Comparison: D	ihydroerg	otamine na	asal spray v	s Placebo								
Outcome: Dura	tion, inte	nsity, frequ	ency of atta	acks								
Certainty asses	sment						Summary of findings					
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsis tency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	DHE	Placebo	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome	
Andersson & Jespersen 1986	Cross- over trial	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	None	137 attacks	133 attacks	No effect on duration and frequency of attacks, but intensity significantly lower	Low	Critical	

Comparison	: Lidocaine	vs Placebo						
Outcome: Di	uration, int	ensity, frequency o	of attacks					
Certainty ass	sessment						Summary of	findings
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Incon- sistency	Indirect-ness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Certainty	Importance of outcome
No controlled studies	Case reports	Very Serious	Very Serious	NA	NA	None	Very Low	Critical

Comparison: V	erapamil vs	Placebo									
Outcome: Freq	uency of att	acks									
Certainty asses	sment						Summary of findings				
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considera tions	Verapamil	Placebo Or Lithium	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Bussone et al. 1990; Leone et al. 2000	Cross- over trial & RCT	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	24 (Bussone et al. 1990) 15 (Leone et al. 2000)	24 Lithium 15 Placebo	Significant effect of Verapamil over placebo; similar effect but less side- effects than lithium	Moderate	Critical

Comparison	Lithium v	Placebo (or Vera	pamil)								
Outcome: Fr	equency of	attacks									
Certainty ass	essment						Summary of fi	ndings			
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other consider ations	Lithium	Placebo Or other drugs	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Bussone et al. 1990; Medina et al. 1980; Steiner et	RCT	Serious	Seriousa	Not serious	Not serious	None	24 (Bussone et al. 1990)	24 Verapamil 14 Placebo	No significant effect of lithium over placebo; similar effect	Low	Critical
al. 1997							et al. 1997)  12 (Medina et al. 1980)	6 "other drugs"	to Verapamil; but more side- effects		

Comparison	: Topirama	te vs Placebo	0					
Outcome: F	requency of	fattacks						
Certainty as	sessment						Summary of	of findings
Manuscrip t	Study design	Risk of bias	Incon-sistency	Indirect-ness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Certainty	Importance of outcome
No controlled studies	Case reports	Very Serious	Very Serious	NA	NA	None	Very Low	Critical

### Supplementary Table 20

Comparison	Frovatri	ptan vs placeb	0								
Outcome: Fr	equency	of attacks									
Certainty ass	essment						Summary of fin	dings			
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considera tions	Frovatriptan	Placebo	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Pageler et al. 2011	RCT	Serious <sup>a</sup>	Serious <sup>a</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	None	11		Not evaluated	Very low	Critical

Comparison:	Melatonin	vs Placebo									
Outcome: Fro	equency of	attacks									
Certainty assessment S								dings			
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considera tions	Intervention	Placebo	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Leone et al. 1996	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	None	10 Melatonin	10 Placebo	5 responders, 5 non-responders	Low	Critical

Comparison: VI	NS vs place	bo									
Outcome: Pain	relief durin	g attacks or	frequency of attack	(S							
Certainty assess	ment				Summary	of findings					
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other consideratio ns	VNS	Sham	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Silber-stein et al. 2016; Goadsby et al. 2018	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	50 patients (Goadsby et al. 2018) 73 (Silber-stein et al. 2016)	77	VNS significantly better effect than sham in episodic cluster headache; no significant difference for chronic cluster headache	Moderate	Critical
Gaul et al. 2016	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	45	48	Significant reduction of attacks.	Moderate	Critical

Comparison:	DBS vs place	bo									
Outcome: Fre	quency of at	tacks									
Certainty asse	essment						Summary of	findings			
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	In-consistency	In-directness	Im-precision	Other considerations	DBS	Placebo	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome
Fontaine et al. 2010	RCT ()	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	None	12 patients, placebo stin		Not significantly reduced	Low	Critical

Outcome: Fre	utcome: Frequency of attacks											
Certainty assessment S								findings				
Manuscript	Study design	Risk of bias	In-consistency	In-directness	Imprecision	Other considerations	GON block	Sham	Effect	Certainty	Importance of outcome	
Ambrosini et al. 2005; Leroux et al. 2011	RCT	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	None	13 (Ambrosini et al. 2005) 19 (Leroux et al. 2011)	10	GON block significantly better than placebo	High		