M.; et al. Moderation of the effect of adolescent-onset cannabis use on adult psychosis by a functional polymorphism in the catechol-O-methyltransferase gene: Longitudinal evidence of a gene X environment interaction. *Biol. Psychiatry* **2005**, *57*, 1117–1127.
20. Grewal, R.S.; George, T.P. Cannabis-induced psychosis: A review. *Psychiatr. Times* **2020**, *37*, 13–15.
21. Rentero, D.; Arias, F.; Sánchez-Romero, S.; et al. Cannabis-induced psychotic disorder and schizophrenia with cannabis use: Clinical differences and treatment outcomes. *Eur. Psychiatry* **2021**, *64*, S488–S489.
22. Ricci, V.; Ceci, F.; Di Carlo, F.; et al. First episode psychosis with and without the use of cannabis and synthetic cannabinoids: Psychopathology, global functioning and suicidal ideation and antipsychotic effectiveness. *Psychiatry Res.* **2023**, *320*, 115053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2023.115053.
23. Martinotti, G.; Chiappini, S.; Mosca, A.; et al. Atypical Antipsychotic Drugs in Dual Disorders: Current Evidence for Clinical Practice. *Curr. Pharm. Des.* **2022**, *28*, 2241–2259. https://doi.org/10.2174/1381612828666220623092853.
24. Ricci, V.; Ciavarella, M.C.; Marrangone, C.; et al. Modern perspectives on psychoses: Dissociation, automatism, and temporality across exogenous and endogenous dimensions. *Front. Psychiatry* **2025**, *16*, 1543673. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2025.1543673.
25. Martinotti, G.; Di Forti, M. Cannabis use and psychosis: Evidence and new clinical features of a new epidemic. *Eur. Neuropsychopharmacol.* **2025**, *91*, 45–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2024.11.007.

26. Caton, C.L.; Hasin, D.S.; Shrout, P.E.; et al. Risk factors for homelessness among indigent urban adults with no history of psychotic illness: A case-control study. *Am. J. Public Health* **2005**, *95*, 1020–1025.
27. Rubio, G.; Martínez-Gras, I.; Manzanares, J. Modulation of impulsivity by topiramate: Implications for the treatment of alcohol dependence. *J. Clin. Psychopharmacol.* **2012**, *32*, 584–585.
28. Rabin, R.A.; Zakzanis, K.K.; George, T.P. The effects of cannabis use on neurocognition in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. *Schizophr. Res.* **2017**, *185*, 142–147.
29. Baldacchino, A.; Hughes, Z.; Kehoe, M.; et al. Cannabis psychosis and paranoia. In *Handbook of Cannabis and Related Pathologies*; Academic Press: Cambridge, MA, USA 2012; pp. 295–308.
30. Gorelick, D.A. Pharmacological treatment of cannabis-related disorders: A narrative review. *CNS Drugs* **2016**, *30*, 777–791.
31. Martinotti, G.; De Risio, L.; Vannini, C.; et al. Substance-related exogenous psychosis: A postmodern syndrome. *CNS Spectr.* **2021**, *26*, 84–91. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1092852920001479.
32. Pisanu, A.; Acquas, E.; Fenu, S.; et al. Real world clinical outcomes of treatment of cannabis-induced psychosis and prevalence of cannabis-related primary psychosis: A retrospective study. *BMC Psychiatry* **2024**, *24*, 494.
33. Ricci, V.; De Berardis, D.; Maina, G. Third-Generation Antipsychotics and Lurasidone in the Treatment of Substance-Induced Psychoses: A Narrative Review. *Healthcare* **2024**, *12*, 339. https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare12030339.
34. Aggarwal, M.; Chand, P.; Srivastava, S.; et al. Cannabis induced psychosis and subsequent psychiatric disorders. *Asian J. Psychiatry* **2017**, *30*, 180–184.
35. Nielsen, S.; Gowing, L.; Sabioni, P.; et al. Pharmacotherapies for cannabis dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* **2019**, *1*, CD008940.
36. Mason, B.J.; Crean, R.; Goodell, V.; et al. A proof-of-concept randomized controlled study of gabapentin: Effects on cannabis use, withdrawal and executive function deficits in cannabis-dependent adults. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **2012**, *37*, 1689–1698.
37. Gray, K.M.; Sonne, S.C.; McClure, E.A.; et al. A randomized placebo-controlled trial of N-acetylcysteine for cannabis use disorder in adults. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* **2017**, *177*, 249–257.
38. Batalla, A.; Janssen, H.; Gangadin, S.S.; et al. The potential of cannabidiol as a treatment for psychosis and addiction: Who benefits most? A systematic review. *J. Clin. Med.* **2019**, *8*, 1058.
39. Leweke, F.M.; Piomelli, D.; Pahlisch, F.; et al. Cannabidiol enhances anandamide signaling and alleviates psychotic symptoms of schizophrenia. *Transl. Psychiatry* **2012**, *2*, e94.
40. Wall, M.B.; Pope, R.; Freeman, T.P.; et al. Dissociable effects of cannabis with and without cannabidiol on the human brain's resting-state functional connectivity. *J. Psychopharmacol.* **2019**, *33*, 822–830.
41. Niemi-Pynttäri, J.A.; Sund, R.; Putkonen, H.; et al. Substance-induced psychoses converting into schizophrenia: A register-based study of 18,478 Finnish inpatient cases. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* **2013**, *74*, e94–e99.
42. Starzer MS, K.; Nordentoft, M.; Hjorthøj, C. Rates and predictors of conversion to schizophrenia or bipolar disorder following substance-induced psychosis. *Am. J. Psychiatry* **2018**, *175*, 343–350.
43. Crocker, C.E.; Emsley, J.; Tibbo, P.G. Mental health adverse events with cannabis use diagnosed in the Emergency Department: What are we finding now and are our findings accurate? *Front. Psychiatry* **2023**, *14*, 1093081.