

# **EVERT: cryotherapy versus salicylic acid for the treatment of verrucae – a randomised controlled trial**

S Cockayne,<sup>1\*</sup> M Curran,<sup>2</sup> G Denby,<sup>2</sup>  
F Hashmi,<sup>3</sup> C Hewitt,<sup>1</sup> K Hicks,<sup>1</sup> S Jayakody,<sup>1</sup>  
A Kang'ombe,<sup>1</sup> C McIntosh,<sup>4</sup> N McLarnon,<sup>5</sup>  
E Stamuli,<sup>1</sup> K Thomas,<sup>6</sup> G Turner,<sup>1</sup> D Torgerson<sup>1</sup>  
and I Watt<sup>1,7</sup> on behalf of the EVerT team

<sup>1</sup>Department of Health Sciences, York Trials Unit, University of York, York, UK

<sup>2</sup>School of Health, University of Northampton, Northampton, UK

<sup>3</sup>University of Brighton, School of Health Professions, Division of Podiatry, Eastbourne, UK

<sup>4</sup>The National University of Ireland Galway, School of Podiatry, Galway, Ireland

<sup>5</sup>Glasgow Caledonian University, School of Health and Social Care, Glasgow, UK

<sup>6</sup>Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK

<sup>7</sup>Hull York Medical School, University of York, York, UK

\*Corresponding author



## ***Executive summary***

*Health Technology Assessment* 2011; Vol. 15: No. 32

DOI: 10.3310/hta15320

**Health Technology Assessment**  
**NIHR HTA programme**  
**[www.hta.ac.uk](http://www.hta.ac.uk)**



# Executive summary

## Objective

To compare the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of cryotherapy using liquid nitrogen versus 50% salicylic acid for the treatment of verrucae (plantar warts).

## Methods

### Design

A multicentre, pragmatic, open, two-armed randomised controlled trial was undertaken with an economic evaluation. Participants were randomised using simple randomisation, with the allocation sequence generated by a computer in a 1:1 ratio. The sample size calculation was based on the difference in cure rates at 12 weeks between the two groups. In order to give 80% power to show a difference in cure rates of 70% versus 85% required 120 patients in each group or 133 patients after allowing for 10% attrition, i.e. a total of 266.

### Setting

Participants were recruited from 14 sites in England, Scotland and Ireland: two podiatry clinics, one of which was in Scotland, four university podiatry schools, one of which was in Ireland and eight general practitioner (GP) practices in five different regions of England.

### Participants

Potential participants were identified by a health-care professional from the study site from GP referrals or self-referrals received by the podiatry or GP practice for the treatment of verrucae. Patients were eligible to participate in the trial if they presented with a verruca that, in the opinion of the health-care professional, was suitable for treatment with both salicylic acid and cryotherapy, and were aged 12 years and over.

### Interventions

Participants randomised to cryotherapy using liquid nitrogen received a maximum of four treatments, 14–21 days apart, delivered by a health-care professional. The first treatment was a gentle freeze lasting approximately 10 seconds, with subsequent treatments undertaken according to the site's usual practice. Debridement, masking and padding of the site were also undertaken according to the site's usual practice. Participants randomised to patient self-treatment with 50% salicylic acid (Verrugon, William Ransom & Son Plc, Hitchin, UK) were instructed on how to use the acid by a health-care professional and instructed to apply it once daily for a maximum of 8 weeks.

### Main outcome measures

The primary outcome was complete clearance of all verrucae at 12 weeks. Secondary outcomes were complete clearance of all verrucae at 12 weeks, controlling for age, whether or not the verrucae had been previously treated and type of verrucae, with a second model to explore the effect of patient preferences, time to clearance of verrucae, clearance of verrucae at 6 months, number of verrucae at 12 weeks and patient satisfaction with the treatment.

## Results

A total of 240 participants (90% of the sample size) were recruited to the trial, with 117 patients allocated to the cryotherapy group and 123 to the salicylic acid group. There was no evidence of a difference between the proportions of participants with complete clearance of all verrucae at 12 weeks between the salicylic acid and cryotherapy groups {14.3% vs 13.6%, chi-squared test statistic 0.02 [1 degrees of freedom (df)];  $p=0.89$ }. Cryotherapy was also associated with higher mean costs per additional healed patient [£101.17, 95% bias-corrected and accelerated confidence interval (CI) £85.09 to £117.26]. The probability of cryotherapy being cost-effective is 40% for a range of willingness-to-pay thresholds of £15,000–30,000 per patient healed. The results of the study did not change when the analysis was repeated but controlled for age, whether or not the verrucae had been previously treated and type of verrucae or patients' preferences at baseline.

There was no evidence of a difference in the clearance of verrucae at 6 months between the salicylic acid and the cryotherapy groups [30.5% vs 33.7%, chi-squared test statistic 0.22 (1 df);  $p=0.64$ ] nor in time to clearance between the two groups [hazard ratio (HR) 0.80, 95% CI 0.51 to 1.25;  $p=0.33$ ]. There was no evidence of a difference in the number of verrucae at 12 weeks between the two groups (incidence rate ratio 1.10, 95% CI 0.84 to 1.45;  $p=0.47$ ).

## Conclusions

There was no evidence of a difference in clearance rates of verrucae between the 50% salicylic acid and the cryotherapy using liquid nitrogen groups. However, the results of this study are applicable only to verrucae or plantar warts and not to warts at other sites, such as the hands, which may respond differently to cryotherapy.

The findings of this study would not be generalisable to other freezing agents, such as nitrous oxide or over-the-counter (OTC) freezing treatments, as they freeze at a higher temperature than liquid nitrogen. Nor could the results be extrapolated to other concentrations of salicylic acid available as OTC preparations, which are usually of a lower concentration, or to the treatment being applied by a health-care professional.

Cryotherapy is associated with higher mean costs per patient healed compared to salicylic acid. Both higher mean costs and lack of evidence of a difference in effectiveness result in cryotherapy having a low probability of being cost-effective, even at high (>£15,000 per patient healed) cost-effectiveness threshold values.

### *Implications for future research*

There are other treatments available for cutaneous warts, but with very little good-quality evidence assessing their effectiveness. The effectiveness of these treatments is worthy of further study.

## Trial registration

This trial is registered as ISRCTN18994246.

## Funding

This project was funded by the NIHR Health Technology Assessment programme and will be published in full in *Health Technology Assessment*; Vol. 15, No. 32. See the HTA programme website for further project information.

## Publication

Cockayne S, Curran M, Denby G, Hashmi F, Hewitt C, Hicks K, *et al.* EVerT: cryotherapy versus salicylic acid for the treatment of verrucae – a randomised controlled trial. *Health Technol Assess* 2011;**15**(32).



### **How to obtain copies of this and other HTA programme reports**

An electronic version of this title, in Adobe Acrobat format, is available for downloading free of charge for personal use from the HTA website ([www.hta.ac.uk](http://www.hta.ac.uk)). A fully searchable DVD is also available (see below).

Printed copies of HTA journal series issues cost £20 each (post and packing free in the UK) to both public **and** private sector purchasers from our despatch agents.

Non-UK purchasers will have to pay a small fee for post and packing. For European countries the cost is £2 per issue and for the rest of the world £3 per issue.

How to order:

- fax (with **credit card details**)
- post (with **credit card details** or **cheque**)
- phone during office hours (**credit card** only).

Additionally the HTA website allows you to either print out your order or download a blank order form.

### **Contact details are as follows:**

Synergie UK (HTA Department)  
Digital House, The Loddon Centre  
Wade Road  
Basingstoke  
Hants RG24 8QW

Email: [orders@hta.ac.uk](mailto:orders@hta.ac.uk)

Tel: 0845 812 4000 – ask for 'HTA Payment Services'  
(out-of-hours answer-phone service)

Fax: 0845 812 4001 – put 'HTA Order' on the fax header

### **Payment methods**

#### *Paying by cheque*

If you pay by cheque, the cheque must be in **pounds sterling**, made payable to *University of Southampton* and drawn on a bank with a UK address.

#### *Paying by credit card*

You can order using your credit card by phone, fax or post.

### **Subscriptions**

NHS libraries can subscribe free of charge. Public libraries can subscribe at a reduced cost of £100 for each volume (normally comprising 40–50 titles). The commercial subscription rate is £400 per volume (addresses within the UK) and £600 per volume (addresses outside the UK). Please see our website for details. Subscriptions can be purchased only for the current or forthcoming volume.

### **How do I get a copy of HTA on DVD?**

Please use the form on the HTA website ([www.hta.ac.uk/htacd/index.shtml](http://www.hta.ac.uk/htacd/index.shtml)). *HTA on DVD* is currently free of charge worldwide.

---

The website also provides information about the HTA programme and lists the membership of the various committees.

# NIHR Health Technology Assessment programme

The Health Technology Assessment (HTA) programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The research findings from the HTA programme directly influence decision-making bodies such as the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) and the National Screening Committee (NSC). HTA findings also help to improve the quality of clinical practice in the NHS indirectly in that they form a key component of the 'National Knowledge Service'.

The HTA programme is needs led in that it fills gaps in the evidence needed by the NHS. There are three routes to the start of projects.

First is the commissioned route. Suggestions for research are actively sought from people working in the NHS, from the public and consumer groups and from professional bodies such as royal colleges and NHS trusts. These suggestions are carefully prioritised by panels of independent experts (including NHS service users). The HTA programme then commissions the research by competitive tender.

Second, the HTA programme provides grants for clinical trials for researchers who identify research questions. These are assessed for importance to patients and the NHS, and scientific rigour.

Third, through its Technology Assessment Report (TAR) call-off contract, the HTA programme commissions bespoke reports, principally for NICE, but also for other policy-makers. TARs bring together evidence on the value of specific technologies.

Some HTA research projects, including TARs, may take only months, others need several years. They can cost from as little as £40,000 to over £1 million, and may involve synthesising existing evidence, undertaking a trial, or other research collecting new data to answer a research problem.

The final reports from HTA projects are peer reviewed by a number of independent expert referees before publication in the widely read journal series *Health Technology Assessment*.

## Criteria for inclusion in the HTA journal series

Reports are published in the HTA journal series if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the referees and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search, appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

The research reported in this issue of the journal was commissioned by the HTA programme as project number 05/513/02. The contractual start date was in October 2006. The draft report began editorial review in July 2010 and was accepted for publication in January 2011. As the funder, by devising a commissioning brief, the HTA programme specified the research question and study design. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the referees for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

Editor-in-Chief: Professor Tom Walley CBE  
Series Editors: Dr Martin Ashton-Key, Professor Aileen Clarke, Dr Tom Marshall, Professor John Powell, Dr Rob Riemsma and Professor Ken Stein  
Associate Editor: Dr Peter Davidson  
Editorial Contact: edit@southampton.ac.uk

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

ISSN 2046-4932 (DVD)

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2011. This work was produced by Cockayne *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (<http://www.publicationethics.org/>).

This journal may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NETSCC, Health Technology Assessment, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland ([www.prepress-projects.co.uk](http://www.prepress-projects.co.uk)), on behalf of NETSCC, HTA.

Printed on acid-free paper in the UK by the Charlesworth Group.