

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_101627
Title of the Manuscript:	Zavegepant Nasal Spray for Treatment of Acute Migraine: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p>	<p>The purpose of the manuscript clearly indicates an attempt to shed light on the cumulative scientific evidence being generated in real time for use of the novel drug for management of migraine – Zavegepant. It is important from the perspective of adding mid-process overview and insight to the growing scientific data on the use of this drug.</p> <p>The title of the study is apt and summarises its intended objective. It could be useful to add words 'safety and efficacy' to the title, as the review focuses only studies based on these outcome measures only. The title page misses author details, affiliations, and corresponding author information.</p> <p>The abstract is detailed; however, exceeds the word limit of 300 (as per journal guidelines). It could be made crisper and more concise. Keywords need to be mentioned in italics arial 10 fonts as per guidelines. Remove any abbreviations from the abstract.</p> <p>The structure of manuscript needs to be drafted as per journal guidelines again – in the form of numbered sections and subsections in capital letters (1 INTRODUCTION, 2 METHODOLOGY – 2.1 CRITERIA, 2.2 SOURCES, and so on).</p> <p>The author might want to add the sections of ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION, DECLARATION OF INTEREST, ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS and FUNDING.</p> <p>The word count of the review article is around 4288 which falls short of the expected count of >5000 words for a review article as per journal guidelines. Elaborating on the clinical aspects of migraine and contemporary treatment modalities, their advantages and limitations and the need for adding novel drugs to the list, might help with balancing the word count. This may also help with optimising the number of references to suggested count of >50.</p> <p>In the INTRODUCTION section, the sequence of paragraphs in the manuscript could be organised in a way that arouses interest in the reader's mind towards the potential unique scope of Zavegepant in the management of migraine. It would be helpful to describe CGRP group of drugs first and then highlight the strengths of Zavegepant.</p> <p>In AIMS AND OBJECTIVES: please write one aim as the main one (provide comprehensive analysis of...) and describe others as objectives (studying efficacy and safety). Do not use the word 'assess' as it is not an interventional or correlational study, it is merely a review of existing literature.</p> <p>The DISCUSSION should be less of a repetition of results, and more of the implications of the same in pragmatic sense. It could touch upon what the author thinks about the unique attributes of this drug, the nasal mode of therapeutic application, the limitations and restrictions of its use and curiosity for any studies which have explored its head-to-head comparison of efficacy and safety with a specific medication for acute management of migraine (naproxen, sumatriptan, rizatriptan, etc).</p> <p>YES</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p><i>Noor N, Angelette A, Lawson A, et al. A Comprehensive Review of Zavegepant as Abortive Treatment for Migraine. Health Psychology Research. 2022;10(2). doi:10.52965/001c.35506</i></p> <p>This article explains the clinical background, need for optimization of treatment modalities, pharmacokinetics, and pharmacodynamics of Zavegapant and adequately summarizes the findings of various studies conducted on the same in the past 4 years. Though of a different objective and design, it is a good quality of systematic review which could add value to the current manuscript.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The study has followed PRISMA algorithm 2. Methodology explained in depth along with a figure 3. The recruited studies are of good design and standard (RCT and open label CT) with placebo-control, adequate sample size and bias elimination 4. Clinical measures on recruited studies cover both clinical (subjective), and laboratory (objective) monitoring parameters 5. The potential bias favoring use of Zavegapant indicated in studies with smaller sample size or weaker designs is eliminated 6. Easily replicable for mentioned future directions <p>Limitations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only 3 studies made the inclusion criteria 2. The serious adverse effects mentioned in the third study are not clear, which leaves concern for an uncertain disadvantage for the use of Zaegapant 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, well written. Needs a few improvisations.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bhakti Murkey
Department, University & Country	United Kingdom