## Migraine

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Ref ID: Brighina et al. 2007 <sup>108</sup> Study	Patient group: Headache patients aged 18-65 Inclusion criteria: Patients referred to the headache	<b>Group 1 – ID migraine</b> Italian version of the ID Migraine (translated by Pfizer who own original copyright). Response to each item treated	Sensitivity (95%Cl)	Migraine (2 items positive): 0.95 (0.91- 0.98) Other primary headache: 0.20 (0.09- 0.32) Secondary headache: 0.48 (0.29-0.67)	Funding: Pfizer (copyright holders of ID Migraine) Limitations:
design: Validation study (cross- sectional)	centres and reporting at least 2 headache attacks in the last 3 months. Must have experienced at least one headache that interfered with their life.	Response to each item treated as a binary variable: 'no' assigned to responses of 'never' or 'rarely' and 'yes' assigned to 'less than half the time' or 'half the time or more'.Sp (9Group 2 – ICHD II Complete clinical evaluation according to the ICHD II criteria. Patients were evaluated by a board-qualified headache specialist (always the same in each centre), blind to the result of the ID migraine. Full assessment included medical history, physical examination including additional diagnostic tests if clinically indicated.Sp (9	Specificity (95%Cl)	Migraine (2 items positive): 0.72 (0.62- 0.82) Other primary headache: 0.12 (0.08- 0.17) Secondary headache: 0.22 (0.16-0.28)	No serious limitations Additional outcomes: Diagnostic outcomes for nausea, photometric and
Setting: interfered 8 headache centres in Sicily (tertiary care) All patient N: 222 Age (mean F/M: 163/3 Drop outs:	Exclusion criteria: NR All patients		Positive predictive value (95%CI)	Migraine (2 items positive): 0.88 (0.82- 0.93) Other primary headache: 0.05 (-0.02- 0.09) Secondary headache: 0.08 (0.04-0.13)	disability as individual measures. Accuracy. Sub-groups of age and
	Age (mean): 38.68±12.02 F/M: 163/59 Drop outs: 0		Negative predictive value (95%Cl)	Migraine (2 items positive): 0.87 (0.78- 0.95) Other primary headache: 0.39 (0.26- 0.51) Secondary headache: 0.75 (0.64-0.87)	<b>2x2 table:</b> completed by NCGC

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Study details Ref ID: Ertas et al. 2009 <sup>263</sup> Study design: Validation study (cross- sectional) Setting: Multicentre outpatients; opthalmolog y, ENT and neurology. 11 centres in Turkey	PatientsPatient group: > 17 years old with headacheInclusion criteria: > 17 year old, presenting to neurology, ear nose and throat (ENT) or ophthalmology clinics, passing the pretest screening questions for headache: if one was affirmative the participants were enrolled for the ID migraine test and examination by a neurologist: (i) Do your headaches limit your ability to work, study or enjoy life? (ii) Do you want to talk to your healthcare professional about your headaches?	InterventionsInterventionsthGroup 1 – ID migraine Including three screening questions: during the last 3 months, (i) Did you feel nauseated or sick to your stomach with your headache? (ii) Did light bother you when you had a headache (drastically more than when you did not have headaches)? (iii) Did your headache limit your ability to work, study or do what you needed to do for at least 1 	Outcome measuresSensitivity Migraine (>2 items positive)Specificity Migraine (>2 items positive)Positive predictive value Migraine (>2 items positive)Negative predictive value Migraine (>2 items positive)	Effect size Neurology: 87.87 ENT: 86.62 Opthalmology: 79.87 Neurology: 73.96 ENT: 74.38 Opthalmology: 75.95 Neurology: 0.86 ENT: 0.80 Opthalmology: 0.86 Neurology: 0.76 ENT: 0.83 Opthalmology: 0.67	Comments Funding: Pfizer Limitations: Original data not reported Not clear if patients could be diagnosed with more than one headache type (assumed they could due to n values reported). Headache not always the primary complaint (no data presented separately for those in which it was). Not specifically stated that diagnosis was made blinded to other test result, but assumed. Additional outcomes: Localization of headache. Severity of headache. Breakdown of ID migraine items. Headache characteristics. Trigger factors. Percentage using medication for headaches. 2x2 table: Completed by NCGC
	<ul> <li>Exclusion criteria: &lt;18 years old, or not capable of communicating.</li> <li>All patients (with headache)</li> <li>N: 1585</li> <li>Drop outs: 564 (did not pass pretest questions)</li> <li>Neurology clinic</li> <li>N: 530 (after pretest)</li> <li>Age, mean (SD): 46.5 (17)</li> <li>F (%): 63.8</li> <li>ENT Clinic</li> </ul>				

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
	N: 263 (after pretest) Age, mean (SD): 47.3 (18) F (%): 58.1				
	Opthalmology clinic N: 228 (before pretest) Age, mean (SD): 43.3 (16) F (%): 52.9				

Abbreviations: NR=not reported, NA=not applicable, M/F=male/female, N=total number of patients randomised, SD=Standard deviation, SE=Standard error, CI=Confidence interval, IHS=International Headache Society, ICHD II=2nd edition of the International Classification of Headache Disorders, ENT=Ear Nose & Throat

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
details Ref ID: Gil- Gouveia et al. 2010 <sup>321</sup> Study design: Validation study (cross- sectional) Setting: 2	Patient group: Adults with headache         Inclusion criteria: Adults reporting at         least 2 headache attacks in the last 3         months attending headache outpatient         clinics.         Exclusion criteria: Age <18 years,	Group 1 – ID migraine Portuguese version obtained by consensus translation process. Participants asked to complete the questionnaire before the first clinical visit to the headache specialist. 1 point scored for each affirmative answer, ≥2 considered a positive diagnostic test. Group 2 – ICHD II Headache specialist blinded to ID-migraine results performed medical and neurological history and examination. ICHD- II diagnosis made and other demographic factors recorded.	Sensitivity (95%Cl) Migraine (>2 items positive) Specificity (95%Cl) Migraine (>2 items positive) Positive predictive value (95%Cl) Migraine (>2 items positive)	0.94 (0.87-0.97) 0.60 (0.46-0.73) 0.80 (0.71-0.87)	Funding: Pfizer approved use of ID migraine, not mention of funding. Limitations: Patients not fulfilling definite ICHD-II criteria excluded from analysis. Additional outcomes:
Setting: 2 headaches outpatient clinics in Portugal	syndromes with no clear diagnosis or not fulfilling definite ICHD-II diagnostic criteria and the presence of more than one headache type or current medication overuse headache (MOH). All patients N: 142 Age, mean (SD): 39.2 (13.9) F/M: 119/23 (83.8% F) Drop outs: 11 excluded due to MOH or not fulfilling ICHD criteria Included in analysis N: 131 Age mean (SD): 38.2 (13.2) F/M: 110/21 (84% F) Disease duration, mean(SD) yrs: 13.6(10.8)		Negative predictive value (95%CI) Migraine (>2 items positive)	0.85 (0.70-0.94)	<ul> <li>Additional outcomes:</li> <li>Age at symptom onset.</li> <li>Headache frequency, duration and intensity.</li> <li>Use of prophylactic treatment.</li> <li>2x2 table: Yes</li> </ul>

Study Details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
<b>Ref ID:</b> Karli et al. 2007 <sup>420</sup>	Patient group: Adults with headache	Group 1 – ID migraine Completed by all patients passing	<b>Sensitivity</b> Migraine (2 items positive)	91.82	Funding: Pfizer
Study	Inclusion criteria: Adults presenting to neurological outpatients clinics over	the pre-test questions. Migraine was diagnosed if there	<b>Specificity</b> Migraine (2 items positive)	63.40	Limitations: No serious limitations
design: Validation study (cross- sectional)	17 years of age and able to communicate. Must have had 2 or more headaches in the last 3 months and answer yes to at least one of the	<ul> <li>were at least 2 positive responses to the 3 ID migraine questions.</li> <li>Group 2 – ICHD II</li> <li>All patients who completed the ID migraine were interviewed by a neurologist or trained neurology resident using a symptom checklist based on a semi-structured diagnostic headache evaluation according to the ICHD-II criteria, and assigned a clinical diagnosis of migraine,</li> </ul>	<b>Positive predictive value</b> (ratio) Migraine (2 items positive)	0.72	Additional outcomes: Diagnostic outcomes
Setting: 41 neurology outpatient clinics in Turkey	following questions: (i) Do your headaches limit your ability to work, study or enjoy life? (ii) Do you want to talk to your healthcare professional about your headaches? <b>Exclusion criteria:</b> Not capable to communicate, younger than 17 years of age.		Negative predictive value (ratio) Migraine (2 items positive)	0.88	for all three questions of ID migraine. Subgroup analysis based on gender and years of education. Numbers diagnosed with each headache type separated by subgroup according to diagnosis and reason
	All patients N: 3683 screened, 1816 included (answering pre-screening questions positively) Age, mean (SD): 45.2 (17) F/M(%): 62.9/37.1 Headache as primary cause of admission: 35.1%				<b>2x2 table:</b> Completed by NCGC

Study Details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Study DetailsRef ID: Khu et al. 2008435Study design: 	PatientsPatient group: Patients presenting to GP clinics with headache (aged >8)Inclusion criteria: Primary complaint of headacheExclusion criteria: Non-consentingAll patients N: 584Age, mean (SD): 37 (11) Range 8- 74 (5% under 20yrs)F/M (%): 74.5/24.5Duration of headaches (%): <1 yr 20.7, 1-5yrs 28.6, >5yrs 49.1MIDAS: minimal disability 53.9%, mild 22.6%, moderate 19.7%, severe 11.6%Drop outs: 0	Interventions Group 1 – ID migraine Completed by patients after instruction by clinician or clinic assistant. Also included questions on demographics, headache duration, frequency, MIDAS, doctor-hopping behaviour, headache treatment and social burden of headaches. >2 positive answers on ID migraine confirmed diagnosis. Group 2 – ICHD II Questionnaire completed by physician according to study coordinator instruction. Included headache feature, clinical diagnosis and management details. Attention was paid to overusage of acute pain medication and perceived need for prophylactic treatment.	Outcome measuresSensitivity*Migraine (2 items positive)Specificity*Migraine (2 items positive)Positive predictive value*Migraine (2 items positive)Negative predictive value*Migraine (2 items positive)Negative predictive positive)Negative predictive positive)Negative predictive positive)	Effect size         0.50 (0.45-         0.55)         0.84 (0.78-         0.85         0.85         0.52	Comments Funding: Janssen-Cilag Limitations: Results reported as percentage diagnosed – diagnostic outcomes calculated by NCGC. Assumed questionnaires interpreted independently, but only states they were collected independently. Physician diagnosis considered as a separate item to IHS diagnosis. Not clear who assigns IHS diagnosis.  Additional outcomes: Reasons for dissatisfaction with current headache treatments. Prophylaxis and indications for taking.
					Headache profile. <b>Notes:</b> * Calculated by NCGC from % prevalence values presented
					2x2 table completed:Yes

Study Details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Ref ID: Kim & Kim 2006 <sup>436</sup> Study design: Diagnostic (cross- sectional) Setting: TMJ and orofacial pain clinic in Korea	Patient group: Adults with TMD or orofacial pain and headache Inclusion criteria: Adults attending TMJ and orofacial pain clinic who reported two or more headaches in the previous 3 months. In addition, the subjects had to either wish to consult a doctor about their headaches or report that the headaches interfered with their lives. Patients had to be able to read and write Korean. Exclusion criteria: NR All patients N: 176 Age, mean(SD): 30.7 (9.3) F/M: 143/33 Drop outs: 0	Group 1 – ID migraine Self-administered questionnaire consisting of nine questions referring to the severity and nature of their headache pain and the presence of associated migraine symptoms. Group 2 – IHS criteria A headache specialist completed the semistructured diagnostic questionnaires and examined the patients and assigned clinical diagnosis of migraine according to IHS criteria.	Sensitivity (95%Cl) Migraine (2 items positive) Specificity (95%Cl) Migraine (2 items positive) Positive predictive value (95%Cl) Migraine (2 items positive) Migraine (2 items positive)	0.58 (0.45-0.72) 0.98 (0.76-1) *†86% *91%	Funding: NR Limitations: NPV not presented. †PPV presented differed to that calculated by NCGC (paper reported 93.9%). Unclear if interpretation of results made blinded to other test results. Patients have TMD and orofacial pain as primary complaint (indirect). NPV not presented. Additional outcomes: Sensitivity and specificity of each of the 9 items on the original ID-Migraine. 2x2 table: Completed by NCGC * calculated by NCGC

Abbreviations: NR=not reported, NA=not applicable, M/F=male/female, N=total number of patients randomised, SD=Standard deviation, SE=Standard error, CI=Confidence interval, IHS =International Headache Society, TMJ=temporomandibular joint, TMD=temporomandibular disorders

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Study detailsProvide the second seco	PatientsPatient group: Adults aged 18-55with headacheInclusion criteria: Men and women aged 18-55 visiting a primary care practice office for any reason.Patients had to be able to read and write English, and not have participated in a previous Pfizer- sponsored migraine study. They must report 2 or more headaches in the previous 3 months. In addition, eligible subjects had to indicate that they had experienced a headache that had limited their ability to work, study, or enjoy life, or that they might wish to speak with a healthcare professional about their headaches.	InterventionsGroup 1 – ID migraineIn the primary care practicepatients were asked to completethe migraine screener (onquestionnaire). Consisting of 9questions developed byconsensus panel based on IHScriteria.There were additional questionson age, sex, race, previousdiagnosis and frequency ofheadache, not used for diagnosis.Questionnaire was reviewed forcompleteness by the primarycare practitioner or a member oftheir staff.Group 2 – IHSThe patient was referred to aheadache specialist for astructured diagnostic headacheevaluation within 2 weeks of thescreening. Results of thescreening questionnaire were notavailable to the headachespecialist.The appointment included amedical history, physicalexamination, comprehensive	Outcome measuresSensitivity (95%Cl)Migraine (2 items positive)Specificity (95%Cl)Migraine (2 items positive)Positive predictive value (95%Cl)Migraine (2 items positive)Negative predictive value (95%Cl)Migraine (2 items positive)Negative predictive value (95%Cl)Migraine (2 items positive)	Effect size         0.81 (0.77-0.85)         0.75 (0.64-0.84)         93.3 (89.9-98.5)         *51.08%	CommentsFunding: PfizerLimitations:Additional exclusion criteria added after 1/3 of patients had been recruited.Reasons for the 8 patients with missing data not stated.Additional outcomes:Diagnostic outcomes on each item of the questionnaire individually.MSQMIDASMigraine-related work productivity questionnaire.Henry Ford Hospital headache disability inventory.Test-retest reliability (on a subset of patients).Notes: 9 item version of screener used initially.NB. Study included for information rather than
	Exclusion criteria: Participation in previous Pfizer-				
	sponsored migraine study. After one third of the sample had been enrolled, an additional entry criterion was added that excluded patients with a previous diagnosis of migraine (to ensure that a high proportion of patients had not				
	previously been diagnosed with migraine). All patients	neurologic history and examination and a semi- structured interview that included the IHS features of migraine supplemented by			analysis. <b>2x2 table:</b> Completed by NCGC

	<ul> <li>N: 563 eligible, 550 screened, 451 completed both index test and reference standard (validation sample)</li> <li>Age mean (SD): 39.3 (10.1)</li> <li>F/M: 341/110 (75.6/24.4%)</li> <li>Drop outs: 99 completed screener but did not attend their neurology appointment (for reference standard) 17.7%</li> <li>8 Missing data from one test (1.4%)</li> </ul>	additional questions relating to family history and medical treatment history. The headache expert was encouraged to probe for clinical information necessary to clarify the differential diagnosis.			* Calculated by NCGC
--	---	--	--	--	----------------------

Abbreviations: NR=not reported, NA=not applicable, M/F=male/female, N=total number of patients randomised, SD=Standard deviation, SE=Standard error, CI=Confidence interval, IHS=International Headache Society

Study details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
details Ref ID: Mostardini et al. 2009 <sup>574</sup> Study design: Validation study (cross sectional) Setting: Headache	Patient group: Patients         discharged from ED with a         diagnosis of primary headache         Inclusion criteria: Attending         headache clinic within 48 hours of         discharge from ED with a         diagnosis of primary headache.         Exclusion criteria: Those who         did not speak Italian fluently and         subjects with an ICHD-II diagnosis	Group 1 – ID migraine Self-administered and dichotomic questionnaire based on three questions regarding the presence of nausea, photophobia and disability during headache. Defined as positive when the answer to at least two out of the three questions is yes.	Sensitivity† Migraine (2 items positive) For primary headaches Specificity† Migraine (2 items positive) For primary headaches Positive predictive value† Migraine (2 items positive) For primary headaches Negative predictive value† Migraine (2 items positive)	0.94 (0.94) 0.81 (0.83) 0.98 (0.99) 0.54 (0.31)	Funding: NR Limitations: †Discrepancies in results reported for primary headaches only – wrong total n used in paper (both values reported here). Patients with ICHD-II diagnosis of probably migraine excluded because ID-Migraine not validated for this category (but TTH etc included)
clinic, post ED discharge (Italy)	Ig:did not speak italian indentity and subjects with an ICHD-II diagnosis of probably migraine.Group 2 – ICHD II A headache expert blinded to the test made a diagnosis according to the ICHD-II criteria. The data used by the ED to make a diagnosis before discharging the patients were obtained.	For primary headaches For all of the above data is NCGC calculated value (study value)		Additional outcomes: Data analysed for those with IHS diagnosis of primary headache, and the whole population (including secondary headache). Notes: Analysis of those with primary headaches only reported here. 2x2 table: Completed by NCGC	

Study Details	Patients	Interventions	Outcome measures	Effect size	Comments
Details Ref ID: Samaan et al. 2010 <sup>682</sup> Study design: Validation study (cross sectional) Setting: Specialist headache clinic	Patient group: Patients referred to specialist headache clinic with significant headaches not managed by other health care providers.Inclusion criteria: All patients registered for the clinic eligible to participate.Exclusion criteria: NRAll patients N: 200 randomised, 170 analysed Age (mean): NRF/M: NR Drop outs: 30 Not stated if they did not attend appointment or were unable to be diagnosed.	<ul> <li>Group 1 – The structured migraine interview (SMI)</li> <li>Designed to answer the question 'did this person suffer from migraine at any time in his/her life'. 10 questions formed from ICHD criteria.</li> <li>The questionnaire was mailed to all patients at the migraine clinic.</li> <li>Responses from SMI were scored usinga computerised coding algorithm to generate migraine diagnosis.</li> <li>Group 2 – Clinician diagnosis</li> <li>A random sample of 200 subjects were selected from the respondents using a random list of ID numbers which concealed the participants' identity. These people were invited to see a migraine clinic headache specialist to provide the clinical diagnosis.</li> </ul>	Sensitivity Specificity Positive predictive value Negative predictive value	0.87 0.58 0.97 0.26	<ul> <li>Funding: NR</li> <li>Limitations:</li> <li>Very specific patient group with significant headaches that could not be managed by other healthcare providers.</li> <li>Study does not specifically state that ICHD criteria used for reference standard, but assumed it would be in this clinic.</li> <li>Missing data for 30 patients, no reason given.</li> <li>Additional outcomes:</li> <li>Correlation with seld-reported migraine, migraine treatment and analgesic use.</li> <li>Comparison of face to face interview the SMI telephone interview.</li> <li>Notes:</li> <li>Clinical diagnosis only included migraine with aura, migraine. For analysis the diagnoses were grouped as migraine (with or without aura) and non-migraine headache.</li> </ul>
					Yes (in paper, verified by NCGC)