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RESEARCH QUESTION

What is the clinical effectiveness of botulinum toxin A for reduction in pain and improvement of functioning in patients with migraine headache?

KEY MESSAGE

Evidence is inconclusive regarding the clinical effectiveness of botulinum toxin A for reduction in pain and improvement of functioning in patients with migraine headache.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2012, Issue 1), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and abbreviated list of major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between Sept 1, 2008 and Jan 25, 2012. Internet links were provided, where available.

RESULTS

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials and non-randomized studies.

One meta-analysis, eight randomized controlled trials, and one non-randomized study were identified pertaining to the clinical effectiveness of botulinum toxin A for reduction in pain and improvement of functioning in patients with migraine headache. No relevant health technology assessment reports were identified. Two pooled analyses were identified that reported on the PREEMPT studies and are included in the appendix.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Pooled Analyses Based on the PREEMPT Trials
