PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 77330

Title: Migraine in physicians and final year medical students: A cross-sectional insight into prevalence, self-awareness, and knowledge from Pakistan

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05868418

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-02 06:24

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-02 09:05

Review time: 2 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.Line 73-74, "Aura, a part of the diagnosis of migraine", aura of migraine including what? Aura is important, but description not detailed enough. 2.Line 83, "consult-seeking and self-medication" What do they mean respectively? 3.Consulters vs. Non-Consulters paragraph, why no meaningful difference in recognizing triggers and indications of prophylaxis between both groups? 4.Line 204-205, 38% believed in the myth that migraine could not be diagnosed without aura, we need to determine is actually how much of the aura.   5.line 232-233, "Preventive therapy is also required in some cases to augment responsiveness to abortive therapy", maybe preventive therapy was working, proof? 6.Line 256, what is PCPs? 7.Line 292-295, drug therapy is a treatment mean, just only emphasized "Monoclonal antibodies" felt very abrupt. whether they were one the newest therapy?   8.Line 312,314, why have two "Secondly"? 9. questionnaires were done in a Tertiary Care Center, rang is narrow. One year of study could collect more care center.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Methodology*

Manuscript NO: 77330

Title: Migraine in physicians and final year medical students: A cross-sectional insight into prevalence, self-awareness, and knowledge from Pakistan

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06186852

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Sudan

Author's Country/Territory: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-01 11:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-08 11:00

Review time: 6 Days and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to thank authors for conducting their study "Migraine in Physicians: A Cross-sectional Insight into Prevalence, Self-awareness, and Knowledge in a Tertiary Care Center of Pakistan"   Title: Your title should be changed into "Migraine in Physicians and Final year medical students: A Cross-sectional Insight into Prevalence, Self-awareness, and Knowledge in a Tertiary Care Center of Pakistan" because you included final year medical students in your study   not only physician. Abstract: Introduction: Introduction was written well. Except the phrase "To our knowledge, this is the first study that determines physician knowledge of triggers and indications of prophylaxis for migraine in the region.   " should be written earlier. My suggestion is to rephrase the last paragraph (line 79-85) in the introduction and last phrase should be aims of your study. Methods: Please write methodology in subheading (example: study design and area, participants, tool and variables, diagnosis of migraine, sample size and sampling, and statistical analysis plan) and write according to STROBE reporting guideline and cite the references for STROBE guideline. Please cite the reference from which you get your questionnaire. Inclusion criteria should be physician and final year medical students experienced headache. This section should be rephrased and written as subheading. Also, write sampling and sample size subheading in methodology section because it was not mentioned. Write version of R and package you used during data analysis. Also, don't mention table 1 and 2 in analysis plan. Results: Please, write subheading for results section: participants characteristics, prevalence of migraine, knowledge of migraine and awareness of migraine or as appropriate. Also, write response rate. Discussion: Remove empty lines (187 ad 194) in the word file.