

# A randomised trial of human papillomavirus (HPV) testing in primary cervical screening

<b>Submission date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 25/04/2003	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 29/10/2021	<b>Condition category</b> Cancer	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

## Plain English summary of protocol

<http://cancerhelp.cancerresearchuk.org/trials/does-an-hpv-test-as-well-as-a-cervical-smear-test-improve-screening-for-cervical-cancer>

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Scientific

### Contact name

Prof Henry C Kitchener

### Contact details

Academic Unit of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Reproductive Healthcare  
University of Manchester  
St Mary's Hospital  
Whitworth Park  
Manchester  
United Kingdom  
M13 0JH  
+44 (0)161 276 6646  
[henry.c.kitchener@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:henry.c.kitchener@manchester.ac.uk)

## Additional identifiers

### Protocol serial number

HTA 98/04/99; HTA 98/04/64

## Study information

Scientific Title

# A randomised trial of human papillomavirus (HPV) testing in primary cervical screening

## Acronym

ARTISTIC

## Study objectives

1. To study a randomised population of women undergoing cytological screening in whom an HPV test result is revealed with a smaller cohort in whom the result is concealed.
2. To study the psychological and psychosexual differences between corresponding cytological groups in the two study arms.
3. To study the economic benefits or otherwise of HPV testing.
4. To study the predictive ability of HPV testing positive or negative in the presence of normal cytology in terms of future risk, and screening intervals.
5. To see if HPV testing achieves a more efficient protocol following "inadequate" smears and low grade smears.
6. To evaluate the relevance of viral persistence and load in predicting risk.
7. To evaluate sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value of HPV testing.
8. To compare the results of different HPV testing methods in terms of objective 7 and also to examine interlaboratory variation.

More details can be found at: <http://www.hta.ac.uk/1162>

Protocol can be found at: <http://www.nchta.org/protocols/199800040064.pdf>

Updated 14/01/2008: the anticipated start and end dates of this trial were updated from 01/04/2000 and 31/03/2006 to 01/06/2001 and 30/11/2009, respectively.

Updated 30/09/2013: the NIHR has awarded funding to extend the follow-up of this trial until 2015. This will be done by linkage with national screening and cancer registration records without recontacting patients.

## Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

## Ethics approval(s)

North West Multi-centre Research Ethics Committee, approved on 18/08/2000 (ref: MREC 00/8/30)

## Study design

Pragmatic randomised controlled trial

## Primary study design

Interventional

## Study type(s)

Screening

## Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Cervical cancer

## Interventions

Women who are attending for cervical screening, all of whom will have a smear and an HPV test, will be individually randomised in a ratio of 3:1 to a study arm (HPV test revealed) and a control arm (HPV test concealed). The control arm will be managed by routine clinical practice as per national guidelines with a rescreen and HPV test at 3 years.

1. High grade smears (HPV +ve or -ve) - routine management (colposcopy)
2. Low grade smears (HPV +ve) - routine management (colposcopy)
3. Low grade smears (HPV -ve) - repeat smear at 6/12. If abnormal, colposcopy
4. Normal smears (HPV +ve) - repeat HPV test at 12/12. If persistent HPV +ve, patient choice between colposcopy and surveillance
5. Normal smears (HPV -ve) - rescreen at 36/12. Colposcope 500 volunteers to address true sensitivity.

### **Intervention Type**

Other

### **Phase**

Not Applicable

### **Primary outcome(s)**

1. Reduction of high and low grade smears in the HPV revealed arm, at the next screening round
2. The difference in psychological and psychosexual outcomes in the HPV revealed arm as a consequence of knowledge of the HPV test result
3. Cost: the number of women experiencing the cost generating events (cytology, HPV test, colposcopy, biopsy and treatment and ad hoc primary care consultations) will be identified and the associated unit costs will be estimated and attached to these events to determine total costs in each arm. Cost effectiveness will be presented as an incremental cost per additional high grade smear detected, and as an incremental cost per life year gained and per quality adjusted life year gained (estimated by extrapolating from the trial endpoint using modelling techniques).

### **Key secondary outcome(s)**

Not provided at time of registration

### **Completion date**

01/01/2015

## **Eligibility**

### **Key inclusion criteria**

Women aged 20-64 weighted by age bands to achieve a spread of HPV positives across the age range.

### **Participant type(s)**

Patient

### **Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

### **Age group**

Adult

**Sex**

Female

**Total final enrolment**

24510

**Key exclusion criteria**

Not provided at time of registration

**Date of first enrolment**

01/06/2001

**Date of final enrolment**

01/01/2015

## **Locations**

**Countries of recruitment**

United Kingdom

England

**Study participating centre**

Academic Unit of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Reproductive Healthcare

Manchester

United Kingdom

M13 0JH

## **Sponsor information**

**Organisation**

University of Manchester (UK)

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/027m9bs27>

## **Funder(s)**

**Funder type**

Government

**Funder Name**

NIHR Health Technology Assessment Programme - HTA (UK)

## Results and Publications

**Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan**

Not provided at time of registration

**IPD sharing plan summary**

Not provided at time of registration

**Study outputs**

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Results article</a>	main results	01/07/2009		Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results on cost effectiveness and psychosocial effects	01/11/2009		Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	extended follow-up results	01/04/2011		Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	extended follow-up results	01/04/2014		Yes	No
<a href="#">Protocol article</a>	protocol	01/02/2010		Yes	No
<a href="#">Plain English results</a>		08/09/2009	29/10/2021	No	Yes