medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Enhanced mindfulness based stress reduction (MBSR+) in episodic migraine: a randomized clinical trial with MRI outcomes

Running title: Mindfulness for migraine RCT with MRI outcomes

David A. Seminowicz[1,2], PhD, Shana AB Burrowes[1,2,3], PhD, Alexandra Kearson[4], BS, Jing Zhang[1,2], BS, Samuel R Krimmel[1,2,5], BS, Luma Samawi[1,2], BS, Andrew J Furman[1,2,5], MS, Michael L Keaser[1,2], BA, Neda F. Gould[4], PhD, Tirsh Magyari[6], MS, LCP, Linda White[4], MS, CRN, Olga Goloubeva[7], PhD, Madhav Goyal[8], MD, B. Lee Peterlin[9], DO, Jennifer A. Haythornthwaite[4], PhD

[1] Department of Neural and Pain Sciences, School of Dentistry, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, USA 21201

[2] Center to Advance Chronic Pain Research, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, USA 21201

[3] Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, USA 21201

[4] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA 21224

[5] Program in Neuroscience, School of Medicine, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, USA 21201

[6] Private Mindfulness-based Psychotherapy Practice, 3511 N Calvert St, Baltimore, MD 21218

[7] University of Maryland Greenebaum Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Maryland Baltimore, Baltimore, MD, USA 21201

[8] Department of Medicine, Division of General Internal Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD USA 21287

[9] Neuroscience Institute, Penn Medicine Lancaster General Health, Lancaster, PA, USA 17601

Correspondence:
David A. Seminowicz, PhD
Department of Neural & Pain Sciences
University of Maryland School of Dentistry
650 W. Baltimore Street, 8 South
Baltimore, MD 21201
dseminowicz@umaryland.edu
twitter: @daspainbrain

Word count: Abstract 270, Introduction to Discussion 3104

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Mindfulness interventions have not been rigorously evaluated in episodic migraine.

Objective: To evaluate the efficacy of an enhanced mindfulness based stress reduction (MBSR+) versus stress management for headache (SMH).

Design, Setting, Participants: Randomized, assessor-blind, clinical trial of 98 adults with episodic migraine recruited at a single academic center comparing MBSR+ (n=50) to SMH (n=48). (https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02133209)

Intervention: MBSR+ and SMH were delivered weekly by group for 8 weeks, then bi-weekly for another 8 weeks.

Measurements: The primary outcome was reduction in headache days from baseline to 20 weeks. MRI outcomes included activity of left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC) and cognitive task network during cognitive challenge, resting state connectivity of right dorsal anterior insula (daINS) to DLPFC and cognitive task network, and gray matter volume of DLPFC, daINS, and anterior midcingulate. Secondary outcomes were headache-related disability, pain severity, response to treatment, migraine days, and MRI whole-brain analyses.

Results: Reduction in headache days from baseline to 20 weeks was greater for MBSR+ (7.8 [95%CI, 6.9-8.8] to 4.6 [95%CI, 3.7-5.6]) than for SMH (7.7 [95%CI 6.7-8.7] to 6.0 [95%CI, 4.9-7.0]) (*P*=0.04). 52% of the MBSR+ group showed a response to treatment (50% reduction in headache days) compared with 23% in the SMH group (*P*=0.004). Reduction in headache-related disability was greater for MBSR+ (59.6 [95%CI, 57.9-61.3] to 54.6 [95%CI, 52.9-56.4]) than SMH (59.6 [95%CI, 57.7-61.5] to 57.5 [95%CI, 55.5-59.4]) *(P*=0.02). There were no differences in clinical outcomes at 52 weeks or MRI outcomes at 20 weeks, although changes related to cognitive networks with MBSR+ were observed.

Limitations: A single site and likely self-selection bias.

Conclusions: MBSR+ is an effective treatment option for episodic migraine.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Migraine is a severe and often disabling neurological disorder(1, 2) and standard preventative agents frequently create challenging side-effects.(3, 4) Migraine guidelines(5) include nonpharmacological preventative treatments, and mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) recently has been shown to improve pain and functional outcomes in chronic low back pain.(6) Yet meditation and mindfulness therapies show only modest benefits to date in reducing the frequency of migraine.(7, 8) The outcomes of MBSR in reducing pain(9) and migraine frequency(7) may improve if training is enhanced to include a longer period of learning, as greater home practice yields better outcomes in MBSR.(10) Since medication can contribute to the frequency of headache,(11) MBSR may be an effective nonpharmacological prevention strategy that has become widely available throughout the United States and Europe in recent years.

Migraine headaches are due to acute alterations in the trigeminovascular system and changes in brain perfusion include widespread increases and decreases in brain activity.(12-14) Beyond the changes known to occur during attacks, mild cognitive deficits occur between attacks(15, 16) and brain structure is altered relative to controls.(17, 18) These brain changes involve cognitive and emotional circuits,(19) particulary the insula,(20) left dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (DLPFC), and anterior/mid cingulate cortex (ACC/MCC).(21) The demands of recurring pain deplete cognitive and emotional resources,(22) and treatments that increase the efficiency of information processing, or cognitive efficiency, may be particularly beneficial for painful conditions such as migraine. The practice of mindfulness meditation appears to increase cognitive efficiency. Long-term meditation practitioners show structural changes in brain areas involved in cognitive and emotional processing (insula, ACC/MCC, and prefrontal cortex(23)), and mindfulness training changes brain function in these and other areas, with consistent long-term changes in insula cortex.(24, 25) The focused attention involved in mindfulness activates these cognitive networks(26) and even brief mindfulness training improves cognitive efficiency and increases engagement of left DLPFC.(27) Increased cognitive efficiency contributes to control over pain in long-term mindfulness practitioners.(28)

This trial compared enhanced MBSR (MBSR+) to an active control on clinical and imaging outcomes in episodic migraine. We hypothesized that MBSR+ would reduce headache frequency (primary) and reduce migraine-related disability (secondary). We also hypothesized that MBSR+ would alter the structure and function of brain areas and networks involved in cognitive efficiency, including: increased gray matter volume in the DLPFC, MCC, and insula; decreased activation of left DLPFC and cognitive task network (known as the extrinsic mode network(29)) during cognitive challenge; and reduced resting state connectivity from anterior insula to left DLPFC and cognitive task network.

Methods

The study protocol was approved by the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine and the University of Maryland Baltimore Institutional Review Boards. Participants were recruited from local headache clinics, primary care providers, and the community in eight cohorts (9-18 participants/cohort) from June 2014 to February 2017. Recruited individuals were 18 to 65 years of age and met International Classification of Headache Disorders criteria for migraine with or without aura.(30) Eligibility was assessed first by telephone (Figure 1), then a screening visit. Following written informed consent, screening established $\geq$1 year history of a migraine diagnosis and excluded individuals who reported severe or unstable

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

psychiatric symptoms, used opioid medications, had prior experience with mindfulness or concurrent treatment expected to affect mindfulness/stress reduction (see Protocol for full inclusion/exclusion). Potential participants completed at least 28 days of an electronic daily diary to establish eligibility (4-14 headache days in 28 days) which served as the baseline measure of headache frequency. Eligible subjects then attended the MRI session, including written informed consent, questionnaires, and quantitative sensory testing.

Assessments

Study questionnaires were completed online at baseline, week 10 (after 8-weeks of MBSR+/SMH), week 20 (after completion of MBSR+/SMH), and at week 52. MRI visits at baseline, week 10, and week 20 were conducted by staff masked to treatment group. All MRI scans used a Siemens Tim-Trio 3T MRI scanner with a 32-channel head coil through March 2017, then a Siemens 3T Prisma Fit MRI scanner with a 64-channel head coil (see Appendix Table 1 for details). Scans included a T1 high resolution anatomical scan, a resting state fMRI scan, and fMRI scans during completion of two blocks of painful thermal stimulation and two blocks of cognitive challenge.(31)

Randomization

Randomization (1:1) was stratified by the presence/absence of another chronic pain disorder and headache frequency from the baseline headache diary (low: 4-8; high: 9-14 headache days per 28 days). The randomization schedule was generated online (randomization.com) and stored in a locked cabinet by non-study staff. Assignment occurred by non-study staff when the participant arrived for the first day of class.

Interventions

Participants were instructed to continue stable use of prescribed preventative treatments and continue use of acute abortives as needed. Separate groups for each intervention met for about 2 hours weekly for 8 weeks then bi-weekly for another 8 weeks. A trained expert in the content for each intervention used a manualized protocol that included participant handouts and materials for home use. MBSR+ was administered by 2 experienced, certified instructors (10 and 40 years of meditation experience). SMH was delivered by a nurse practitioner (11 years experience treating headache patients). Checklists were completed by instructors at the end of sessions to verify all components were delivered. Missed sessions were made up individually in person or by phone.

MBSR+ included 2 segments: 1) MBSR included the 8-week program with retreat (32) adapted using trauma-informed methods to include a longer arriving practice at each session and loving kindness in week 2(33); and 2) 4 additional MBSR+ bi-weekly sessions emphasizing self-compassion and including sympathetic joy, equanimity, and gratitude. The final traditional MBSR session focused on applying skills before, during, and after migraines (see Appendix Methods) and the MBSR+ sessions included both didactic content and mindfulness practice, including body scan, yoga, sitting and walking meditations.

SMH included 12 sessions focused on didactic content about the role of stress and other triggers in headaches and followed a smiliar format and timing to the MBSR+ sessions, minus the retreat. Topics included stress at work and home; coping with stress mental health and personality; sleep hygiene; pain education; and medications for migraine. Information, group discussion, and social support among

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

group members was emphasized; behavior change and specific skill development was not addressed. Each session included a 10-minute period of standardized muscle stretching exercises.

Measures

Sociodemographic and medical data were obtained at baseline (Table 1). Clinical and imaging outcome measures were collected at baseline, week 10 (secondary), and week 20 (primary) and clinical outcome measures were collected at week 52 (secondary). The week 20 time point, along with the 28 day period of prospective diaries that patients completed, conforms to current guidelines on RCTs for migraine prophylaxis(34).

Primary Outcomes

Clinical Outcomes: The primary outcome was measured as the change from baseline to week 20. Headache frequency was measured using an electronic daily diary for 28 days based on the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke preventive therapy headache diary, which was provided via an email link. When fewer than the full 28 days were completed, the proportion of headache days was calculated (number of headache days/total number of diary days) and then multiplied by 28 to get a continuous variable for headache days. Note: in the clinical trial registration we included headache-related disability as a primary outcome. However, given prior RCTs on migraine have almost exclusively used headache frequency as the primary outcome, we chose to limit focus on that sole primary outcome.

Imaging Outcomes: Brain function was measured as activation during cognitive task(31) performance in left DLPFC and cognitive task network, and resting state connectivity of right dorsal anterior insula to left DLPFC and cognitive task network. Brain structure was measured as gray matter volume in DLPFC, cingulate, and anterior insula. Regions-of-interest were defined from the cognitive task group activation map for all participants combined at baseline. Peak voxels for each region were selected, a 4mm radius sphere was created, and data were extracted from the scan of interest for each subject.

Secondary outcomes

Clinical Outcomes: Secondary outcomes were assessed at weeks 10, 20, and 52. Headache-related disability was measured using the six item Headache Impact Test(35) that shows strong psychometric properties.(36) Headache intensity was computed as the average of all headache intensity ratings from the electronic daily diary.(34) Response to treatment was defined as $\geq$50% reduction in number of headache days(34) from baseline to week 20. A migraine(31) day was coded when at least 2 of the following criteria were met: unilateral, pulsating, moderate/severe pain, aggravated by routine activity; and at least one of the following criteria were met: nausea/vomiting or light/noise sensitivity

Imaging Outcomes: Whole brain analyses of gray matter volume, activation to pain, activation to cognitive challenge, and resting state connectivity of the insula cortex were measured using Sandwich estimator toolbox(37) (see Appendix).

Sample size

Using a 0.050 two-sided significance level, a sample of 90 subjects randomized to 2 treatment groups (1:1) provides 80% power to detect an effect size of at least 0.60 in change of headache frequency for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

MBSR+ relative to SMH using a t-test and the difference between a proportion of responders for MBSR of 0.435 (20/45) and for SMH of 0.150 (7/45) using a Fisher's exact test.

Statistical Methods

Clinical outcomes were analyzed using the intention-to-treat approach. Effects of intervention were estimated using mixed-effects models, where patient was a random effect, and fixed factors included treatment, time, treatment-by-time interaction, age, cohort, interval in days between MRI and treatment, medication, presence of other pain, and education. Difference in treatment response rate was assessed using a generalized linear model with a logit link function. The regression model for the mean with the binomial distribution variance function was utilized to model the log odds ratios. The generalized linear models included the following covariates,: age, medication, level of education, presence of other pain, interval in days between MRI and first intervention. A logistic regression model predicted probability of response to treatment. P-values are nominal and not adjusted for multiple outcomes. Testing was two-sided and used the 0.05 level of significance, and statistical analyses used R-Studio, Version 1.1.453.

Imaging outcomes were analyzed per protocol and additional exclusion criteria for MRI data, sequence information, data preprocessing, and first level analyses are described in Appendix. Linear mixed models included patient as a random effect and fixed factors of treatment, time, and the treatment-by-time interaction, and scanner as a covariate, with bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. The Sandwich estimator toolbox(37) modeled longitudinal changes in whole brain analyses. Statistical significance was assessed using 10,000 iterations of wild bootstrap, and cluster-based correction for multiple comparisons using a familywise error rate alpha of 0.05, with a cluster-forming threshold of $p<0.001$. The contrast of interest was the treatment-by-time interaction. Main effects of time and treatment are provided in Appendix.

Results

Among 573 individuals contacted for telephone screening, 168 were potentially eligible and 119 of these met the headache frequency criteria during baseline (Figure 1). The main reasons for exclusion were not meeting migraine or headache frequency criteria, ineligible or refused MRI/pain testing, schedule incompatability, or migraine secondary to injury. Ninety eight participants were randomized to treatment; 50 were assigned to receive MBSR+ and 48 were assigned to receive SMH. All attended at least one session. Five participants (5%) withdrew from treatment after the first session but agreed to continue with data collection and 3 participants (3%) withdrew from treatment and were lost to follow-up. Forty three (86%) of the MBSR+ participants and 40 (83%) of the SMH participants completed all sessions, either in the group or individually as a make-up.

At baseline, treatment groups were similar on all sociodemographic characteristics (Table 1). Participants (mean age of 36 years) were predominantly female (91%), white (72%), and 80% had completed at least one year of college. At baseline, they reported an average of 7.8 headache days and only 15% were using a preventive treatment for migraine. There were no group differences in treatment withdrawal or loss to follow-up.

Primary outcomes

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

At week 20, the MBSR+ group reported fewer headache days (4.6 [95% CI 3.6 to 5.6]) compared to the SMH group (6.0 [95% CI 4.9 to 7.0]; *P*=.04; Table 2). This effect was apparent at week 10, as the MBSR+ group reported fewer headache days (5.5 [95% CI 4.6 to 6.5]) compared to the SMH group (6.9 [95% CI 5.9 to 7.9] *P*=.04). This treatment effect was not significant at week 52 (*P*=.12).

Regions of interest revealed no significant treatment-by-time effects related to gray matter volume, cognitive task activation, or resting state fMRI (Figure 3 and Appendix). Both groups showed decreased anterior mid cingulate volume (P=.04) and decreased connectivity of right dorsal anterior insula to cognitive task network (P=.02) at week 20.

Secondary outcomes

At week 20, the MBSR+ group also reported reduced HIT-6 scores (2.0 [95% CI 1.1 to 2.9]) compared to the SMH group (3.7 [95% CI 2.7 to 4.7]; *P*=.04). Headache impact did not differ between treatment groups at week 10 or week 52 (Table 2) and average headache pain intensity did not differ between treatment group at any timepoint (Table 2). At week 20, 52% of the MBSR+ group were classified as treatment responders ($\geq$50% reduction in headache days) compared to 23% of the SMH group (*P*=0.004; Table 2, Figure 2), yielding a number needed to treat (NNT) of 3.4. The MBSR+ group reported fewer migraine days at week 10 (*P*=.0008) and week 20 (*P*=.004) relative to SMH, but not at week 52 (Table 2).

Whole brain analyses revealed a significant treatment-by-time interaction on activation during the cognitive challenge. The MBSR+ group showed decreased activation in the bilateral cuneus and right parietal operculum at week 20 compared to the SMH group (Appendix Table 2). Whole brain analyses also revealed a significant interaction of left dorsal anterior insula connectivity to the right posterior parietal cortex and right cuneus (Appendix Table 2). There were no significant interaction effects for the other five insula seed regions, gray matter volume, or activation during pain stimulation for the whole brain analyses.

Adverse Events

There were 16 adverse events reported of which 15 were mild (e.g., high blood pressure, hives, jaw pain) or moderate (e.g., car accident, kidney stone); the one serious adverse event (stroke), in accordance with the data safety monitoring plan and consultation with the independent monitoring committee, was deemed unlikely related to intervention. The remaining 7 were definitely not related, 7 were unlikely related, and 1 was possibly related to study procedures (one participant reported a migraine during the MRI session).

Discussion:

Among adults with episodic migraine, enhanced mindfulness based stress reduction (MBSR+) decreased headache days and headache related disability, as well as yielded a higher treatment response rate, relative to the active control (SMH). Treatment response (50% reduction in headache frequency) to MBSR+ relative to SMH yielded an NNT of 3.4, which is comparable to valproic acid – one of the first line treatments for episodic migraine prophylaxis.(38) These results hold promise for the use of mindfulness-based interventions for headache, with treatment response rates qualitatively comparable or exceeding effects of most existing standard pharmaceutical therapies in the time frames they have been tested.(39-53) Developing and testing methods to sustain these benefits over longer periods is

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

warranted, as the effects of MBSR+ in reducing headache frequency did not sustain over the 52 week follow-up.

Although no effects of MBSR+ training were observed on the primary neuroimaging outcomes, secondary whole-brain analyses identified two findings that suggest an increase in cognitive efficiency. Compared to SMH, MBSR+ training led to decreased activation of the parietal operculum and visual cortex (cuneus) during the cognitive challenge. Both long-term meditators(55) and individuals trained in MBSR(56) show altered visual cortex connectivity and increased activation during focused attention. The parietal operculum, including posterior insula, is activated by pain and deactivated by cognitive challenge(57) and we have previously reported that this is the only acute pain-related activation that is modulated by cognitive demand in both healthy subjects and migraine patients.(21) Additionally, we observed reduced resting connectivity of the dorsal anterior insula to posterior parietal cortex and visual cortex (cuneus) following MBSR+ training compared to SMH. Because dorsal anterior insula strongly connects to the posterior parietal cortex and cuneus as part of the cognitive task network,(58) this finding supports increased cognitive efficiency following MBSR+. These increases in cognitive efficiency seen in the MBSR+ group may reflect changes due to the practice of meditation or alternatively may reflect the effect of having fewer headaches during the period surrounding measurement.

This is the first study to our knowledge using MRI primary outcomes in a registered clinical trial for a chronic pain condition. The primary imaging outcomes, including changes in gray matter volume, activation during cognitive challenge, and resting state connectivity of the anterior insula in *a priori* selected regions-of-interest, did not differ between groups.. The choice of these regions was based on literature when the study was proposed and our preliminary data, focusing on the DLPFC(59) and other brain areas showing pain-cognition interactions.(21, 60-64) The vast majority of neuroimaging studies compare individuals with chronic pain to healthy subjects, rather than longitudinal designs examining how the brain changes with treatment. Since we did not find treatment effects in the areas that distinguish those experiencing daily pain, our findings suggest that brain changes distinguishing patients from healthy controls might not be useful as treatment targets.

Most MRI studies reporting effects of treatment have only investigated the treatment group,(64-67) or treatment responders within a group exposed to treatment,(68-70) and ours is the first study to compare two active treatment arms and including both treatment responsders and nonresponders. It is possible that the results from previous studies examining brain changes over time are dependent on treatment response, rather than the effects of intervention itself. Future work should thus include comparisons of responders and non-responders.

The present findings share limitations common to most RCTs and may have limited generalizability due to the likely selection bias that results from the strenuous requirements of participation, including time commitment and willingness to complete repeated MRI scans, resulting in most of the participants being college educated. Study strengths, in addition to the use of MRI outcomes, include one of the largest sample sizes for measuring brain imaging outcomes in migraine or any chronic pain disorder, the very small loss to follow-up, the close matching of MBSR+ to the active control, and long-term follow-up.

Conclusions:

In episodic migraine, MBSR+ showed superior treatment effects compared to an active control, with significant reductions in headache frequency that are comparable to commonly used first line

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

treatments for episodic migraine prophylaxis. Brain changes in the MBSR+ group were seen in the pattern of functional connectivity and activation during a challenging cognitive task that are consistent with increased cognitive efficiency. These findings suggest that MBSR+ can be an effective prophylactic treatment option for episodic migraine.

Acknowledgements: NCCIH/NIH R01 AT007176 to DAS. The Independent Monitoring Committee members: Erica Sibinga, Tianjing Li, George Wittenberg, and Michael Baime.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Leonardi M, Raggi A**.** Burden of migraine: international perspectives. Neurol. Sci. 2013;34 Suppl 1:S117-8. doi: 10.1007/s10072-013-1387-8.:S117-S8.
2. Collaborators GDaIIaP**.** Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries, 1990-2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. Lancet. 2017;390(10100):1211-59.
3. Ong JJY, Wei DY, Goadsby PJ**.** Recent Advances in Pharmacotherapy for Migraine Prevention: From Pathophysiology to New Drugs. Drugs. 2018;78(4):411-37.
4. Schurks M, Diener HC, Goadsby P**.** Update on the prophylaxis of migraine. Curr Treat Options Neurol. 2008;10(1):20-9.
5. Penzien DB, Irby MB, Smitherman TA, Rains JC, Houle TT**.** Well-Established and Empirically Supported Behavioral Treatments for Migraine. Curr Pain Headache Rep. 2015;19(7):34.
6. Cherkin DC, Sherman KJ, Balderson BH, Cook AJ, Anderson ML, Hawkes RJ, et al. Effect of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction vs Cognitive Behavioral Therapy or Usual Care on Back Pain and Functional Limitations in Adults With Chronic Low Back Pain: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA. 2016;315(12):1240-9.
7. Anheyer D, Leach MJ, Klose P, Dobos G, Cramer H**.** Mindfulness-based stress reduction for treating chronic headache: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Cephalalgia. 2018:333102418781795.
8. Gu Q, Hou JC, Fang XM**.** Mindfulness Meditation for Primary Headache Pain: A Meta-Analysis. Chin Med. J. (Engl.). 2018;131(7):829-38.
9. Goyal M, Singh S, Sibinga EM, Gould NF, Rowland-Seymour A, Sharma R, et al. Meditation Programs for Psychological Stress and Well-being: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Intern Med. 2014;174(3):357-68.
10. Parsons CE, Crane C, Parsons LJ, Fjorback LO, Kuyken W**.** Home practice in Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy and Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction: A systematic review and meta-analysis of participants' mindfulness practice and its association with outcomes. Behav Res Ther. 2017;95:29-41.
11. Buse DC, Greisman JD, Baigi K, Lipton RB**.** Migraine Progression: A Systematic Review. Headache. 2019;59(3):306-38.
12. Charles A**.** The pathophysiology of migraine: implications for clinical management. Lancet Neurol. 2018;17(2):174-82.
13. Colombo B, Messina R, Rocca MA, Filippi M**.** Imaging the migrainous brain: the present and the future. Neurol Sci. 2019.
14. Burstein R, Noseda R, Borsook D**.** Migraine: Multiple Processes, Complex Pathophysiology. Journal of Neuroscience. 2015;35(17):6619-29.
15. Suhr JA, Seng EK**.** Neuropsychological functioning in migraine: clinical and research implications. Cephalalgia. 2012;32(1):39-54.
16. Vuralli D, Ayata C, Bolay H**.** Cognitive dysfunction and migraine. J Headache Pain. 2018;19(1):109.
17. Jia Z, Yu S**.** Grey matter alterations in migraine: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Neuroimage Clin. 2017;14:130-40.
18. Bashir A, Lipton RB, Ashina S, Ashina M**.** Migraine and structural changes in the brain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Neurology. 2013;81(14):1260-8.
19. Chong CD, Schwedt TJ, Dodick DW**.** Migraine: What Imaging Reveals. Curr Neurol Neurosci Rep. 2016;16(7):64.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

20. Borsook D, Veggeberg R, Erpelding N, Borra R, Linnman C, Burstein R, et al. The Insula: A "Hub of Activity" in Migraine. Neuroscientist. 2016;22(6):632-52.
21. Mathur VA, Khan SA, Keaser ML, Hubbard CS, Goyal M, Seminowicz DA**.** Altered cognition-related brain activity and interactions with acute pain in migraine. Neuroimage Clin. 2015;7:347-58. doi: 10.1016/j.nicl.2015.01.003. eCollection;%2015.:347-58.
22. Seminowicz DA, Ceko M**.** Can we exploit cognitive brain networks to treat chronic pain? Pain Manag. 2015;5(6):399-402.
23. Fox KC, Nijeboer S, Dixon ML, Floman JL, Ellamil M, Rumak SP, et al. Is meditation associated with altered brain structure? A systematic review and meta-analysis of morphometric neuroimaging in meditation practitioners. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2014;43:48-73.
24. Young KS, van der Velden AM, Craske MG, Pallesen KJ, Fjorback L, Roepstorff A, et al. The impact of mindfulness-based interventions on brain activity: A systematic review of functional magnetic resonance imaging studies. Neurosci Biobehav Rev. 2018;84:424-33.
25. Gotink RA, Meijboom R, Vernooij MW, Smits M, Hunink MG**.** 8-week Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction induces brain changes similar to traditional long-term meditation practice - A systematic review. Brain Cogn. 2016;108:32-41.
26. Dickenson J, Berkman ET, Arch J, Lieberman MD**.** Neural correlates of focused attention during a brief mindfulness induction. Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci. 2013;8(1):40-7.
27. Allen M, Dietz M, Blair KS, van Beek M, Rees G, Vestergaard-Poulsen P, et al. Cognitive-affective neural plasticity following active-controlled mindfulness intervention. J Neurosci. 2012;32(44):15601-10.
28. Grant JA, Courtemanche ϑ, Rainville P**.** A non-elaborative mental stance and decoupling of executive and pain-related cortices predicts low pain sensitivity in Zen meditators. Pain. 2011;152(1):150-6.
29. Hugdahl K, Raichle ME, Mitra A, Specht K**.** On the existence of a generalized non-specific task-dependent network. Front Hum. Neurosci. 2015;9:430. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2015.00430. eCollection;%2015.:430.
30. (IHS). HCCotIHS**.** The International Classification of Headache Disorders, 3rd edition (beta version). Cephalalgia. 2013;33(9):629-808.
31. Bush G, Shin LM, Holmes J, Rosen BR, Vogt BA**.** The Multi-Source Interference Task: validation study with fMRI in individual subjects. Mol. Psychiatry. 2003;8(1):60-70.
32. Kabat-Zinn J**.** Full Catastrophe Living: Using the Wisdom of Your Body and Mind to Face Stress, Pain, and Illness. New York, NY: Random House; 2005.
33. Kimbrough E, Magyari T, Langenberg P, Chesney M, Berman B**.** Mindfulness intervention for child abuse survivors. J Clin Psychol. 2010;66(1):17-33.
34. Society IH, Tfelt-Hansen P, Pascual J, Ramadan N, Dahlof C, D'Amico D, et al. Guidelines for controlled trials of drugs in migraine: Third edition. A guide for investigators. Cephalalgia. 2012;32(1):6-38.
35. Kosinski M, Bayliss MS, Bjorner JB, Ware JE, Jr., Garber WH, Batenhorst A, et al. A six-item short-form survey for measuring headache impact: the HIT-6. Qual. Life Res. 2003;12(8):963-74.
36. Yang M, Rendas-Baum R, Varon SF, Kosinski M**.** Validation of the Headache Impact Test (HIT-6) across episodic and chronic migraine. Cephalalgia. 2011;31(3):357-67.
37. Guillaume B, Hua X, Thompson PM, Waldorp L, Nichols TE**.** Fast and accurate modelling of longitudinal and repeated measures neuroimaging data. Neuroimage. 2014;94:287-302.
38. Linde M, Mulleners WM, Chronicle EP, McCrory DC**.** Valproate (valproic acid or sodium valproate or a combination of the two) for the prophylaxis of episodic migraine in adults. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013(6):Cd010611.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

39. Afshari D, Rafizadeh S, Rezaei M**.** A comparative study of the effects of low-dose topiramate versus sodium valproate in migraine prophylaxis. Int J Neurosci. 2012;122(2):60-8.
40. Ashtari F, Shaygannejad V, Akbari M**.** A double-blind, randomized trial of low-dose topiramate vs propranolol in migraine prophylaxis. Acta Neurol Scand. 2008;118(5):301-5.
41. Bartolini M, Silvestrini M, Taffi R, Lanciotti C, Luconi R, Capecci M, et al. Efficacy of topiramate and valproate in chronic migraine. Clin Neuropharmacol. 2005;28(6):277-9.
42. Blumenfeld AM, Schim JD, Chippendale TJ**.** Botulinum toxin type A and divalproex sodium for prophylactic treatment of episodic or chronic migraine. Headache. 2008;48(2):210-20.
43. Brandes JL, Saper JR, Diamond M, Couch JR, Lewis DW, Schmitt J, et al. Topiramate for migraine prevention: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2004;291(8):965-73.
44. Diener HC, Bussone G, Van Oene JC, Lahaye M, Schwalen S, Goadsby PJ**.** Topiramate reduces headache days in chronic migraine: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled study. Cephalalgia. 2007;27(7):814-23.
45. Diener HC, Matias-Guiu J, Hartung E, Pfaffenrath V, Ludin HP, Nappi G, et al. Efficacy and tolerability in migraine prophylaxis of flunarizine in reduced doses: a comparison with propranolol 160 mg daily. Cephalalgia. 2002;22(3):209-21.
46. Diener HC, Tfelt-Hansen P, Dahlof C, Lainez MJ, Sandrini G, Wang SJ, et al. Topiramate in migraine prophylaxis--results from a placebo-controlled trial with propranolol as an active control. J Neurol. 2004;251(8):943-50.
47. Freitag FG, Collins SD, Carlson HA, Goldstein J, Saper J, Silberstein S, et al. A randomized trial of divalproex sodium extended-release tablets in migraine prophylaxis. Neurology. 2002;58(11):1652-9.
48. Luo N, Di W, Zhang A, Wang Y, Ding M, Qi W, et al. A randomized, one-year clinical trial comparing the efficacy of topiramate, flunarizine, and a combination of flunarizine and topiramate in migraine prophylaxis. Pain Med. 2012;13(1):80-6.
49. Mathew NT, Saper JR, Silberstein SD, Rankin L, Markley HG, Solomon S, et al. Migraine prophylaxis with divalproex. Arch Neurol. 1995;52(3):281-6.
50. Sarchielli P, Messina P, Cupini LM, Tedeschi G, Di Piero V, Livrea P, et al. Sodium valproate in migraine without aura and medication overuse headache: a randomized controlled trial. Eur Neuropsychopharmacol. 2014;24(8):1289-97.
51. Silberstein SD, Dodick DW, Lindblad AS, Holroyd K, Harrington M, Mathew NT, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of propranolol added to topiramate in chronic migraine. Neurology. 2012;78(13):976-84.
52. Silvestrini M, Bartolini M, Coccia M, Baruffaldi R, Taffi R, Provinciali L**.** Topiramate in the treatment of chronic migraine. Cephalalgia. 2003;23(8):820-4.
53. Stovner LJ, Linde M, Gravdahl GB, Tronvik E, Aamodt AH, Sand T, et al. A comparative study of candesartan versus propranolol for migraine prophylaxis: A randomised, triple-blind, placebo-controlled, double cross-over study. Cephalalgia. 2014;34(7):523-32.
54. Pradhan EK, Baumgarten M, Langenberg P, Handwerger B, Gilpin AK, Magyari T, et al. Effect of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction in rheumatoid arthritis patients. Arthritis Rheum. 2007;57(7):1134-42.
55. Berkovich-Ohana A, Harel M, Hahamy A, Arieli A, Malach R**.** Alterations in task-induced activity and resting-state fluctuations in visual and DMN areas revealed in long-term meditators. Neuroimage. 2016;135:125-34.
56. Kilpatrick LA, Suyenobu BY, Smith SR, Bueller JA, Goodman T, Creswell JD, et al. Impact of Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction Training on Intrinsic Brain Connectivity. Neuroimage. 2011.
57. Seminowicz DA, Davis KD**.** Interactions of Pain Intensity and Cognitive Load: The Brain Stays on Task. Cerebral Cortex. 2007;17(6):1412-22.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

58. Chang LJ, Yarkoni T, Khaw MW, Sanfey AG**.** Decoding the role of the insula in human cognition: functional parcellation and large-scale reverse inference. Cereb. Cortex. 2013;23(3):739-49.
59. Seminowicz DA, Moayedi M**.** The Dorsolateral Prefrontal Cortex in Acute and Chronic Pain. J. Pain. 2017;18(9):1027-35.
60. Ceko M, Shir Y, Ouellet JA, Ware MA, Stone LS, Seminowicz DA**.** Partial recovery of abnormal insula and dorsolateral prefrontal connectivity to cognitive networks in chronic low back pain after treatment. Hum. Brain Mapp. 2015:10.
61. Seminowicz DA, Davis KD**.** Pain Enhances Functional Connectivity of a Brain Network Evoked by Performance of a Cognitive Task. Journal of Neurophysiology. 2007;97(5):3651-9.
62. Seminowicz DA, Mikulis DJ, Davis KD**.** Cognitive modulation of pain-related brain responses depends on behavioral strategy. Pain. 2004;112(1-2):48-58.
63. Seminowicz DA, Shpaner M, Keaser ML, Krauthamer GM, Mantegna J, Dumas JA, et al. Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy Increases Prefrontal Cortex Gray Matter in Patients With Chronic Pain. J Pain. 2013(13):10.
64. Seminowicz DA, Wideman TH, Naso L, Hatami-Khoroushahi Z, Fallatah S, Ware MA, et al. Effective Treatment of Chronic Low Back Pain in Humans Reverses Abnormal Brain Anatomy and Function. The Journal of Neuroscience. 2011;31(20):7540-50.
65. Gwilym SE, Fillipini N, Douaud G, Carr AJ, Tracey I**.** Thalamic atrophy associated with painful osteoarthritis of the hip is reversible after arthroplasty; a longitudinal voxel-based-morphometric study. Arthritis Rheum. 2010.
66. Seminowicz DA, Shpaner M, Keaser ML, Krauthamer GM, Mantegna J, Dumas JA, et al. Cognitive-behavioral therapy increases prefrontal cortex gray matter in patients with chronic pain. J Pain. 2013;14(12):1573-84.
67. Rodriguez-Raecke R, Niemeier A, Ihle K, Ruether W, May A**.** Brain Gray Matter Decrease in Chronic Pain Is the Consequence and Not the Cause of Pain. Journal of Neuroscience. 2009;29(44):13746-50.
68. Vachon-Presseau E, Berger SE, Abdullah TB, Huang L, Cecchi GA, Griffith JW, et al. Brain and psychological determinants of placebo pill response in chronic pain patients. Nat Commun. 2018;9(1):3397.
69. Tetreault P, Mansour A, Vachon-Presseau E, Schnitzer TJ, Apkarian AV, Baliki MN**.** Brain Connectivity Predicts Placebo Response across Chronic Pain Clinical Trials. PLoS Biol. 2016;14(10):e1002570.
70. Elsenbruch S, Kotsis V, Benson S, Rosenberger C, Reidick D, Schedlowski M, et al. Neural mechanisms mediating the effects of expectation in visceral placebo analgesia: An fMRI study in healthy placebo responders and nonresponders. Pain. 2012;153(2):382-90.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Sample characteristics. N (%) unless otherwise stated

Characteristic	All , n=98	Randomized to SMH, n=48	Randomized to MBSR+, n=50	p-value
Age: median years (range)	36 (18-65)	36 (21-63)	36 (18-65)	NS
Gender M F	 9 (9.2) 89 (90.8)	 6 (12.5) 42 (87.5)	 3 (6.0) 47 (94.0)	NS
Race White African American Other	 71 (72.4) 17 (17.3) 9 (9.1)	 36 (75.0) 7 (14.6) 5 (10.4)	 35 (70.0) 10 (20.0) 4 (8.0)	NS
Presence of idiopathic pain No Yes	 70 (71.4) 28 (28.6)	 35 (72.9) 13 (27.1)	 35 (70.0) 15 (30.0)	NS
Headache Frequency Low (4-8) High (>8 and <15)	 50 (51.0) 48 (49.0)	 25 (52.1) 23 (47.9)	 25 (50.0) 25 (50.0)	NS
Education Up to some college College or more	 20 (20.4) 78 (79.6)	 7 (14.6) 41 (85.4)	 13 (26.0) 37 (74.0)	p=0.21
Medication/Vitamin, any No Yes	 83 (90.8) 15 (9.2)	 44 (91.7) 4 (8.3)	 39 (78.0) 11 (22.0)	p=0.09
Median days (range) between MRI and first intervention.		10 (0-21)	10 (1-25)	NS

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Primary and Secondary Clinical Outcomes. Adjusted means, 95% Confidence Intervals

Primary Clinical Outcomes[1]			
Week	SMH	MBSR+	p-value
Headache days (per 28 day calendar)[2]			
baseline	7.7 (6.7 8.7)	7.8 (6.9 8.8)	0.85
10	6.9 (5.9 7.9)	5.5 (4.6 6.5)	**0.04**
20	6.0 (4.9 7.0)	4.6 (3.7 5.6)	**0.04**
52	5.6 (4.6 6.7)	4.6 (3.7 5.6)	0.12
Secondary Clinical Outcomes			
HIT-6 [3]			
baseline	59.6 (57.7 61.5)	59.6 (57.9 61.3)	0.99
10	58.5 (56.5 60.4)	56.3 (54.5 58.1)	0.08
20	57.5 (55.5 59.4)	54.6 (52.9 56.4)	**0.02**
52	58.4 (56.4 60.4)	56.2 (54.4 58.1)	0.10
Week	SMH	MBSR	p-value
Pain severity [4]			
baseline	4.3 (3.8 4.8)	4.7 (4.2 5.2)	0.20
10	4.4 (3.9 4.9)	4.4 (4.0 4.9)	0.62
20	4.4 (3.9 5.0)	4.4 (4.0 4.9)	0.63
52	4.7 (4.2 5.3)	4.5 (4.1 5.0)	0.84
Number of responders[5] N, %; 95% CI			
20	11 (23%; 12-37%)	26 (52%; 37-66%)	**0.004**
Migraine days (per 28 day calendar) [2]			
baseline	3.2 (2.2 4.2)	3.3 (2.5 4.2)	0.83
10	4.0 (3.0 5.0)	1.9 (1.0 2.8)	**0.0008**
20	3.7 (2.7 4.7)	2.0 (1.1 2.9)	**0.004**
52	3.1 (2.1 4.0)	2.1 (1.2 3.0)	0.12

[1]Primary clinical outcome time point was week 20 (gray shading).

[2]adjusted for cohort, age, medication, and education level.

[3]adjusted for cohort, age, medication, and presence of idiopathic pain.

[4]adjusted for cohort, age, medications, education level, presence of idiopathic pain, and interval days between baseline and first MBSR/SMH session.

[5]Response was defined as 50% or greater reduction in headache frequency at week 20 compared to baseline.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Participant Flow Through Trial Comparing Extended Minfulness Based Stress Reduction and Stress Management for Migraine Headache.

[a] – Of the 50 participants randomized to receive extended mindfulness-based stress reduction, 43 completed all 12 sessions. Participants were recruited in 8 separate cohorts (range of 4-8/cohort).

[b] – Of the 48 participants randomized to receive stress management for headaches, 40 completed all 12 sessions. Participants were recruited in 8 separate cohorts (range of 2-11/cohort).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Clinical outcomes. Mean (thick lines; 95% confidence intervals shown in thin lines) number of headache days per 28-day diary (uncorrected values) for SMH (gray) and MBSR+ (black). Responder rates (with response defined as a 50% reduction in headach days from baseline) are shown in bar plots, with MBSR+ in red and SMH in blue. At week 20 (primary outcome) both headache frequency and response rate were significantly better in the MBSR+ group.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19004069; this version posted August 6, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. MRI outcomes. A) Regions-of-interest for primary outcome analyses, defined from the baseline group map (all patients) for activation during the cognitive task. There were no significant effects of treatment for region-of-interest analyses. B) whole-brain analysis interaction effect for cognitive task-related activation. Identified regions show a decrease in activation level in the MBSR+ compared to SMH group over time. C) whole-brain analysis interaction effect for left dorsal aINS connectivity. Regions show a decrease in activation level in the MBSR compared to SMH group over time. Images are displayed on the average anatomical MRI for all patients at baseline. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals.