

## **Treatment of severe ankle sprain: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial comparing the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of three types of mechanical ankle support with tubular bandage. The CAST trial**

MW Cooke,<sup>1\*</sup> JL Marsh,<sup>2</sup> M Clark,<sup>1</sup>  
R Nakash,<sup>1</sup> RM Jarvis,<sup>1</sup> JL Hutton,<sup>2</sup>  
A Szczepura,<sup>1</sup> S Wilson<sup>3</sup> and SE Lamb,<sup>1</sup>  
on behalf of the CAST trial group

<sup>1</sup>Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Warwick, UK

<sup>3</sup>The Medical School, University of Birmingham, UK

\*Corresponding author



### ***Executive summary***

*Health Technology Assessment* 2009; Vol. 13: No. 13

DOI: 10.3310/hta13130

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





## Executive summary

### Background

The optimal treatment for severe ankle sprains is unclear. Potential treatments include no intervention, physiotherapy, different types of supports, immobilisation and surgical repair of the ligaments. Recent systematic reviews highlight a lack of good-quality evidence to aid clinical decision-making. There is a need for well-conducted and adequately powered randomised controlled trials of the effectiveness of different clinical approaches.

### Objectives

Objectives were, first, to estimate the clinical effectiveness of three different methods of ankle support [below knee cast, Aircast® ankle brace (DJO Incorporated, Vista, CA) and Bledsoe® boot (Bledsoe Boot Systems, Grand Prairie, TX)] in comparison with double layer tubular compression bandage in terms of recovery of function (primary outcome), recovery of normal occupation (secondary outcome) and avoidance of residual symptoms including recurrent instability, lasting limitation of physical activity and need for further medical, rehabilitation or surgical treatment (secondary outcomes); and, second, to measure the cost-effectiveness of each strategy, including treatment and subsequent health-care costs.

### Design

A pragmatic randomised controlled trial was designed to reflect a model of practice used in the majority of UK hospital emergency departments. It included an integral evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the different therapies. A total of 584 participants were recruited and randomised to one of four treatment arms: tubular bandage, below knee cast (10 days), Aircast brace or Bledsoe boot. Follow-up was by postal questionnaire at 4 weeks, 12 weeks and 9 months, with response rates of 83%, 82% and 76% respectively.

### Participants

Participants aged 16 or over with acute severe ankle sprain, unable to weight bear, with no fracture, were recruited from eight emergency departments across the UK.

### Intervention

Treatments were applied 2–3 days after presentation to allow time for swelling to resolve. Participants were given written and verbal instructions regarding the use of supports. Instructions were standardised across all centres and derived from a combination of the manufacturer's recommendations, results of a national survey carried out to inform the design of the trial, and current clinical guidelines.

### Main outcome measures

A disease-specific measure [Foot and Ankle Outcome Score (FAOS)] and generic measures [Functional Limitations Profile (FLP), short form questionnaire with 12 items (SF-12) and EuroQol 5 dimensions (EQ-5D)] were used to assess the response to treatment, and information was gathered to assess resource use.

### Results

After adjustment for age, sex and baseline score, the below knee cast offered a small but statistically significant benefit at 4 weeks in terms of pain, foot- and ankle-related quality of life (QoL), and the physical component score of the SF-12. Neither the Aircast brace nor the Bledsoe boot was statistically significantly or clinically different from tubular bandage.

At 12 weeks, and in comparison with tubular bandage, the below knee cast was statistically

significantly better in terms of pain, activities of daily living, return to sports and QoL. Calculation of effect sizes suggests that these benefits were small to moderate, depending on the domain of outcome. The Aircast brace was associated with clinically and statistically significant changes in ankle-related QoL and mental health but not in other domains. The Bledsoe boot conferred no significant advantage over tubular bandage.

By 9 months there were no significant differences between the three comparator supports and tubular bandage for any outcome measure.

## Economic evaluation results

Mean direct health-care costs per participant indicated that the Bledsoe boot was the most expensive support (£215 including fitting), with tubular bandage the least expensive (£1.44); Aircast (£39.23) was more expensive than the below knee cast (£16.46). Inclusion of indirect costs (sick leave) raised overall costs substantially, resulting in no significant difference between the groups.

Cost–utility analysis, comparing incremental costs with the differential impact on health-related quality of life over 9 months, demonstrated that the Aircast brace [£301 per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY)] and below knee cast (£339 per QALY) were more cost-effective than the Bledsoe boot (£2116 per QALY). Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves confirmed that the Bledsoe boot was least cost-effective and that the Aircast brace and below knee cast differences were broadly similar.

Inclusion of indirect costs produced different rank orders depending on the assumptions made; results should be treated with some caution.

## Conclusions

Ankle sprains with an inability to weight bear have a prolonged recovery. The prognosis should be cautious, explaining that the injury, independent of treatment, has a significant risk of some disability in the form of symptoms, limitations of mobility or activities at 9 months.

Such patients, initially treated with 2–3 days of elevation, ice and non-weight-bearing exercise, had a more rapid resolution of symptoms and return to normal activities in the first 3 months when treated

with a below knee cast for 10 days than when treated with tubular bandage.

By 9 months all treatments were equally effective. Mental health deteriorated in the early stages of recovery but returned to normal by 12 weeks. The study suggests that choice of treatment may affect speed of recovery but not long-term outcome.

## Implications for health care

Two devices appeared to offer cost-effective alternatives to tubular bandage: the below knee cast and the Aircast brace. The below knee cast resulted in the fastest recovery and higher levels of sporting function and overall quality of recovery by 3 months. There were no differences in long-term outcome and the decision about which brace to apply should incorporate an assessment of likely compliance and acceptability to patients.

## Recommendations for research

1. The role of physiotherapy is not known in these injuries. In view of the poor prognosis in relatively active people, the effects of a regime of physiotherapy during and after the period of functional support or as an alternative to immobilisation should be investigated.
2. There are still no adequately powered studies of less severe ankle sprains.
3. In the UK, anticoagulants are not routinely used in lower limb injury, whereas this is standard practice in most of mainland Europe. More research is needed to determine the risk–benefit of such strategies.

## Trial registration

This trial is registered as ISRCTN37807450.

## Publication

Cooke MW, Marsh JL, Clark M, Nakash R, Jarvis RM, Hutton JL, *et al.*, on behalf of the CAST trial group. Treatment of severe ankle sprain: a pragmatic randomised controlled trial comparing the clinical effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of three types of mechanical ankle support with tubular bandage. The CAST trial. *Health Technol Assess* 2009;13(13).

# 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 01/14/10. The contractual start date was in November 2002. The draft report began editorial review in July 2006 and was accepted for publication in July 2007. 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

Series Editors:

Dr Aileen Clarke, Dr Peter Davidson, Dr Chris Hyde, Dr John Powell,  
Dr Rob Riemsma and Professor Ken Stein

ISSN 1366-5278

© 2009 Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO

This monograph 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: NCCHTA, Alpha House, Enterprise Road, Southampton Science Park, Chilworth, 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 NCCHTA.

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