



University of  
**Salford**  
MANCHESTER

# The EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments) trial : a randomised controlled trial of needling versus nonsurgical debridement for the treatment of plantar verrucae

Hashmi, F, Fairhurst, C, Cockayne, S, Cullen, MB, Bell, K, Coleman, E, Harrison-Blount, MJ and Torgerson, D

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/bjd.15751>

<b>Title</b>	The EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments) trial : a randomised controlled trial of needling versus nonsurgical debridement for the treatment of plantar verrucae
<b>Authors</b>	Hashmi, F, Fairhurst, C, Cockayne, S, Cullen, MB, Bell, K, Coleman, E, Harrison-Blount, MJ and Torgerson, D
<b>Publication title</b>	British Journal Of Dermatology
<b>Publisher</b>	Wiley
<b>Type</b>	Article
<b>USIR URL</b>	This version is available at: <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/42625/">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/42625/</a>
<b>Published Date</b>	2017

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [library-research@salford.ac.uk](mailto:library-research@salford.ac.uk).

# The EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments 2) trial: a randomized controlled trial of needling vs. nonsurgical debridement for the treatment of plantar verrucae

F. Hashmi<sup>1</sup>, C. Fairhurst,<sup>2</sup> S. Cockayne,<sup>2</sup> M. Cullen,<sup>1</sup> K. Bell,<sup>2</sup> E. Coleman,<sup>2</sup> M. Harrison-Blount<sup>1</sup> and D. Torgerson<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Health Sciences, University of Salford, Brian Blatchford Building, Salford M6 6PU, U.K.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York Trials Unit, ARRC Building, Ground Floor, York YO10 5DD, U.K.

## Summary

### Correspondence

Farina Hashmi.

E-mail: F.Hashmi@salford.ac.uk

### Accepted for publication

15 June 2017

### Funding sources

There was no external funding associated with the project.

### Conflicts of interest

None declared.

DOI 10.1111/bjd.15751

**Background** Verrucae are a common foot skin pathology, which can in some cases persist for many years. Plantar verrucae can be unsightly and painful. There are a range of treatment options including needling.

**Objectives** The EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments 2) trial aimed to evaluate the clinical and cost-effectiveness of the needling procedure for the treatment of plantar verrucae, relative to callus debridement.

**Methods** This single-centre randomized controlled trial recruited 60 participants (aged  $\geq 18$  years with a plantar verruca). Participants were randomized 1 : 1 to the intervention group (needling) or the control group (debridement of the overlying callus). The primary outcome was clearance of the index verruca at 12 weeks after randomization. Secondary outcomes included recurrence of the verruca, clearance of all verrucae, number of verrucae, size of the index verruca, pain and participant satisfaction at 12 and 24 weeks. A cost-effectiveness analysis was carried out from the National Health Service perspective over 12 weeks.

**Results** Sixty eligible patients were randomized (needling group  $n = 29$ , 48%; debridement group  $n = 31$ , 52%) and 53 were included in the primary analysis (needling  $n = 28$ , 97%; debridement  $n = 25$ , 81%). Clearance of the index verruca occurred in eight (15%) participants (needling  $n = 4$ , 14%; debridement  $n = 4$ , 16%;  $P = 0.86$ ). The needling intervention costs were on average £14.33 (95% confidence interval 5.32–23.35) more per patient than for debridement.

**Conclusions** There is no evidence that the needling technique is more clinically or cost-effective than callus debridement. The results show a significant improvement in pain outcomes after needling compared with the debridement treatment alone.

### What's already known about this topic?

- Verrucae are notoriously difficult to treat, can last for many years and cause pain and discomfort.
- There is a lack of high-quality evidence evaluating verruca treatments, and considerable uncertainty regarding optimal treatments.
- Current common treatments of choice are salicylic acid and cryotherapy; however, although both treatments are equally effective, the clearance rate for these treatments is low (14%).

### What does this study add?

- This trial evaluated the clinical and cost-effectiveness of a needling technique, relative to callus debridement.

- There are two published studies on this treatment: a retrospective case series evaluation and a small randomized controlled trial that reports needling to be more effective than cryotherapy.
- This trial found no evidence to suggest that needling increases verruca clearance rates.
- This trial provides evidence that needling significantly reduces pain compared with callus debridement.

Plantar verrucae (or warts) are common, with prevalence rates estimated between 0.84% (U.S.A.)<sup>1</sup> and 12.9% (Russia).<sup>2</sup> A Cochrane systematic review of 21 trials for wart treatments with placebo groups<sup>3</sup> reported clearance rates that averaged 27% (range 0–73%) in the placebo groups after an average period of 15 weeks (range 4–24). While these data have led some practitioners to recommend that warts should not be treated at all,<sup>4,5</sup> patients often still seek treatment if verrucae are unsightly or painful. There is uncertainty around the optimal treatment of verrucae and a need for high-quality trials to evaluate therapies.

The Falknor needling technique,<sup>6</sup> first described in the 1960s, has recently received renewed interest as a treatment. It involves administration of a local anaesthetic and repeatedly inserting a needle into the verruca until it enters the underlying dermis and subcutaneous fat layer. The mechanical trauma to the viral tissue is believed to evoke inflammation and hence enhance the immune response in the area.<sup>7</sup> In a retrospective review of 45 patients who received needling, 31 (69%) experienced clearance of verrucae, three (7%) demonstrated a reduction in size and pain, and 11 (24%) showed no improvement 8 weeks after treatment.<sup>8</sup>

To our knowledge, there is only one published randomized controlled trial (RCT) evaluating the effectiveness of the needling procedure.<sup>9</sup> This trial randomized 37 participants to receive either needling or cryotherapy. There was a statistically significant difference in clearance of the primary verruca 12 weeks after the initial treatment: needling 65% (11 of 17) and cryotherapy 6% (one of 16);  $P = 0.001$ .

The objective of the EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments 2) trial was to evaluate the clinical and cost-effectiveness of the needling procedure compared with callus debridement for the treatment of plantar verrucae.

## Patients and methods

### Trial design

Full details of the trial design have been published elsewhere<sup>10</sup> and are provided in brief below. This was a single-centre, pragmatic, open, two-armed RCT with an economic evaluation. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Salford, Department of Health Sciences Ethical Approval Committee (HSCR15/24), and the University of York,

Department of Health Sciences Research Governance Committee (HSRGC/2014/98/B). The trial was registered with the metaRegister of Controlled Trials (ISRCTN16429440).

### Study population

Patients were eligible if they were aged  $\geq 18$  years and had a plantar verruca on weight-bearing skin that, in the opinion of the podiatrist, was suitable for both treatments. Potential participants were excluded if they were unsuitable for local anaesthesia, had impaired healing, were immunosuppressed (or taking immunosuppressant drugs), had peripheral neuropathy or renal failure requiring dialysis, were pregnant, were unable or unwilling to give informed consent, or were taking part in a trial evaluating other treatments for their verruca(e).

### Recruitment and randomization of participants

Participants were recruited between March 2015 and March 2016 from the University of Salford Podiatry Clinic. Eligible participants gave written informed consent and baseline measures were taken. They were then randomized 1 : 1 to receive needling or callus debridement immediately. A member of the research team telephoned the secure, remote randomization service at the York Trials Unit (YTU), University of York, to obtain the allocation. Block randomization with randomly permuted block sizes of two and four was used. The block size was kept secret from the recruiting clinicians.

### Interventions

Treatments were conducted by two podiatrists proficient in the needling technique who received training in trial procedures. For participants presenting with mosaic or multiple plantar verrucae, the largest and thickest lesion (the index verruca) was identified.

### Control group

The skin surrounding the index verruca was disinfected and the callus overlying the lesion was removed using a surgical blade.

## Intervention group: needling procedure

Intervention participants were treated as described for the control group, with the addition of the administration of a local anaesthetic (Scandonest 3% plain) via tibial nerve block, prior to callus debridement.

An empty surgical needle (21 gauge) was used repeatedly to puncture through the lesion to the subcutaneous tissue to produce point bleeding until there was no more resistance, or reactive pressure, from the epidermis. This was done for the whole lesion. The total number of punctures varied according to the size of the lesion. In the case of large mosaic verrucae, a section of the verruca was needled. This follows the practice reported by Longhurst and Bristow.<sup>8</sup> All participants were asked not to take anti-inflammatory drugs (such as ibuprofen) for 48 h but were permitted to take paracetamol for pain relief.

## Follow-up

Participants in the needling group attended a review appointment 1 week after the treatment, where debridement of any uncomfortable eschar was performed. Participants completed questionnaires at 1 day and 12 and 24 weeks and were invited for follow-up appointments at 12 and 24 weeks after randomization. At 12 weeks in both groups, overlying callus was debrided if the lesion was causing discomfort. At 24 weeks, if the verruca had not cleared further, alternative treatments were offered.

All participants received £20 of high-street shopping vouchers, divided equally between the 12- and 24-week appointments, to offset any incidental expenses associated with trial participation.

## Outcome measures

### Baseline assessment

Data on the participant and verruca were collected and a digital photograph of the verruca was taken (Appendix S1; see Supporting Information).

### Primary outcome

The primary outcome was clearance of the index verruca at 12 weeks after randomization as determined by blinded assessment at the site. The podiatrist (blind assessor) was asked what treatment they believed the participant had received to assess the success of the blinded review.

### Secondary outcomes

Clearance or recurrence of the treated verruca was assessed at 24 weeks. Secondary outcomes at 12 and 24 weeks included time to clearance, clearance of all verrucae, number of verrucae, size of the index verruca, pain and participant satisfaction

with treatment. Data on pain and the use of painkillers 24 h after treatment were collected.

## Sample size

The EVERT2 trial was powered at 80% to detect a difference in clearance rate of the index verruca from 30% in the debridement group to 70% in the needling group at 12 weeks after randomization. Allowing for 10% attrition, we required 58 participants to be randomized (29 to each treatment group).

## Statistical analysis

Analysis was conducted in Stata v13 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, U.S.A.) using two-sided statistical tests at the 5% significance level for the primary outcome and 1% for secondary outcomes. Available-case intention to treat was used including all participants in the groups to which they were randomized irrespectively of whether or not they received their allocated treatment. Baseline and outcome data, including adverse events, are summarized descriptively. The primary outcome was analysed using a  $\chi^2$ -test. In a sensitivity analysis, logistic regression was used to adjust the primary analysis for duration of the verruca, whether or not the verruca had been previously treated and type of verruca (mosaic/nonmosaic). These analyses were repeated replacing any missing blinded outcome data with self-reported clearance where available. Clearance of all verrucae at 12 and 24 weeks, and clearance of the index verruca at 24 weeks, were analysed via  $\chi^2$ -tests.

Cohen's kappa was used to measure the agreement of clearance between the participant and the blinded assessor at 12 and 24 weeks. Poisson regression compared the number of verrucae at 12 and 24 weeks between the treatment groups, adjusting for the number of verrucae at baseline. Self-reported time to clearance of all verrucae in days from randomization was analysed using Cox proportional hazards regression adjusting for duration of verruca, whether or not the verruca had been previously treated and type of verruca. Pain and size of the index verruca at weeks 12 and 24 were analysed via repeated measures covariance pattern models with baseline value, treatment group, time and a treatment group-by-time interaction term as fixed effects and participant as a random effect.

Total costs per participant were calculated (including all resource use and intervention costs) from the perspective of the U.K. National Health Service (NHS). A multiple imputation approach was taken to account for missing data.

## Results

Seventy-six individuals were screened and 61 (80%) were randomized (Fig. 1). One ineligible participant (allocated to the needling group) was randomized in error as they had a corn and not a verruca. Therefore, 60 eligible patients were




Fig 1. CONSORT flow diagram of participants in the EVerT2 (Effective Verruca Treatments 2) trial. YTU, York Trials Unit.

randomized: 29 (48%) to the needling group and 31 (52%) to the debridement group.

The majority of participants were female ( $n = 38$ , 63%), and the mean age was 40 years (range 19–76) (Table 1). Participants had had their verruca for a median of 3 years, and most had sought treatment previously ( $n = 47$ , 78%). The most commonly reported reason for seeking treatment was that the verruca was painful ( $n = 42$ , 70%). In general, the two groups were comparable at baseline; however, the proportions of women, patients with a mosaic verruca and patients who had sought previous treatment for their verrucae were greater in the needling group than in the debridement group, and the average pain experienced was higher.

All participants received their allocated treatment. Two participants allocated to debridement withdrew from the trial: one received debridement but later withdrew as they were not happy with the treatment group they had been allocated to and were not prepared to wait until after the trial to receive needling; and one missed their 12-week review and withdrew when invited for their 24-week appointment.

At 12 weeks, 53 (88%) participants had their index verruca assessed for clearance by a blinded assessor (needling  $n = 28$ , 97%; debridement  $n = 25$ , 81%; Table S1; see Supporting Information). Clearance of the index verruca was judged to have occurred in eight (15%) participants [needling  $n = 4$ , 14%; debridement  $n = 4$ , 16%; difference in percentage  $-1.7$ ,

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of randomized participants

Characteristic	Needling (n = 29)	Debridement (n = 31)	Total (n = 60)
Age (years)			
Mean $\pm$ SD	42.5 $\pm$ 14.2	37.1 $\pm$ 12.9	39.7 $\pm$ 13.7
Median (range)	40.4 (23.4–76.0)	36.5 (19.5–68.7)	38.1 (19.5–76.0)
Sex, n (%)			
Male	9 (31)	13 (42)	22 (37)
Female	20 (69)	18 (58)	38 (63)
Number of verrucae at baseline			
Mean $\pm$ SD	4.0 $\pm$ 3.2	4.2 $\pm$ 3.8	4.1 $\pm$ 3.5
Median (range)	3 (1–11)	3 (1–16)	3 (1–16)
Duration of verrucae (months)			
Mean $\pm$ SD	60.3 $\pm$ 53.5	56.2 $\pm$ 62.9	58.2 $\pm$ 58.1
Median (range)	48 (3–240)	36 (6–312)	36 (3–312)
Type of verrucae, n (%)			
Mosaic	5 (17)	3 (10)	8 (13)
Nonmosaic	24 (83)	28 (90)	52 (87)
Size of index verruca (mm <sup>2</sup> )			
Mean $\pm$ SD	51.9 $\pm$ 78.2	61.7 $\pm$ 123.6	56.9 $\pm$ 103.4
Median (range)	22 (2–356)	18 (4–607)	20.5 (2–607)
Previous treatment, n (%)			
Yes	25 (86)	22 (71)	47 (78)
No	4 (14)	9 (29)	13 (22)
Type of previous treatments, n (%) <sup>a</sup>			
Over the counter	22 (76)	21 (68)	43 (72)
Podiatrist	18 (62)	14 (45)	32 (53)
General practitioner	9 (31)	7 (23)	16 (27)
Other trial	0	1 (3)	1 (2)
Other <sup>b</sup>	6 (21)	1 (3)	7 (12)
Reason for seeking treatment, n (%) <sup>a</sup>			
Pain	25 (86)	17 (55)	42 (70)
Unable to go swimming	10 (34)	9 (29)	19 (32)
Unable to participate in other sports	7 (24)	7 (23)	14 (23)
Other <sup>c</sup>	10 (34)	14 (45)	24 (40)
Pain, visual analogue scale 0–100			
Mean $\pm$ SD	44.5 $\pm$ 32.3	24 $\pm$ 25.5	33.9 $\pm$ 30.5
Median (range)	50 (0–96)	13 (0–83)	28.5 (0–96)
Previous verrucae, n (%)	n = 25		n = 56
Yes	16 (64)	21 (68)	37 (66)
No	9 (36)	10 (32)	19 (34)
Number of previous verrucae	n = 16	n = 21	n = 37
Mean $\pm$ SD	4.4 $\pm$ 5.0	4.7 $\pm$ 6.5	4.5 $\pm$ 5.8
Median (range)	2 (1–20)	3 (1–30)	2 (1–30)
Age at which previous verrucae occurred (years)	n = 15	n = 22	n = 37
Mean $\pm$ SD	27.9 $\pm$ 21.0	18.5 $\pm$ 9.2	22.3 $\pm$ 15.6
Median (range)	23 (6–76)	16.5 (8–38)	18 (6–76)

Numbers of patients are given where data were unavailable for the full cohort. <sup>a</sup>More than one category could be selected for each patient.

<sup>b</sup>Self-filing/debridement (needling n = 3, debridement n = 1); duct tape (needling n = 2); hospital freeze treatment (needling n = 1).

<sup>c</sup>Aesthetics (needling n = 5, debridement n = 4); concern about passing verruca to others (needling n = 1, debridement n = 5); had it so long/want rid (needling n = 1, debridement n = 1); prevents from walking long distances (needling n = 2); invited to take part in EVERT2 trial (debridement n = 2); verruca getting worse/larger (needling n = 1, debridement n = 1); well-being (debridement n = 1).

95% confidence interval (CI)  $-21.1$ – $17.6$ ,  $P = 0.86$ ]. These eight had complete clearance of all their verrucae (four participants had one verruca at baseline; one each had two, three, four or five). There was no evidence of a difference in the likelihood of clearance between the two groups from the  $\chi^2$ -test ( $\chi^2 = 0.03$ ,  $P = 0.86$ ) or the adjusted logistic regression [odds ratio (OR) 1.10, 95% CI 0.22–5.58,  $P = 0.91$ ].

Two participants returned a 12-week participant questionnaire that included a self-assessment of clearance (both not cleared) but did not return for a clinic assessment. There was only a negligible difference in the parameter estimates and P-values when the analyses were repeated replacing the missing blinded outcome with self-reported clearance (results not presented). Of the eight participants with blinded assessed

clearance of all verrucae at 12 weeks, seven self-reported that they believed their verrucae had cleared, while one did not. Two further participants thought their verrucae had gone when they had not. The level of agreement between self-reported and blinded assessed clearance was high ( $\kappa = 0.79$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ).

At week 12, there was no evidence that the age of the verruca was associated with clearance (adjusted OR 1.0, 95% CI 0.98–1.02,  $P = 0.74$ ). Also, verrucae that had been treated previously were marginally less likely to clear than verrucae that had not been treated before, but this difference was not statistically significant (adjusted OR 0.8, 95% CI 0.12–5.28,  $P = 0.81$ ). All eight mosaic verrucae were still present at the end of the 12-week period.

At week 12, the blinded podiatrists reported that they were unable to tell which treatment the participant had received for 48 (91%) of the 53 participants assessed (needling 24 of 28, 86%; debridement 24 of 25, 96%). They believed that two needling participants had received debridement, but correctly identified the treatment for two needling participants and one debridement participant.

At 24 weeks, 49 (82%) participants had their index verruca assessed for clearance by a blinded assessor, and 11 of these (22%) were judged to have cleared (needling five of 25, 20%; debridement six of 24, 25%;  $\chi^2 = 0.18$ ,  $P = 0.68$ ). All but one of these had complete clearance of all verrucae (needling five of 25, 20%; debridement five of 24, 21%;  $\chi^2 = 0.01$ ,  $P = 0.94$ ). Where both self-reported and blinded outcome assessments of clearance were available, there was total agreement ( $\kappa = 1.00$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). One participant judged by the blinded assessors to have complete clearance did not respond to whether they thought their verrucae had all cleared, but annotated the questionnaire with 'Think it may have gone as for the last 12 weeks I have had no pain. I found it difficult to see the verruca position as it is in an awkward position'. There were no reported instances of reoccurrence between weeks 12 and 24.

The median number of verrucae at 12 weeks in the needling group was 1.5 (range 0–8) (24 weeks, median 1, range 0–8) and in the debridement group it was 2 (range 0–19) (24 weeks, median 1, range 0–11). There was no evidence of a difference in the number of verrucae at 12 weeks [incidence rate ratio (IRR) 0.89, 95% CI 0.67–1.18;  $P = 0.42$ ] or 24 weeks (IRR 0.81, 95% CI 0.50–1.31,  $P = 0.39$ ) or in time to clearance of all verrucae (hazard ratio 2.17, 95% CI 0.72–6.54,  $P = 0.17$ ) between the two groups.

Participants in the needling group reported higher levels of pain at baseline and 1 day after treatment than in the debridement group, but lower levels at 12 weeks, and also at 24 weeks when the difference was statistically significant (Table 2). There was a small-to-moderate correlation between pain and verruca size at 12 weeks ( $r = 0.37$ ) and 24 weeks ( $r = 0.15$ ). Fifteen (26%) of the 57 participants who returned a day 1 questionnaire reported using a painkiller after their treatment (all in the needling group). There was no evidence of a difference in the size of the index verruca between the two groups at 12 or 24 weeks (Table 2).

More participants in the needling group than in the debridement group said that they would be willing to have the same treatment again (82% vs. 60%) (Table 3). Most of the needling group at both 12 and 24 weeks were either happy or very happy with their treatment, whereas in the debridement group a greater number were indifferent, unhappy or very unhappy than were happy or very happy.

There were two nonserious adverse events reported, both unrelated to the trial and mild in intensity. One event was expected (pain, needling participant) and one unexpected (gastrointestinal tract yeast infection, needling participant).

### Economic evaluation

All patients received at least one treatment visit at the podiatry clinic. The mean number of treatment visits was similar between groups:  $2.14 \pm 0.74$  for the needling group ( $n = 29$ ) vs.  $1.96 \pm 0.54$  for the debridement group ( $n = 31$ ). Only one participant in each group reported visiting a general practitioner (GP) or nurse about their verrucae at the 12-week assessment. Accounting for the total number of treatment visits to the podiatry clinics, as well as additional GP/nurse visits, the needling intervention cost on average £14.33 (95% CI 5.32–23.35) more per patient compared with debridement.

### Discussion

This is the largest trial to date evaluating the clinical and cost-effectiveness of the needling technique. We found no evidence of a difference in effectiveness between needling and callus debridement in terms of clearance rates and verruca size, and an increase in cost. However, although the pain 24 h after treatment was greater in the needling group, the pain experienced at 12 and 24 weeks was reduced for this group compared with the callus debridement group. At 24 weeks this difference was statistically significant. The needling technique was found to be safe and acceptable to participants, and 82% of the needling participants stated that they would be willing to have the same treatment again. The needling treatment was associated with higher costs per cured patient. There was no difference in the likelihood of clearance between the two groups, and the needling intervention has higher costs for no additional benefit compared with debridement. Needling is thus not cost-effective compared with debridement.

Our results for clearance conflict with the findings of the only other RCT of the needling procedure by Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> This was a smaller study of 37 participants and showed a statistically significant difference in clearance rates favouring the needling group after 12 weeks, relative to cryotherapy. The clearance rate for the needling group was 65% (11 of 17), which is approximately 4.5 times greater than our corresponding rate of 14% (four of 28). Similarly, Longhurst and Bristow<sup>8</sup> reported a 69% (31 of 45) resolution of verrucae in a retrospective case series analysis. However, our results are similar to the EVerT trial, which reported a 14% cure rate for both salicylic acid treatment and cryotherapy.<sup>11</sup>

**Table 2** Verruca pain measured on a visual analogue scale, and verruca size (mm<sup>2</sup>) by randomized group and time point

	Needling (n = 29)	Debridement (n = 31)	Adjusted mean difference (95% CI); P-value
How painful is your verruca today? 0 (no pain) to 100 (worst possible pain)			
Baseline			
Mean ± SD	44.5 ± 32.3	24.0 ± 25.5	
Median (range)	50 (0–96)	13 (0–83)	–
Day 1			
		n = 28	
Mean ± SD	30.3 ± 25.6	8.8 ± 10.9	
Median (range)	21 (0–89)	4 (0–36)	–
Week 12			
		n = 26	
Mean ± SD	17.0 ± 19.6	20.4 ± 24.3	–9.64 (–20.12 to 0.85); P = 0.07
Median (range)	4 (0–67)	6 (0–78)	
Week 24			
	n = 24	n = 26	
Mean ± SD	10.9 ± 17.0	15.5 ± 21.9	–12.54 (–23.61 to –1.46); P = 0.03
Median (range)	4 (0–70)	5 (0–89)	
Size of index verruca, mm <sup>2</sup>			
Baseline			
Mean ± SD	51.9 ± 78.2	61.7 ± 123.6	
Median (range)	22 (2–356)	18 (4–607)	–
Week 12			
	n = 28	n = 24	
Mean ± SD	38.3 ± 69.0	50.8 ± 99.6	0.10 (–20.61 to 20.81); P = 0.99
Median (range)	11 (0–337)	12.5 (0–423)	
Week 24			
	n = 24	n = 22	
Mean ± SD	46.3 ± 91.6	19.0 ± 33.7	–2.79 (–34.02 to 28.43); P = 0.86
Median (range)	12.5 (0–411)	8.5 (0–145)	

Numbers of patients are given where patients had dropped out of the study or not provided data. CI, confidence interval.

**Table 3** Participant satisfaction with treatment by randomized group

	Needling (n = 29)	Debridement (n = 31)	Total (n = 60)
Would you be willing to have the same treatment again?			
Week 12, n (%)	n = 28	n = 25	n = 53
Yes	23 (82)	15 (60)	38 (72)
No	2 (7)	9 (36)	11 (21)
Don't know	3 (11)	1 (4)	4 (8)
How happy are you with your treatment?			
Week 12, n (%)	n = 29	n = 26	n = 55
Very happy	11 (38)	7 (27)	18 (33)
Happy	11 (38)	5 (19)	16 (29)
Neither happy nor unhappy	5 (17)	7 (27)	12 (22)
Unhappy	0	7 (27)	7 (13)
Very unhappy	2 (7)	0	2 (4)
Week 24, n (%)	n = 24	n = 26	n = 50
Very happy	9 (38)	7 (27)	16 (32)
Happy	7 (29)	4 (15)	11 (22)
Neither happy nor unhappy	6 (25)	10 (38)	16 (32)
Unhappy	0	5 (19)	5 (10)
Very unhappy	2 (8)	0	2 (4)

Our study followed the same treatment protocols as Longhurst<sup>8</sup> and Cunningham,<sup>9</sup> with the exception that participants in our needling group were given one treatment. Longhurst and Bristow<sup>8</sup> reported a high resolution rate (38 of 45) after one needling treatment. Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> reported a median

of 2 treatments, 5 weeks apart, and a mean of 1.61 ± 0.05 treatments, 5.08 ± 2.08 weeks apart. Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> did not report how many verrucae resolved after one or two treatments. The theory that verrucae resolve in response to localized tissue damage (which is yet to be confirmed) would suggest that this could be achieved after one needling procedure.

Data on resolution rates are unclear; therefore, if two treatments are conducted within a few weeks of each other and the verruca resolves it could be possible that the response from the first treatment is still occurring when the second treatment is administered. We therefore decided that from a trial design perspective, one treatment in each group would provide clarity in this regard. We also based our decision from an ethical perspective, as if it is likely that the verrucae may resolve after one treatment then it would not be ethical to conduct a second treatment. As this is the first large RCT to test the effects of needling on verrucae, we felt it necessary to standardize the interventions between both groups. It is possible that multiple treatments are required to stimulate the required immune response and promote clearance, and this may help explain the difference in results. The next step in the evaluation of needling treatment would be to test the number of treatments required to achieve verruca resolution. Also, the use of combination treatments could be explored, for example the use of home treatments between needling treatments.

There are also differences between the populations in our and Cunningham's trials. The mean and median ages of the



participants in our study (Table 1) are greater than those reported by Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> (mean 26.1 ± 10.0 years, median 22.5, range 18–53). Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> recruited from their university-based podiatry clinic only. However, in addition to recruiting from our university clinic, we advertised in community areas accessed by the general public, such as supermarkets, health centres, day centres, leisure centres and athletics clubs. We also placed advertisements in local newspapers and via social media accounts. We can therefore accept that we recruited from a wider population than the Cunningham study. However, there is a general opinion within the podiatry profession (based on peer discussions and not evidence) that people with tenacious verrucae opt for needling after all other treatment options have been exhausted. Our data do show that the majority of the participants (78%) had tried other treatments before participating in the trial. Cunningham *et al.*<sup>9</sup> did not report data on previous treatments in their study.

Although overall the average verruca size at baseline was similar in both trials (56.9 vs. 52.7 mm<sup>2</sup>), there is an imbalance in verruca size in the Cunningham trial, and needling participants tended to have much smaller verrucae (mean 29.1 mm<sup>2</sup>) than cryotherapy patients (75.0 mm<sup>2</sup>), which was not accounted for in the analysis. In addition, our participants tended to have had their verruca for longer than in the Cunningham cohort (mean 58 vs. 34 months), with an even bigger difference seen in the two needling groups (60 vs. 29 months). Our data showed no association between the age of the verruca and the clearance rate.

The major strength of this study is that it is of high quality. The risk of bias has been minimized due to the use of adequate randomization, allocation concealment, blinded outcome assessment and intention-to-treat analysis. Our study does have potential limitations. It was a single-centre study and therefore the results may not be applicable to patients presenting in GP practices, or NHS or private podiatry clinics.

This trial did not have a true placebo or 'no treatment' arm. It was envisaged that people would volunteer for this study to access the intervention treatment, which is not widely available in the NHS or private podiatry clinics. The risk of losing participants to follow-up would have been high if these participants were randomized into a 'no treatment' group. Therefore, we decided to offer callus debridement (which is currently the treatment provided in some NHS podiatry clinics) to maximize participant retention throughout the trial. All participants in the control group were offered a free needling treatment at the end of the trial if their verruca was still present. The use of a 'sham' needling treatment for the control group was considered; however, the trial team concluded that it would be unethical to administer a local anaesthetic if no treatment was to be given. Therefore, it is likely that the clearance we saw was due to natural history rather than any treatment effects.

In summary, the results of this trial reveal that the verruca needling treatment is no more efficacious than callus removal

and is more costly. The only significant result was in the pain outcomes, which were reduced in the needling group compared with the debridement group. The intervention was dominated by usual care in the economic evaluation, hence it is not cost-effective compared with usual care.

## Acknowledgments

The research team would like to thank the independent members of the Trial Steering/Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee, Professor Wesley Vernon OBE and Belinda Longhurst, for their advice, oversight of the study and reviewing of adverse event data. We would like to thank Sue Royle, Sue Helal and Carol Warrender for managing the administration of the participants, and the blinded assessors: Kath Parnell and Angela Wong.

## References

- 1 Johnson ML, Roberts J. Skin conditions and related need for medical care among persons 1–74 years. *US Dept Health Educ Welfare Pub* 1978; **1660**:1–26.
- 2 Beliaeva TL. [The population incidence of warts]. *Vestn Dermatol Venerol* 1990; **2**:55–8 (in Russian).
- 3 Kwok CS, Gibbs S, Bennett C *et al.* Topical treatments for cutaneous warts. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012; **9**: CD001781.
- 4 Sterling JC, Handfield-Jones S, Hudson PM. Guidelines for the management of cutaneous warts. *Br J Dermatol* 2001; **144**:4–11.
- 5 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Clinical knowledge summaries. Warts and verrucae. Available at: <https://cks.nice.org.uk/warts-and-verrucae> (last accessed 24 August 2017).
- 6 Falknor GW. Needling – a new technique in verruca therapy. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc* 1969; **59**:51–2.
- 7 Liebl H, Kloth LC. Skin cell proliferation stimulated by microneedles. *J Am Coll Clin Wound Spec* 2012; **25**:2–6.
- 8 Longhurst B, Bristow I. The treatment of verrucae pedis using Falknor's needling method: a review of 46 cases. *J Clin Med* 2013; **2**:13–21.
- 9 Cunningham DJ, Brimage JT, Naraghi RN *et al.* Needling versus liquid nitrogen cryotherapy for the treatment of pedal warts. Randomized controlled pilot study. *J Am Podiatr Med Assoc* 2014; **104**:394–401.
- 10 Hashmi F, Torgerson D, Fairhurst F *et al.* EVerT2 – needling versus non-surgical debridement for the treatment of verrucae: study protocol for a single-centre randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open* 2015; **5**:e009406.
- 11 Cockayne S, Curran M, Denby G *et al.* EVerT: cryotherapy versus salicylic acid for the treatment of verrucae – a randomised controlled trial. *Health Technol Assess* 2011; **15**:1–170.

## Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's website:

**Appendix S1** Protocol for taking photographs.

**Table S1** Baseline characteristics of randomized participants included in the primary analysis (n = 53).