Migraine Treatment in Europe: A Comprehensive Analysis of Current Therapeutic Options, Healthcare Access Disparities, and Emerging Evidence for Optimal Patient Care

JEFFREY SILVER[1]

[1] Warrington, United Kingdom

Received: 16th July 2025; 25th July 2025

Abstract

Background: Migraine represents a significant neurological disorder affecting approximately 11.5% of the European population, with substantial personal, economic, and healthcare system impacts. Recent advances in migraine pathophysiology understanding, particularly the role of calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP), have revolutionized treatment approaches.

Objective: To provide a comprehensive analysis of current migraine treatment options available to patients across European healthcare systems, evaluate emerging therapeutic evidence, and identify healthcare access disparities and optimization opportunities.

Methods: This comprehensive review synthesized evidence from recent systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and clinical guidelines published between 2020-2025, including the 2024 International Headache Society recommendations, 2025 European epidemiological data, and national healthcare policy documents. Data sources included PubMed, Cochrane Library, European Medicines Agency reports, and national health authority guidelines.

Results: Current evidence demonstrates significant advances in migraine management, with CGRP-targeted therapies now recommended as first-line preventive treatments for episodic migraine with moderate disability. European prevalence varies from 9.7% (Germany) to 14.0% (Spain), with 56.1% of patients experiencing disability. Treatment satisfaction remains suboptimal, with less than 50% of patients reporting high satisfaction with current therapies. Healthcare access disparities exist across European countries, particularly for novel CGRP inhibitors, with reimbursement criteria varying significantly between nations.

Conclusions: While therapeutic options for migraine have expanded substantially, significant opportunities exist to optimize patient care through improved access to evidence-based treatments, standardized reimbursement criteria, and enhanced healthcare provider education. The shift toward CGRP-targeted therapies as first-line treatments represents a paradigm change requiring healthcare system adaptation across Europe.

KEYWORDS: MIGRAINE, CGRP INHIBITORS, EUROPEAN HEALTHCARE, TREATMENT ACCESS, SYSTEMATIC REVIEW, HEALTHCARE DISPARITIES, NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS, PREVENTIVE THERAPY, TRIPTANS, HEALTHCARE POLICY

Corresponding author: Jeffrey Silver - j.silver1471@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

Migraine stands as one of the most prevalent and disabling neurological conditions worldwide, representing a significant public health challenge that extends far beyond individual suffering to encompass substantial societal and economic burdens[1]. The Global Burden of Disease Study 2015 identified migraine as the third leading cause of disability in individuals under 50 years of age, highlighting its profound impact during the most productive years of life[2]. In Europe, this neurological disorder affects an estimated 30.5 million adults, representing approximately 11.5% of the population across five major European Union countries, with notable variations in prevalence ranging from 9.7% in Germany to 14.0% in Spain[3].

The pathophysiological understanding of migraine has undergone revolutionary changes over the past decade, fundamentally altering therapeutic approaches and treatment paradigms. The discovery of calcitonin gene-related peptide (CGRP) as a key mediator in migraine pathogenesis has ushered in a new era of targeted therapies, moving beyond traditional approaches that relied primarily on repurposed medications originally developed for other conditions[4]. This advancement represents the first class of medications specifically designed for migraine prevention, marking a paradigm shift in neurological therapeutics.

European healthcare systems face unique challenges in migraine management, characterized by diverse reimbursement policies, varying access to specialized care, and disparate treatment guidelines across member states. While the European Medicines Agency has approved multiple CGRP-targeted therapies, implementation and access remain inconsistent, creating a complex landscape where patient outcomes may depend significantly on geographic location and healthcare system characteristics[5]. The economic burden of migraine in Europe exceeds €111 billion annually, encompassing direct healthcare costs, productivity losses, and broader societal impacts[6].

Recent epidemiological data from the 2025 National Health and Wellness Survey across five European countries reveals concerning patterns of undertreatment and suboptimal patient satisfaction. Despite 79.7% of diagnosed patients receiving some form of treatment, satisfaction rates remain below 50% for most therapeutic categories, with only 25.6% of patients using monoclonal antibodies and 19.3% using onabotulinumtoxinA reporting high satisfaction levels[3]. These findings underscore the critical need for improved treatment strategies and enhanced access to evidence-based therapies.

The landscape of migraine treatment has been further complicated by recent safety updates, particularly regarding topiramate, which has been reclassified due to neurodevelopmental risks, necessitating extreme caution in women of childbearing age[7]. Simultaneously, the withdrawal of flunarizine from the French market in October 2023 has reduced available preventive options, emphasizing the importance of expanding access to newer, safer alternative[7].

Contemporary treatment approaches must address not only the clinical efficacy of available therapies but also the complex interplay of healthcare access, economic considerations, and patient-centered care. The 2024 American Headache Society consensus statement's recommendation of CGRP monoclonal antibodies as first-line preventive treatments for episodic migraine represents a significant shift in clinical practice, supported by robust evidence demonstrating superior tolerability compared to traditional preventive medications[8].

This comprehensive analysis aims to evaluate the current state of migraine treatment across European healthcare systems, examining therapeutic efficacy, access disparities, and emerging evidence to provide actionable insights for optimizing patient care. By synthesizing recent clinical evidence with real-world healthcare data, this review seeks to inform clinical practice, healthcare policy, and future research directions in the evolving landscape of migraine management.

The urgency of addressing migraine as a serious neurological condition has been recognized at the highest policy levels, with the European Migraine and Headache Alliance advocating for inclusion of migraine in the 2025 EU Neurological Health Strategy[6]. This policy momentum,

combined with advancing therapeutic options and growing clinical evidence, creates an unprecedented opportunity to transform migraine care across Europe and improve outcomes for millions of affected individuals.

2. Methods

2.1 Study Design and Approach

This comprehensive review employed a systematic approach to synthesize current evidence on migraine treatment options, healthcare access patterns, and clinical outcomes across European healthcare systems. The analysis integrated multiple data sources and methodological approaches to provide a holistic assessment of the contemporary migraine treatment landscape.

2.2 Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive literature search was conducted across multiple databases including PubMed/MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, and Web of Science for publications from January 2020 to July 2025. The search strategy employed both Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms and free-text keywords, including: "migraine," "headache," "CGRP," "calcitonin gene-related peptide," "monoclonal antibodies," "gepants," "triptans," "Europe," "healthcare access," "treatment outcomes," and "systematic review."

Specific search filters were applied to identify high-quality evidence, including: "Systematic Review," "Meta-Analysis," "Clinical Trial," "Practice Guideline," and "Consensus Development Conference." The search was limited to English-language publications and human studies. Additional sources included gray literature from European health authorities, professional society guidelines, and regulatory agency reports.

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion Criteria:

- Systematic reviews and meta-analyses of migraine treatments published 2020-2025
- Clinical practice guidelines from international and national headache societies
- Epidemiological studies reporting European migraine prevalence and burden data
- Health technology assessments and reimbursement decisions from European agencies
- Real-world evidence studies on treatment effectiveness and patient outcomes
- Healthcare policy documents and access analyses

Exclusion Criteria:

- Single-center studies with limited generalizability
- Case reports and case series
- Studies focusing exclusively on pediatric populations
- Non-European studies without relevant comparative data
- Publications without peer review or official endorsement

2.4 Data Sources and Evidence Synthesis

Primary data sources included:

1. **Clinical Guidelines:** International Headache Society Global Practice Recommendations (2024), NICE Headache Guidelines CG150 (updated June 2025), French Headache Society Position Paper (2024), and European Headache Federation recommendations.

2. **Epidemiological Data**: The 2025 National Health and Wellness Survey across five European countries (France, Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, Spain) representing 30.5 million adults with diagnosed migraine.

3. **Systematic Reviews:** Recent meta-analyses of CGRP-targeted therapies, comparative effectiveness studies of acute treatments, and safety analyses of preventive medications.

4. **Regulatory Documents:** European Medicines Agency approval decisions, national reimbursement criteria, and health technology assessments from major European countries.

5. **Policy Documents:** European Migraine Action Plan (2024), EU Neurological Health Strategy proposals, and national healthcare access reports.

2.5 Quality Assessment

The quality of included systematic reviews and meta-analyses was assessed using the AMSTAR 2 (A MeaSurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews) criteria. Clinical practice guidelines were evaluated using the AGREE II (Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation) instrument. Epidemiological studies were assessed for methodological rigor, sample representativeness, and data quality.

2.6 Data Extraction and Analysis

Data extraction was performed systematically, capturing study characteristics, population demographics, intervention details, outcome measures, and key findings. For treatment efficacy data, primary outcomes included reduction in monthly migraine days, response rates (≥50% reduction in migraine frequency), and patient-reported outcome measures. Safety data encompassed adverse event rates, discontinuation rates, and long-term safety profiles.

Healthcare access data included reimbursement criteria, waiting times for specialist care, geographic availability of treatments, and cost-effectiveness analyses. Economic burden data encompassed direct healthcare costs, indirect costs from productivity losses, and total societal costs.

2.7 Synthesis Methodology

Evidence synthesis employed a narrative approach given the heterogeneity of study designs, populations, and outcome measures. Where appropriate, quantitative data were presented in tabular format to facilitate comparison across studies and countries. Treatment recommendations were graded according to the strength of supporting evidence and consistency across multiple sources.

The analysis framework incorporated multiple perspectives:

- Clinical Perspective: Efficacy, safety, and tolerability of available treatments
- Patient Perspective: Treatment satisfaction, quality of life impacts, and access barriers
- Healthcare System Perspective: Cost-effectiveness, resource utilization, and policy implications
- Societal Perspective: Economic burden, productivity impacts, and public health considerations

2.8 Limitations

Several limitations were acknowledged in this analysis. First, the heterogeneity of healthcare systems across Europe limits the generalizability of findings from individual countries. Second, real-world evidence may be subject to selection bias and confounding factors not present in controlled clinical trials. Third, the rapidly evolving treatment landscape means that some recent developments may not yet be reflected in published literature. Finally, access to proprietary healthcare utilization data was limited, potentially affecting the comprehensiveness of healthcare access analyses.

3. Results

3.1 European Migraine Epidemiology and Burden

The most recent comprehensive epidemiological analysis across five major European countries reveals significant variations in migraine prevalence and impact[3]. Among 62,319 survey respondents representing 265 million adults, 7,311 individuals with physician-diagnosed migraine were identified, corresponding to an estimated 30.5 million affected adults across France, Germany, United Kingdom, Italy, and Spain.

Prevalence by Country:

- Spain: 14.0% (highest prevalence)
- Italy: 12.7%
- France: 11.9%
- United Kingdom: 10.4%
- Germany: 9.7% (lowest prevalence)

The demographic distribution demonstrates the characteristic female predominance, with women experiencing nearly twice the prevalence of men (14.9% vs 8.0%). Peak prevalence occurs in the 30-39 age group (15.0%), followed by the 18-29 and 40-49 age groups (both 14.5%). Notably, prevalence decreases substantially in adults aged 70 and older (4.7%), consistent with the natural history of migraine across the lifespan.

Disability and Impact Assessment: The Migraine Disability Assessment (MIDAS) scores reveal substantial functional impairment across the European population. Among diagnosed patients, 56.1% reported mild, moderate, or severe disability, with the distribution as follows:

- Severe disability (MIDAS ≥21): 23.8%
- Moderate disability (MIDAS 11-20): 16.6%
- Mild disability (MIDAS 6-10): 15.8%
- Minimal disability (MIDAS 0-5): 43.9%

Germany reported the highest percentage of patients with disability (66.0%), while other countries showed more consistent patterns ranging from approximately 50-60%. This finding suggests potential differences in disease severity, healthcare access, or reporting patterns across European healthcare systems.

Migraine Frequency Patterns: Analysis of monthly migraine days (MMDs) reveals that 25.5% of patients experience more than four migraine days per month, meeting criteria for frequent episodic migraine. The distribution of migraine frequency shows:

- <4 MMDs: 74.5%
- 4-9 MMDs: 17.4%
- 10-14 MMDs: 3.9%
- ≥15 MMDs (chronic migraine): 4.1%

When examining monthly headache days among patients with at least one migraine day, 56.2% reported more than four headache days per month, indicating substantial headache burden beyond diagnosed migraine episodes.

Menstrually-Related Migraine: Among pre-menopausal women with diagnosed migraine, 47.8% reported experiencing menstrually-related migraines, with significant country-specific variations:

- Italy: 67.4% (highest)
- Spain: 58.0%
- France: 34.5% (lowest)

These variations may reflect differences in recognition, reporting, or hormonal factors across populations.

3.2 Current Treatment Patterns and Satisfaction

Treatment Utilization: Current treatment patterns across Europe demonstrate widespread but suboptimal medication use. Among the 30.5 million adults with diagnosed migraine, treatment distribution shows:

- Over-the-counter medications only: 28.5%
- Prescription medications only: 27.0%
- Both prescription and OTC medications: 24.2%
- No current treatment: 20.4%

The finding that approximately one in five patients receives no treatment represents a significant care gap, particularly concerning given the substantial disability burden documented in this population.

Prescription Medication Classes: Among patients using prescription medications (51.2% of diagnosed patients), the most commonly reported classes include:

- Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs): 50.2%
- Analgesics: 32.9%
- Triptans: 28.9%
- Anticonvulsants: Data not specified
- Beta-blockers: Data not specified
- OnabotulinumtoxinA: Limited use
- Monoclonal antibodies (CGRP-targeted): Limited use

Treatment Satisfaction: Treatment satisfaction represents a critical quality indicator, with concerning findings across all medication categories. Overall satisfaction rates (extremely or very satisfied) remain below 50% for all treatment groups:

Prescription Medications:
- Triptans: 46.0% (highest satisfaction)
- Beta-blockers: 39.9%
- Monoclonal antibodies: 25.6%
- OnabotulinumtoxinA: 19.3% (lowest satisfaction)

Over-the-Counter Medications:
- Triptans (OTC formulations): 49.8%
- NSAIDs: 40.9%
- Analgesics: 34.1%

These low satisfaction rates highlight significant unmet medical needs and suggest opportunities for treatment optimization.

3.3 CGRP-Targeted Therapies: Evidence and Access

Clinical Efficacy Evidence: The most comprehensive recent evidence synthesis demonstrates robust efficacy for CGRP-targeted monoclonal antibodies across multiple outcome measures[8]. A 2024 systematic review and meta-analysis of eptinezumab, fremanezumab, galcanezumab, and erenumab showed statistically significant reductions in medication overuse headache when compared to placebo, particularly for triptans and multiple drug combinations.

A large-scale prospective study involving 5,818 patients revealed that over 50% achieved a ≥50% reduction in monthly headache days with CGRP monoclonal antibody treatment[8]. Predictors of superior treatment response included:

- Unilateral pain pattern
- Lower baseline monthly migraine days
- Lower baseline disability scores

These findings support earlier intervention strategies, suggesting that treatment initiation before migraines become highly disabling and frequent may optimize outcomes.

Comparative Effectiveness: The Roblee et al. meta-analysis comparing CGRP monoclonal antibodies with traditional preventive medications (topiramate and divalproex) demonstrated high certainty evidence for superior tolerability of CGRP-targeted therapies while maintaining comparable efficacy[8]. This evidence supports the 2024 American Headache Society consensus statement recommending CGRP monoclonal antibodies as first-line preventive treatments for episodic migraine with moderate disability.

European Regulatory Status: The European Medicines Agency has approved three CGRP monoclonal antibodies for migraine prevention:

- Erenumab (Aimovig): Monthly subcutaneous injection, 70-140 mg
- Fremanezumab (Ajovy): Monthly (225 mg) or quarterly (675 mg) subcutaneous injection
- Galcanezumab (Emgality): Monthly subcutaneous injection, 120 mg (after 240 mg loading dose)

Eptinezumab, administered as quarterly intravenous infusions, has received approval in some European countries and is available in French hospitals and clinics, generally provided free of charge[7].

Reimbursement and Access Disparities: Significant disparities exist in access to CGRP-targeted therapies across European healthcare systems:

France: The Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS) supports reimbursement for patients with:

- At least 8 migraine days per month
- Failure of at least two previous preventive treatments
- Severe migraine classification

United Kingdom: The National Health Service provides funding for qualifying patients through specialized headache centers, though waiting times may extend several months.

Germany: Robust insurance coverage through statutory health insurance, with relatively broad access criteria.

Other European Countries: Variable coverage ranging from comprehensive reimbursement to limited access through private insurance or out-of-pocket payment.

3.4 Acute Treatment Evidence

Network Meta-Analysis Findings: The most recent comprehensive network meta-analysis of acute migraine treatments, published in BMJ 2024, evaluated comparative effectiveness across multiple drug classes[9]. Key findings include:

Superior Efficacy Profile:

- Eletriptan
- Rizatriptan
- Sumatriptan
- Zolmitriptan

These established triptans demonstrated superior efficacy compared to recently marketed drugs, including newer gepants and ditans, challenging assumptions about the superiority of newer therapeutic classes for acute treatment.

Novel Acute Treatments: Recent systematic reviews have evaluated the efficacy of three novel oral drugs for acute migraine treatment:

- Lasmiditan (5-HT1F receptor agonist)
- Rimegepant (CGRP receptor antagonist)
- Ubrogepant (CGRP receptor antagonist)

While these agents offer important alternatives for patients with cardiovascular contraindications to triptans, their overall efficacy profiles do not exceed those of established triptans in head-to-head comparisons[10].

3.5 Healthcare Provider Patterns

Diagnostic Patterns: Across the five European countries studied, primary care physicians serve as the predominant diagnostic providers for migraine:

- Primary care physicians: 66.5%
- Neurologists: 26.3%
- Nurse practitioners: 2.5%

Specialist Access Variations: Significant variations exist in neurologist involvement in migraine diagnosis:

- Italy: 36.4% (highest neurologist involvement)
- Germany: 35.3%
- Spain: 32.5%
- France and UK: Lower percentages (specific data not provided)

These patterns reflect differences in healthcare system organization, referral pathways, and specialist availability across European countries.

3.6 Economic Burden and Healthcare Utilization

European Economic Impact: The total economic burden of migraine across Europe exceeds €111 billion annually, encompassing both direct healthcare costs and indirect costs from productivity losses[6]. This substantial economic impact affects approximately 41 million individuals (14.7% of adults) across the European Union.

Cost Distribution:

- Direct healthcare costs: 60% of total burden
- Indirect costs (productivity losses): 40% of total burden

Medication Overuse Patterns: Acute medication overuse was reported in 13.8% of diagnosed migraine patients, representing a significant clinical concern that contributes to treatment resistance and increased healthcare utilization[3].

4. Discussion

4.1 Key Findings and Clinical Implications

This comprehensive analysis reveals a complex landscape of migraine management across Europe, characterized by significant therapeutic advances alongside persistent challenges in healthcare access and patient satisfaction. The findings demonstrate both the promise of emerging treatments and the urgent need for healthcare system optimization to realize their full potential.

Epidemiological Insights and Healthcare Planning: The documented prevalence variations across European countries, ranging from 9.7% in Germany to 14.0% in Spain, have important implications for healthcare resource allocation and policy development. These differences may reflect genuine population variations, diagnostic practices, or healthcare system characteristics that influence case identification and reporting. The consistent female predominance (14.9% vs 8.0% in males) and peak prevalence in the 30-39 age group underscore the need for targeted healthcare strategies addressing working-age adults, particularly women during their most productive years.

The finding that 56.1% of diagnosed patients experience measurable disability (MIDAS ≥6) contradicts persistent misconceptions about migraine as a minor health concern. With 23.8% experiencing severe disability (MIDAS ≥21), migraine represents a major cause of functional impairment comparable to other serious chronic conditions. This disability burden, combined with the €111 billion annual economic impact across Europe, positions migraine as a critical public health priority requiring comprehensive policy responses.

Treatment Paradigm Shifts and Evidence Integration: The 2024 American Headache Society consensus statement recommending CGRP monoclonal antibodies as first-line preventive treatments represents a fundamental paradigm shift in migraine management[8]. This recommendation, supported by robust evidence demonstrating superior tolerability compared to traditional preventives while maintaining comparable efficacy, challenges established stepped-care approaches that require multiple treatment failures before accessing targeted therapies.

The evidence supporting earlier access to CGRP-targeted treatments is particularly compelling. The large-scale prospective study demonstrating that patients with unilateral pain, fewer baseline migraine days, and lower disability scores achieve superior treatment responses suggests that delayed treatment initiation may compromise outcomes[8]. This finding has profound implications for current reimbursement policies that often require extensive prior treatment failures, potentially allowing disease progression that reduces treatment responsiveness.

Healthcare Access Disparities and Policy Implications: The documented disparities in CGRP inhibitor access across European healthcare systems represent a significant equity concern. While the European Medicines Agency has approved these treatments, implementation varies dramatically, from comprehensive coverage in Germany to restrictive criteria requiring at least eight migraine days per month and two treatment failures in France[7]. These variations create a "postcode lottery" where patient outcomes depend significantly on geographic location rather than clinical need.

The finding that only 25.6% of patients using monoclonal antibodies report high satisfaction, compared to 46.0% for triptans, requires careful interpretation. This counterintuitive finding may reflect several factors: higher expectations for newer, more expensive treatments; inclusion of treatment-resistant patients who have failed multiple prior therapies; or insufficient treatment duration to achieve optimal outcomes. Alternatively, it may indicate that current patient selection criteria or treatment protocols require optimization.

Treatment Satisfaction and Unmet Medical Needs: The universally low treatment satisfaction rates across all medication categories represent a critical quality indicator demanding immediate attention. With no treatment category achieving 50% high satisfaction rates, the current therapeutic landscape fails to meet patient expectations and needs. This finding is particularly concerning given the substantial disability burden and economic impact documented in this population.

The 20.4% of diagnosed patients receiving no treatment represents a significant care gap that may reflect multiple factors: patient choice, contraindications to available treatments, healthcare access barriers, or provider knowledge gaps. Understanding and addressing these factors is essential for improving population-level outcomes.

Acute Treatment Evidence and Clinical Practice: The network meta-analysis findings demonstrating superior

efficacy of established triptans (eletriptan, rizatriptan, sumatriptan, zolmitriptan) compared to newer agents challenge assumptions about therapeutic advancement[9]. While newer agents like gepants and ditans offer important alternatives for patients with cardiovascular contraindications, their overall efficacy profiles do not exceed established treatments. This evidence supports continued use of triptans as first-line acute treatments while reserving newer agents for specific clinical scenarios.

The integration of combination therapy recommendations in the updated NICE guidelines, specifically triptan plus NSAID or triptan plus paracetamol, reflects growing evidence for synergistic effects in acute treatment[11]. This approach may optimize outcomes while potentially reducing individual medication doses and associated side effects.

4.2 Healthcare System Optimization Opportunities

Integrated Care Models: The predominance of primary care physicians in migraine diagnosis (66.5%) highlights both an opportunity and a challenge. While primary care accessibility is advantageous for patient access, the complexity of modern migraine management may exceed traditional primary care capabilities. Integrated care models that combine primary care accessibility with specialist expertise through telemedicine, shared care protocols, or embedded specialist support may optimize outcomes while maintaining efficiency.

The significant variations in neurologist involvement across countries (ranging from 32.5% in Spain to 36.4% in Italy) suggest opportunities for standardizing care pathways and ensuring appropriate specialist input for complex cases. Countries with lower specialist involvement may benefit from enhanced primary care education and support systems.

Reimbursement Policy Harmonization: The disparate reimbursement criteria across European countries create inefficiencies and inequities that undermine optimal patient care. Harmonizing access criteria based on clinical evidence rather than economic constraints could improve outcomes while potentially reducing long-term costs through earlier intervention and prevention of disease progression.

The French model requiring at least eight migraine days per month for CGRP inhibitor reimbursement appears overly restrictive given evidence supporting earlier intervention[7]. More nuanced criteria incorporating disability measures, quality of life impacts, and treatment response predictors may better align reimbursement with clinical evidence.

4.3 Emerging Therapeutic Landscape

CGRP Pathway Targeting: The success of CGRP monoclonal antibodies has validated the CGRP pathway as a therapeutic target and stimulated development of additional agents. The emergence of oral CGRP receptor antagonists (gepants) for both acute and preventive treatment offers additional options with different administration routes and pharmacokinetic profiles. Rimegepant, approved for both acute and preventive use, represents a particularly interesting development that may simplify treatment regimens for some patients.

The potential for combination CGRP pathway targeting, using both monoclonal antibodies and gepants, represents an emerging strategy that may enhance efficacy through complementary mechanisms[12]. However, this approach requires careful evaluation of safety, cost-effectiveness, and patient selection criteria.

Personalized Medicine Approaches: The identification of treatment response predictors for CGRP monoclonal antibodies (unilateral pain, lower baseline migraine frequency, lower disability scores) suggests opportunities for personalized treatment selection[8]. Developing validated prediction models could optimize treatment allocation, improve outcomes, and enhance cost-effectiveness by identifying patients most likely to benefit from specific therapies.

Genetic factors, biomarkers, and clinical phenotyping may further refine treatment selection as our understanding of migraine heterogeneity advances. The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches

to analyze complex clinical datasets may accelerate development of personalized treatment algorithms.

4.4 Safety Considerations and Risk Management

Topiramate Safety Updates: The recent identification of neurodevelopmental risks associated with topiramate use during pregnancy has significant implications for clinical practice[7]. The reclassification requiring extreme caution in women of childbearing age effectively removes this agent as a first-line option for a substantial portion of the migraine population. This change further supports the shift toward CGRP-targeted therapies, which have demonstrated favorable safety profiles in reproductive-age women.

The withdrawal of flunarizine from the French market in October 2023 represents another reduction in available preventive options, emphasizing the importance of expanding access to newer, safer alternatives[7]. These safety-driven changes in the therapeutic landscape underscore the value of treatments specifically developed for migraine rather than repurposed medications.

Long-term Safety Monitoring: While CGRP monoclonal antibodies have demonstrated favorable safety profiles in clinical trials and early real-world experience, long-term safety monitoring remains essential. The physiological roles of CGRP in cardiovascular function, wound healing, and other processes require continued surveillance as these treatments are used in broader populations over extended periods.

4.5 Future Research Directions

Real-World Evidence Generation: The transition from clinical trial evidence to real-world implementation requires robust post-marketing surveillance and effectiveness studies. Understanding how treatment outcomes in diverse clinical populations compare to controlled trial results will inform optimal treatment protocols and patient selection strategies.

Comparative effectiveness research examining different CGRP-targeted therapies in head-to-head studies will provide valuable guidance for treatment selection. Current evidence primarily compares individual agents to placebo, limiting ability to differentiate between options within the class.

Healthcare Delivery Optimization: Research examining optimal care delivery models for migraine management could inform healthcare system design and resource allocation. Studies comparing different approaches to specialist integration, telemedicine utilization, and care coordination may identify strategies for improving access while maintaining quality.

Economic evaluations incorporating broader societal perspectives, including productivity impacts and quality of life measures, will provide essential data for reimbursement decisions and healthcare policy development.

Biomarker Development: The identification of predictive biomarkers for treatment response could revolutionize migraine management by enabling precision medicine approaches. Research examining genetic factors, inflammatory markers, neuroimaging findings, and other potential biomarkers may identify objective measures to guide treatment selection.

4.6 Limitations and Considerations

Several limitations must be acknowledged in interpreting these findings. The heterogeneity of European healthcare systems limits generalizability of findings from individual countries. Real-world evidence may be subject to selection bias and confounding factors not present in controlled clinical trials. The rapidly evolving treatment landscape means some recent developments may not yet be reflected in published literature.

Additionally, the focus on five major European countries may not represent the full diversity of European healthcare systems, particularly in Eastern European countries with different economic and healthcare infrastructure characteristics. Cultural factors influencing pain perception, healthcare-seeking behavior, and treatment adherence may also vary across populations in ways not captured by clinical measures.

5. Conclusions

This comprehensive analysis of migraine treatment across European healthcare systems reveals a landscape of significant therapeutic advancement accompanied by persistent challenges in access, implementation, and patient satisfaction. The emergence of CGRP-targeted therapies represents a paradigm shift toward precision medicine in neurology, offering the first treatments specifically designed for migraine prevention with superior tolerability profiles compared to traditional options.

The epidemiological data demonstrating substantial disability burden in 56.1% of diagnosed patients, combined with the €111 billion annual economic impact across Europe, positions migraine as a critical public health priority requiring comprehensive policy responses. The documented prevalence variations across countries, ranging from 9.7% to 14.0%, highlight the need for tailored healthcare strategies that address regional differences while ensuring equitable access to evidence-based treatments.

The 2024 consensus recommendation for CGRP monoclonal antibodies as first-line preventive treatments represents a fundamental shift from traditional stepped-care approaches. Evidence supporting earlier intervention, particularly the finding that patients with lower baseline disability achieve superior treatment responses, challenges current reimbursement policies that require multiple treatment failures before accessing targeted therapies. This paradigm shift necessitates healthcare system adaptation to optimize patient outcomes while managing economic considerations.

The universally low treatment satisfaction rates across all medication categories, with no treatment achieving 50% high satisfaction, represent a critical quality indicator demanding immediate attention. These findings, combined with the 20.4% of diagnosed patients receiving no treatment, highlight significant unmet medical needs that require multifaceted solutions addressing clinical, economic, and healthcare delivery factors.

Healthcare access disparities across European countries create inequitable outcomes where patient care depends significantly on geographic location rather than clinical need. The variation in CGRP inhibitor reimbursement criteria, from comprehensive coverage in Germany to restrictive requirements in France, undermines the principle of equitable healthcare access within the European Union. Harmonizing access criteria based on clinical evidence rather than economic constraints could improve outcomes while potentially reducing long-term costs through earlier intervention.

The evidence supporting established triptans as superior acute treatments, despite the availability of newer agents, reinforces the importance of evidence-based treatment selection over therapeutic novelty. While newer agents offer important alternatives for specific patient populations, their overall efficacy profiles do not exceed established treatments, supporting continued use of triptans as first-line acute therapy.

Future research priorities should focus on real-world effectiveness studies, biomarker development for personalized treatment selection, and healthcare delivery optimization. The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning approaches to analyze complex clinical datasets may accelerate development of personalized treatment algorithms that optimize outcomes while improving cost-effectiveness.

The safety-driven changes in the therapeutic landscape, including topiramate restrictions and flunarizine withdrawal, emphasize the value of treatments specifically developed for migraine. These developments further support the transition toward CGRP-targeted therapies, which have demonstrated favorable safety profiles in reproductive-age women and other vulnerable populations.

In conclusion, while significant therapeutic advances have transformed the migraine treatment landscape, realizing their full potential requires coordinated efforts to address healthcare access disparities, optimize treatment protocols, and develop personalized medicine approaches. The convergence of advancing therapeutic options, growing clinical evidence, and increasing policy recognition creates an unprecedented opportunity to transform migraine care across Europe and improve outcomes for millions of affected individuals. Success will require collaboration among clinicians, researchers, policymakers, and patient advocates to ensure that scientific advances translate into meaningful improvements in patient care and quality of life.

References

1. Steiner TJ, Stovner LJ, Vos T. GBD 2015: Migraine is the third cause of disability in under 50s. J Headache Pain. 2016;17(1):104. Available from: https://thejournalofheadacheandpain.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s10194-016-0692-4

2. Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 310 diseases and injuries, 1990–2015: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. Lancet. 2016;388(10053):1545-1602.

3. Coppola G, Brown JD, Mercadante AR, Drakeley S, Sternbach N, Jenkins A, et al. The epidemiology and unmet need of migraine in five european countries: results from the national health and wellness survey. BMC Public Health. 2025;25:254. Available from: https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-024-21244-8

4. Puledda F, Sacco S, Diener HC, Ashina M, Al-Khazali HM, Ashina S, et al. International Headache Society Global Practice Recommendations for Preventive Pharmacological Treatment of Migraine. Cephalalgia. 2024;44(9). Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/03331024241269735

5. European Medicines Agency. Assessment reports for CGRP-targeted therapies. Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/

6. European Migraine & Headache Alliance. Towards a European Migraine Action Plan: Key Policy Recommendations. Brussels: EMHA; 2024. Available from: https://www.emhalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/Final-Pfizer-Migraine-Action-Plan.pdf

7. Moisset X, Demarquay G, de Gaalon S, Roos C, Donnet A, Giraud P, et al. Migraine treatment: Position paper of the French Headache Society. Rev Neurol (Paris). 2024;180(10):1087-1099. Available from: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0035378724006003

8. Nicol KS, Burkett JG. Review: An Update on CGRP Monoclonal Antibodies for the Preventive Treatment of Episodic Migraine. Curr Pain Headache Rep. 2025;29(1):55. Available from: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11861264/

9. Deng L, Qian J, Yang Y, Xu B, Zou J, Yuan H, et al. Comparative effects of drug interventions for the acute management of migraine episodes in adults: systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ. 2024;386:e080107. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/386/bmj-2024-080107

10. Gendolla A, Diener HC, Sacco S, Ashina M, Braschinsky M, Lainez MJA, et al. Efficacy of lasmiditan, rimegepant and ubrogepant for acute treatment of migraine in patients with cardiovascular risk factors, cardiovascular disease, or previous triptan non-response: a systematic review. J Headache Pain. 2024;25(1):194. Available from: https://thejournalofheadacheandpain.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s10194-024-01904-1

11. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Headaches in over 12s: diagnosis and management. NICE guideline [CG150]. London: NICE; 2012 [updated 2025 Jun 3]. Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg150

12. Sacco S, Braschinsky M, Ducros A, Lampl C, Little P, van den Brink AM, et al. Combining treatments for migraine prophylaxis: the state-of-the-art. J Headache Pain. 2024;25(1):206. Available from: https://thejournalofheadacheandpain.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s10194-024-01925-w

