

Epidemiological Trends and Economic Burden of Genital Warts in Dutch Primary Care

Veijer C¹, Bes J², Dolk C³, Postma MJ^{1,4,5,6}, de Jong LA¹

¹ Department of Health Sciences, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

² Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research (Nivel), Utrecht, The Netherlands

³ MSD Nederland, Haarlem, The Netherlands

⁴ Department of Economics, Econometrics and Finance, Faculty of Economics & Business, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

⁵ Center of Excellence in Higher Education for Pharmaceutical Care Innovation, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia

⁶ Department of Pharmacology and Therapy, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

Corresponding author: L.A. de Jong, l.d.jong@umcg.nl

Funding: This study was funded by Merck Sharp & Dohme LLC, a subsidiary of Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, NJ, USA

Conflict of interest: CV, JB, and LJ do not report any conflicts of interest. CD is an employee of MSD the Netherlands who may own stock and/or hold stock options in Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, NJ, USA. MJP reports grants and honoraria from various pharmaceutical companies, inclusive those potentially interested in the subject matter of this paper.

Author contributions: CV analysed the data and wrote the manuscript in consultation with LAdJ. LAdJ supervised the project. JB, CD, MJP and LAdJ provided critical comments on the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version.

1 Abstract

2 Background

3 This study aims to describe the epidemiological trends and estimate the economic burden of genital
4 warts (GW) in Dutch primary care.

5 Methods

6 A retrospective, non-interventional, multiyear study (2011-2021) was performed using data from the
7 Nivel Primary Care Database. Changes in incidence by age group, sex, and level of urbanisation of
8 individuals with GW and associated healthcare resource use (general practitioner consultations,
9 prescribed medication, and referrals) were estimated over the 11-year period. Total annual
10 healthcare costs and cost per incident case were estimated via a bottom-up gross costing approach.

11 Results

12 Between 2011 and 2021, GW incidence increased, which was especially seen in men (from 2.0 to 3.5
13 per 1 000 inhabitants) and to a lesser extent in women (from 1.9 to 2.1 per 1 000 inhabitants). GW
14 incidence was most common in age group 20-29 years (men: 43.6%; women: 50.7%) and highly
15 urbanised areas. Medication was prescribed in 61.4% of GW cases, and 5.4% of GW patients were
16 referred to secondary care. Total costs in Dutch primary care increased by 108% from EUR 2.3 million
17 in 2011 to EUR 4.9 million in 2021. The cost per incident case also showed an increasing trend from
18 EUR 72 in 2011 to EUR 99 in 2021. Referrals to secondary care resulted in a 14-30% increase of total
19 costs.

20 Conclusions

21 This study provides novel insights into recent epidemiological trends of GW and its associated costs
22 in Dutch primary care. Incidence especially increased among men and total annual costs of GW in
23 primary care doubled between 2011 and 2021.

24 **Keywords:** genital warts; healthcare resources, human papilloma virus; economic burden.

1 Introduction

2 Understanding the epidemiological trends and economic burden of a disease is essential when
3 planning preventive measures and efficiently allocating healthcare resources. Especially in the field of
4 infectious diseases, it is useful to evaluate which preventive measures effectively counteract the root
5 cause of disease transmission. One such disease concerns the highly infectious and one of the most
6 common viral sexually transmissible diseases worldwide: genital warts (GW; *condylomata*
7 *acuminata*).

8 GW are benign epithelial skin lesions predominantly caused by an infection with non-oncogenic
9 human papillomavirus (HPV) subtypes 6 and 11 [1]. Worldwide incidence rates range between 100
10 and 200 new cases per 100 000 general adult population, and peak at the age of 15-29 years [2]. The
11 majority of cases are asymptomatic and transient, though recurrence of the self-limiting disease after
12 initial clearance or beyond treatment is common [3]. Treatment options consist of home-based
13 therapy, including self-applied topical treatments podophyllotoxin, imiquimod, and sinecatechins,
14 and clinic-based therapy, including chemical treatments and ablative techniques, such as
15 electrotherapy, cryotherapy, and laser therapy [1].

16 Apart from pharmaceutical treatment against GW, a number of preventive therapies exists and are
17 globally used to prevent certain HPV-related diseases. Currently, three prophylactic vaccines are
18 licensed in the European Union, all targeting a different range of HPV types: the bivalent vaccine,
19 Cervarix® (targeting HPV types 16/18), the quadrivalent recombinant vaccine, Gardasil® (targeting
20 HPV types 6/11/16/18), and the nonavalent vaccine, Gardasil 9® (targeting HPV types
21 6/11/16/18/31/33/45/52/58). As of 2010, the Netherlands started routine HPV vaccination for girls
22 only using the bivalent vaccine, which does not provide protection against the HPV types 6/11
23 causing GW [4].

24 There is limited data on epidemiology, healthcare resource use (HCRU), and costs of GW in scientific
25 literature. In recent years, a few national studies have described epidemiological trends and have

1 estimated the economic burden of GW [5-11]. Outcome measures differ substantially across these
2 analyses, as well as applied methodologies (e.g. Delphi panel versus physician survey), costing
3 methods (bottom-up micro-costing approach versus claims data), and study setting. Although
4 objectives of the studies are comparable, the methodological variations hamper the generalisability
5 of results to a specific country's context.

6 In the Netherlands, the last national study on the economic burden of GW was published two
7 decades ago by van der Meijden *et al.*, who retrospectively analysed treatment patterns, resource
8 use, and costs per patient [12]. The study however did not report any incidence or prevalence
9 estimates of GW in the Netherlands, and population-level costs were not considered. In recent years,
10 new GW incidence rates are roughly estimated at 46 000 episodes per year in the Dutch population,
11 though details on HCRU and costs are lacking [13]. The current study aims to describe the
12 epidemiological trends of patients with GW in terms of age, sex, and level of urbanisation, and to
13 estimate the HCRU and economic burden of GW in the Netherlands.

1 Methodology

2 Study design and setting

3 A retrospective, non-interventional, multiyear study was performed, using electronic health record
4 (EHR) data that is routinely recorded by general practitioners (GPs) who participate to the Nivel
5 Primary Care Database (Nivel-PCD), to calculate epidemiological trends and the economic burden of
6 GW between 2011 and 2021 in the Netherlands [14]. This study was approved by the relevant
7 governance bodies of Nivel-PCD (nr. NZR00322.032). According to Dutch legislation, obtaining neither
8 informed consent nor approval by a medical ethics committee is obligatory for this kind of
9 observational study [15].

10 Study population

11 Patients were included if they have been diagnosed at the GP between 2011 and 2021 with
12 *Condylomata accuminata*, based on a registration of the International Classification of Primary Care
13 (ICPC-1) codes Y76 (men) or X91 (women) [16]. Numbers were extrapolated to the total Dutch
14 population based on age, sex, and level of urbanisation. The average number of inhabitants at
15 January 1 of the relevant year was used to calculate each year's population [17].

16 Outcome measures and analysis

17 Epidemiological (i.e. incidence) and HCRU data (i.e. GP consultations, prescribed drug treatments,
18 and referrals to secondary care) were obtained from the Nivel-PCD, comprising routinely recorded
19 data from EHRs of approximately 500 general practices in the Netherlands (10%) [14]. Routinely
20 recorded data from GPs are an important source of information, as every citizen is registered with a
21 GP and GPs act as gatekeepers in the Dutch healthcare system. The economic burden was calculated
22 by multiplying the HCRU data by unit costs. Unit costs were obtained from various publicly available
23 sources and are described in detail below. Costs were calculated in Microsoft Excel (Microsoft
24 Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA). Data visualisations were produced using Microsoft Power BI
25 (version 2.121.903.0).

1 To avoid false accuracy, estimates that were based on low numbers were replaced by '<100' for
2 absolute and '<0.1' for relative frequencies before being transferred to Excel. In the analysis, these
3 values were imputed by 50 and 0.05 for absolute and relative frequencies, respectively. This was only
4 applicable to data clustered by age group.

5 **Epidemiology**

6 Epidemiology measures included incident cases of GW reported at the GP. Incidence is defined as the
7 number of new disease episodes of GW presented at the GP in the relevant year and is reported per
8 1 000 inhabitants per year. A disease episode was defined as the period between the date of
9 diagnosis and the time of the last encounter plus half of the duration of the contact-free interval. The
10 contact-free interval was defined as the period in which it is likely a patient will visit the GP again if
11 symptoms persist. For GW, the contact-free interval was 16 weeks [18]. Incidence was clustered by
12 sex (men; women), age group (six categories: 0-19; 20-29; 30-39; 40-49; 50-69; ≥70 years), and level
13 of urbanisation (cities: areas with > 1 500 home addresses/km²; towns and semi-dense areas: areas
14 with 1 000 to 1 500 home addresses/km²; rural areas: areas with < 1 000 home addresses/km²).

15 **Healthcare resource use**

16 GP consultations were clustered by sex, type of consultation, and year. As of January 2019, the
17 categorisation of GP consultation types changed to better cover the increasing trends in
18 consultations by phone and email (SupMat_table1) [19]. Prescribed medication was clustered by sex
19 and year for each type of medication (podophyllotoxin, imiquimod, and sinecatechins). Prescriptions
20 were available as the number of prescriptions per incident case with a prescription and as a
21 percentage of the total number of incident cases. Data on referrals to secondary care were available
22 from 2015 to 2021 and were stratified by type of medical specialty per year.

23 **Economic burden**

24 The cost analysis used a healthcare payer's perspective, including direct medical costs only. Costs
25 were calculated using a bottom-up gross costing approach, in which absolute HCRU data were

1 multiplied by unit costs [20]. An overview of unit costs in Euros per year is provided in Supplementary
2 Materials.

3 Costs of GP consultations were derived from reference prices per consultation type from the Dutch
4 costing manual for economic evaluations in healthcare [21]. The costing manual differentiated GP
5 consultations by two types: standard GP consultation and telephone consultation. The Nivel-PCD
6 data on the number of consultations, though, were differentiated by more than two types
7 (SupMat_table1). Therefore, the cost of telephone consultations were used for email consultations
8 as well, whereas the cost of standard consultation was used for the other types of consultations.

9 Costs of prescribed medication consist of costs for the pharmacy to purchase the drug, as well as
10 costs incurred as pharmacy service charge (prescription fee) [22]. Pharmacy purchase prices were
11 obtained from the *G-Standaard* [23]. Prices of medication products for GW were selected on the
12 relevant Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification and included Condylin® (D06BB04 –
13 podophyllotoxin solution for men), Wartec® (D06BB04 – podophyllotoxin cream for women [24]),
14 Aldara® (D06BB10 – imiquimod), and Veregen® (D06BB12 – sinecatechins, introduced in 2012) [25].
15 The pharmacy service charge was based on the 2020 tariffs for first-time and standard dispensing as
16 reported by the Foundation for Pharmaceutical Statistics (*Stichting Farmaceutische Kengetallen, SFK*)
17 [26]. A weighed prescription fee per year was calculated using the average number of prescriptions
18 per patient. Since costs of GP consultations and prescription fees were not available for each year,
19 these were converted to each specific price year (2011-2021) using the consumer price index from
20 Statistics Netherlands [27].

21 Costs of a referral to a secondary care specialist were based on average selling prices of different
22 hospital products within the relevant diagnosis group of the Dermatology and Venerology specialty
23 ('*diagnose 21 – SOA*') [28]. Prices were obtained from the '*Diagnose Behandel Combinatie-*
24 *informatiesysteem*' dataset (a Dutch variant of the Diagnosis-Related Group [DRG] system) of the
25 Dutch healthcare authority (*Nederlandse Zorgautoriteit, NZa*) for secondary care costs [23, 28]. The


- 1 annual average price per referral visit was calculated by multiplying the share of patients within the
- 2 diagnosis group by the average selling price per care product that is included in the relevant care
- 3 product group (*'Infecties met hoofdzakelijk seksuele overdracht'*).

1 Results

2 Epidemiology

3 In the Netherlands, an increase in incidence of GW diagnosed at the GP was observed between 2011
4 (2.0 per 1 000 inhabitants) and 2021 (2.8 per 1 000 inhabitants). Over the 11-year period, more men
5 than women were newly diagnosed with GW, and the difference increased steadily over time. Male
6 incidence per 1 000 inhabitants increased by 1.5 (2011: 2.0; 2021: 3.5), while female incidence per 1
7 000 inhabitants increased by 0.3 (2011: 1.9; 2021: 2.2) (Figure 1a). As shown in Figure 1b and
8 SupMat_figure1, incident cases diagnosed at the GP were highest in the 20-29 age group in both
9 sexes (men: 43.6%; women: 50.7%). Incidence across age groups remained stable over the study
10 period. The proportion of men was higher in all age groups except for the youngest age group (0-19
11 years). Considering incidence of GW by level of urbanisation, incident cases were highest in cities,
12 followed by towns/semi-dense areas and rural areas (11-year averages of 3.3, 2.1, and 1.5 per 1 000
13 inhabitants, respectively) (Figure 1c). This distribution remained relatively stable over the years.

1



2

3 *Figure 1 Epidemiology measures of genital warts (GW) based on routinely recorded data from general practitioners (GPs)*
 4 *in the Netherlands between 2011 and 2021. A) Incidence per 1000 inhabitants by sex per year; B) Mean incidence per 1*
 5 *000 inhabitants over the period 2011-2021 by sex and age group (reported cases for women in the age group '≥70 years'*
 6 *could not be retrieved because of very low numbers and were imputed by 0.05 per 1 000 inhabitants); C) Incidence per 1 000*
 7 *inhabitants by level of urbanisation per year.*

1 Healthcare resource use

2 The number of GP consultations per incident case increased from 1.3 in 2011 to 1.6 in 2021 (average:
3 1.4; men: 1.3; women: 1.5) (Figure 2). On average, 61.4% of GW cases received a prescription for at
4 least one topical treatment (men: 64.0%; women: 58.1%) (Figure 3). Of the total number of
5 prescriptions, podophyllotoxin was the most commonly prescribed type of medication (80.6%),
6 followed by imiquimod (16.1%) and sinecatechins (3.4%) (Figure 4a). The average number of
7 prescriptions per incident case that received a prescription was 1.4 for podophyllotoxin, 1.5 for
8 imiquimod, and 1.5 for sinecatechins (Figure 4b). In the period 2015–2021, on average 5.4% of
9 incident cases were referred to a secondary care specialist. The majority of referrals was made to a
10 dermatologist (75.5%), followed by a specialist at the obstetrics and gynaecology department (17.6%)
11 (SupMat_table3).



Figure 2 General practitioner (GP) consultations per incident case of genital warts in the Netherlands by sex.




Figure 3 Incident cases of genital warts with a medication prescription as percentage of the total number of incident cases of genital warts in the Netherlands by sex and year.




Figure 4 Medication prescriptions for incident cases of genital warts (GW) based on routinely recorded data from general practitioners (GPs) in the Netherlands between 2011 and 2021. A) Prescriptions per type of medication as a percentage of the total number of prescriptions per year for incident cases of GW; B) Prescriptions per incident case of GW with a prescription by type of medication.

1 Economic burden

2 Annual total cost in primary care for GW increased from EUR 2.3 million in 2011 to EUR 4.9 million in
3 2021. Total costs including costs related to referrals to secondary care increased from EUR 3.9 million
4 in 2015 to EUR 5.8 million in 2021. Costs of GW per year increased by 14 – 30% after adding costs of
5 referrals to secondary care. As of 2015, GP consultations made up the majority of total costs (47.4%),
6 followed by prescribed medication costs (36.6%), and referrals to secondary care (16.0%). Costs per
7 incident case also increased (Table 1). In primary care the cost per case increased from EUR 71.80 in
8 2011 to EUR 98.76 in 2021. The cost per case including referrals to secondary care increased from
9 EUR 93.29 in 2015 to EUR 117.40 in 2021.

Table 1. Direct medical costs of GW per year and costs per incident case of GW per year for only primary care as well as both primary care and referrals to secondary care. Data on referrals to secondary care were available from 2015 to 2021. Abbreviations: GP = general practitioner; GW = genital warts.

Year	Primary care				Primary care and referrals to secondary care		
	GP consultations (€)	Prescribed medication (€)	Total primary care (€)	Costs per GW case in primary care (€)	Referrals to secondary care (€)	Total including secondary care (€)	Costs per GW case including secondary care (€)
2011	1,297,062	1,052,498	2,349,560	71.80	-	-	-
2012	1,342,027	1,147,382	2,489,409	69.95	-	-	-
2013	1,613,942	1,312,144	2,926,086	74.79	-	-	-
2014	1,816,489	1,732,373	3,548,862	85.12	-	-	-
2015	1,870,226	1,523,172	3,393,399	81.15	507,364	3,900,762	93.29
2016	1,705,341	1,539,553	3,244,895	78.70	670,860	3,915,754	94.98
2017	2,019,494	2,066,432	4,085,927	90.05	821,403	4,907,330	108.15
2018	2,290,774	1,851,250	4,142,024	84.79	1,246,209	5,388,233	110.29
2019	2,627,105	1,754,582	4,381,687	92.72	680,345	5,062,033	107.11
2020	2,734,133	1,897,807	4,631,941	97.54	642,626	5,274,566	111.08
2021	2,995,797	1,901,086	4,896,883	98.76	924,745	5,821,628	117.40

1 Discussion

2 This study is the first analysis of HCRU and associated costs of GW in the Netherlands. Between 2011
3 and 2021, the incidence of GW in the Netherlands recorded by GPs gradually increased, especially
4 among men. HCRU of GW cases increased accordingly, and total costs increased mainly due to higher
5 incidence and higher medical costs. In general, the results represent a rising trend in economic
6 burden of GW in primary care. Although a minority of new GW cases were referred by the GP to a
7 secondary care specialist (on average 5.4% of patients), the addition of secondary care costs to
8 primary care costs revealed that these are a substantial part of total costs of GW care.

9 The increase of incident cases was especially present in men. A recently published report by the
10 RIVM based on Nivel-PCD data showed similar trends: the number of episodes of GW in men
11 increased from 2017 through 2021, while the number of episodes for women remained relatively
12 stable [13]. Nonetheless, the reporting rates presented in the RIVM report were extrapolated to the
13 total number of Dutch residents aged 15-64, in contrast to an extrapolation to the whole Dutch
14 population as was done in our analysis. Since the numerators across both studies are different, a
15 valid comparison of the number of episodes cannot be made.

16 The question can be asked whether the diverging incidence between men and women may be
17 explained by the protective effect of HPV vaccination. Although HPV-6/11 are phylogenetically not
18 closely related to the oncogenic types, there is an ongoing debate about the protective effect of HPV
19 vaccination against GW. A Dutch cohort study estimated vaccine effectiveness six years after
20 vaccination and did not find an effect of the bivalent vaccine against HPV-6/11 infections [29]. This
21 finding was consistent with several other studies, in which no cross-protective effect on genital HPV-
22 6/11 positivity was observed [30-33]. In contrast, a large population-based study in the Netherlands
23 observed a partially protective effect of 23-40% against GW in women fully vaccinated with the
24 bivalent vaccine compared to unvaccinated women [4]. This was in line with two previous studies
25 performed in the United Kingdom, including the results from the largest randomized controlled trial

1 of the bivalent HPV vaccine [34, 35]. However, findings of a large meta-analysis by Drolet et al.
2 including these studies concluded that—although in some younger women the risk on GW seems
3 lower after bivalent vaccination—there were no significant changes in anogenital warts diagnoses
4 between the pre- and post-vaccination periods of the bivalent vaccine [36]. Other recent studies also
5 reported no decrease in HPV-6/11 prevalence following bivalent vaccine introduction [37, 38]. Thus,
6 based on the currently available literature, the diverging incidence between both sexes as observed
7 here cannot conclusively be explained by the protective effect of bivalent vaccination.

8 Not unexpectedly, incidence of GW according to the level of urbanisation was found to be highest in
9 cities. In general, people living in highly urbanised areas are younger and likely have more interaction
10 than those living outside these areas. A consistently higher incidence of STIs in highly urbanised areas
11 compared to less urbanised areas was also reported in a Nivel report on newly STI-related GP
12 consultations [39].

13 Our analysis included data from the first two years of the COVID-19 pandemic (2020-2021).
14 Potentially fewer GP consultations due to limited access to healthcare services could have impacted
15 GW related incidence and costs. However, incidence and costs did not decrease during these two
16 years compared to the preceding years in the analysis. In fact, GW incidence increased in 2020 and
17 2021 for men. As such, no conclusive effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on GW related incidence and
18 costs could be determined.

19 Medication was prescribed in 61.4% of newly diagnosed GW cases between 2011 and 2021.
20 Prescription rates over the years were consistently higher for men than for women (men: 64.0%;
21 women: 58.1%; at least one prescription per year), which might potentially be explained by the
22 location of the warts. For men, warts are usually situated at the external genital regions, whereas for
23 women, GW more often appear internally, making self-applied treatment less suitable [40].

24 Total costs were highest in the final year of the analysis, while the largest annual change in costs was
25 observed in 2017. Apart from a rising number in incidence and subsequent GP consultations, drug

1 costs also increased due to price changes. The average pharmacy purchase price of the
2 podophyllotoxin solution increased by 30.8% within one year (2016: EUR 15.38; 2017: EUR 20.13). In
3 2018, costs of referrals increased by 51.7% compared to 2017, which was mainly due to an enlarged
4 proportion of referrals (SupMat_table3). A direct reason to explain the higher rate of referrals could
5 not be found. Overall, it is arduous to transfer cost outcomes presented here to other jurisdictions, as
6 differences across countries in *inter alia* vaccination strategies, healthcare systems, and clinical
7 pathways are substantial [41].

8 This study is the first analysis of HCRU and associated costs of GW in the Netherlands, and one of the
9 few estimating the economic burden of GW in the European region [42-44]. The results are based on
10 a representative sample of the Dutch population visiting the GP [14]. The analysis included cost data
11 of the three most relevant resource items in the context of GW. Adding prescription fees to drug
12 costs provided an accurate illustration of the actual expenses made for prescribed treatments.

13 Nonetheless, the study bears several limitations that should not be neglected. Reported incidence
14 and HCRU and associated costs are surrounded by uncertainties that may have caused an
15 underestimation of the real-world situation. First, data of the Nivel-PCD included reported disease
16 episodes at the GP, leaving GW diagnoses at sexual health centres (SHCs) aside. However, previous
17 research has shown that only around 3% of the GW diagnoses comes from SHCs, indicating that the
18 vast majority of diagnoses is reported at the GP [13]. Second, many cases may be undetected
19 because of shame or an asymptomatic representation of the disease. A recent study in Catalunya
20 (Spain), estimated that approximately one-fifth of GW cases was not registered, especially for
21 women over the age of 30 [45]. Third, costs of secondary care as calculated here are expected to be
22 much higher in actual clinical practice. The number of referrals represent the single fact of a referral
23 being made by a GP to a secondary care specialist, and do not give insight into the number of visits
24 nor the type of treatment given in secondary care. Moreover, risk of wart recurrence after treatment
25 is substantial (20-30%), especially among immunocompromised patients, such as HIV-positive

1 individuals [40]. As such, the actual economic burden of GW in the Netherlands is expected to be
2 even higher than estimated in the current analysis.

3 On the other hand, several costs may have been overestimated to some extent. The number of
4 prescribed medications are based on registry data of GPs and may have been overestimated as a
5 consequence of non-dispensing of prescribed medication. A Dutch study showed that approximately
6 10% of first prescriptions in the dermatological drug class (ATC classification) initiated by a GP was
7 not dispensed at the pharmacy [46]. Therefore, at least the sum of prescription fees may be lower
8 than calculated here. Furthermore, not all referred patients may have actually visited a secondary
9 care specialist. One study performed in the Netherlands reported referral compliance rates of 77%
10 and 90% for patients referred for the male and female genital system, respectively [47]. Referral non-
11 compliance might result in fewer costs incurred for secondary care than calculated here.

12 Besides the volume component in the calculation of secondary care costs, the price component
13 should be interpreted with caution as well. Prices pertained to the care products used in the
14 Dermatology and Venerology specialty only, thereby leaving the care products in the Obstetrics and
15 Gynaecology specialty aside. Also, the share of patients per care product within the diagnosis group
16 included more than just GW patients, since the diagnosis group applies to STIs in general. Moreover,
17 reimbursement claims of health insurers do not accurately reflect the actual expenses made in
18 secondary care [21].

19 As the outcome of the analysis on the economic burden of GW is surrounded by multiple
20 uncertainties, further similar analyses require less aggregated data. Individual cost data would serve
21 as a valuable input to estimate the cost-effectiveness of HPV-related therapies. Preferably, a micro-
22 costing bottom-up approach should be used, capturing the procedures performed by GPs (to obtain
23 clinic-based as opposed to home-based treatment), indirect cost items (such as travel costs), and
24 HCRU and unit costs in secondary care (in contrast to an average cost per DRG-like payment).

1 It is beyond the scope and design of the study to correlate health interventions to the
2 epidemiological data as presented here. Nonetheless, from an economic point of view, all costs
3 associated with GW care are opportunity costs and could have been prevented if the disease were to
4 be eliminated. The transmission of the HPV causing GW is influenced by sexual behaviour and
5 smoking [48]. Several strategies exist to reduce the number of GW infections, including education on
6 healthy (sexual) behaviour and vaccination [49]. A declining incidence of GW is pivotal to abate the
7 economic burden on the Dutch healthcare system.

8 This study provides novel insights into recent epidemiological trends of GW and its associated HCRU
9 and costs in primary care in the Netherlands. Incidence especially increased among men from 2.0 per
10 1 000 inhabitants in 2011 to 3.5 per 1 000 inhabitants in 2021, and total annual costs of GW in
11 primary care doubled between 2011 and 2021 and was estimated at approximately EUR 5 million in
12 2021. The results illustrate the need for effective preventive measures and behavioural awareness
13 aimed at the root cause of GW development.

References

1. Federatie Medisch Specialisten (FMS). Seksueel overdraagbare aandoeningen (SOA) B5. Anogenitale wratten (condylomata acuminata). Richtlijndatabase; [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: https://richtlijndatabase.nl/richtlijn/seksueel_overdraagbare_aandoeningen_soa/deel_b_specifiek_e_soa_s/b5_anogenitale_wratten_condylomata_acuminata.html.
2. Patel H, Wagner M, Singhal P, Kothari S. Systematic review of the incidence and prevalence of genital warts. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2013;13(1):39.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Sexually Transmitted Infections Treatment Guidelines, 2021 - Anogenital Warts. [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: <https://www.cdc.gov/std/treatment-guidelines/anogenital-warts.htm>.
4. Woestenberg PJ, Guevara Morel AE, Bogaards JA, Hooiveld M, Schurink-van 't Klooster TM, et al. Partial Protective Effect of Bivalent Human Papillomavirus 16/18 Vaccination Against Anogenital Warts in a Large Cohort of Dutch Primary Care Patients. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2021;73(2):291-7.
5. Berrada M, Holl R, Ndao T, Benčina G, Dikhaye S, et al. Healthcare resource utilization and costs associated with anogenital warts in Morocco. *Infectious Agents and Cancer*. 2021;16(1):64.
6. Prilepskaya VN, Gomberg M, Kothari S, Yee K, Kulkarni A, et al. Estimating the Burden of Illness Related to Genital Warts in Russia: A Cross-Sectional Study. *J Health Econ Outcomes Res*. 2020;7(2):182-8.
7. Lee TS, Kothari-Talwar S, Singhal PK, Yee K, Kulkarni A, et al. A cross-sectional study estimating the burden of illness related to genital warts in South Korea. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(6):e014217.
8. Saldarriaga EM, Cárcamo CP, Babigumira JB, García PJ. The Annual costs of treating genital warts in the Public Healthcare Sector in Peru. *BMC Health Services Research*. 2021;21(1):1092.
9. Dahlstrom KR, Fu S, Chan W, Shelal Z, Ramondetta LM, et al. Medical Care Costs Associated with Genital Warts for Commercially Insured US Patients. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2018;36(11):1355-65.
10. Park YJ, Kim JM, Lee BR, Kim TH, Lee EG. Annual prevalence and economic burden of genital warts in Korea: Health Insurance Review and Assessment (HIRA) service data from 2007 to 2015. *Epidemiol Infect*. 2018;146(2):177-86.
11. Gylling A, Uusi-Rauva K, Toppila I, Hiltunen-Back E. The Burden of Genital Warts in Finland: Cross-Sectional Analysis of the Prevalence and Direct Medical Costs in 2018. *Vaccines [Internet]*. 2023; 11(7).
12. van der Meijden WI, Notowicz A, Blog FB, Langley PC. A retrospective analysis of costs and patterns of treatment for external genital warts in The Netherlands. *Clin Ther*. 2002;24(1):183-96.
13. Wees Dv, Visser M, Aar Fv, Coul EOd, Staritsky L, et al. Sexually transmitted infections in the Netherlands in 2021. Seksueel overdraagbare aandoeningen in Nederland in 2021: Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid en Milieu RIVM; 2022.
14. Nivel. Nivel Primary Care Database. [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: <https://www.nivel.nl/en/nivel-zorgregistraties-eerste-lijn/nivel-primary-care-database>.
15. Dutch Civil Law, Article 7:458. [30-08-2023]. Retrieved from: <http://www.dutchcivillaw.com/civilcodebook077.htm>.
16. Lamberts H, Wood M. ICPC, international classification of primary care: Oxford University Press, USA; 1987.
17. Statline CBS. The Netherlands in figures. [Retrieved from: <https://opendata.cbs.nl/statline/#/CBS/en/>].
18. Nielen MMJ, Spronk I, Davids R, Korevaar JC, Poos R, et al. Estimating Morbidity Rates Based on Routine Electronic Health Records in Primary Care: Observational Study. *JMIR Med Inform*. 2019;7(3):e11929.
19. Dutch healthcare institute (NZa). Prestatie- en tariefbeschikking huisartsenzorg en multidisciplinaire zorg 2019 - TB/REG-19619-03. [30-08-2023]. Retrieved from: https://puc.overheid.nl/nza/doc/PUC_247681_22/1/.

20. Špacírová Z, Epstein D, García-Mochón L, Rovira J, Olry de Labry Lima A, et al. A general framework for classifying costing methods for economic evaluation of health care. *The European Journal of Health Economics*. 2020;21(4):529-42.
21. Zorginstituut Nederland (ZiNL). Guideline for conducting economic evaluations in healthcare [in Dutch: Richtlijn voor het uitvoeren van economische evaluaties in de gezondheidszorg]. 2016.
22. Zorginstituut Nederland (ZiNL). De kosten voor farmaceutische zorg. [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: <https://www.farmacotherapeutischkompas.nl/algemeen/kosten>.
23. Z-Index. Dutch drug database G-Standaard. [Retrieved from: <https://www.z-index.nl/english>].
24. Nederlands Huisartsen Genootschap (NHG). NHG Standaard - Het soa-consult.
25. College ter Beoordeling van Geneesmiddelen (CGB). Veregen 10%, zalf. [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: https://db.cbg-meb.nl/ords/f?p=111:3::ATC:::PO_DOMAIN,PO_LANG,P3_RVG1:H,NL,110904.
26. Stichting Farmaceutische Kengetallen (SFK). Data en feiten 2020 - Het jaar 2019 in cijfers. 2020. <https://www.sfk.nl/publicaties/data-en-feiten/Dataenfeiten2020.pdf>.
27. Consumer prices; price index 2015=100 [Internet]. Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS). Available from: <https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/figures/detail/83131eng>.
28. Nederlandse Zorgautoriteit. Open data van de Nederlandse Zorgautoriteit. [Retrieved from: <https://www.opendisdata.nl/>].
29. Donken R, King AJ, Bogaards JA, Woestenberg PJ, Meijer CJLM, et al. High Effectiveness of the Bivalent Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccine Against Incident and Persistent HPV Infections up to 6 Years After Vaccination in Young Dutch Women. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2018;217(10):1579-89.
30. Woestenberg PJ, King AJ, van der Sande MA, Donken R, Leussink S, et al. No evidence for cross-protection of the HPV-16/18 vaccine against HPV-6/11 positivity in female STI clinic visitors. *J Infect*. 2017;74(4):393-400.
31. Navarro-Illana E, López-Lacort M, Navarro-Illana P, Vilata JJ, Díez-Domingo J. Effectiveness of HPV vaccines against genital warts in women from Valencia, Spain. *Vaccine*. 2017;35(25):3342-6.
32. Petráš M, Adámková V. Rates and predictors of genital warts burden in the Czech population. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2015;35:29-33.
33. Sonnenberg P, Tanton C, Mesher D, King E, Beddows S, et al. Epidemiology of genital warts in the British population: implications for HPV vaccination programmes. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2019;95(5):386-90.
34. Szarewski A, Skinner SR, Garland SM, Romanowski B, Schwarz TF, et al. Efficacy of the HPV-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine against low-risk HPV types (PATRICIA randomized trial): an unexpected observation. *J Infect Dis*. 2013;208(9):1391-6.
35. Howell-Jones R, Soldan K, Wetten S, Mesher D, Williams T, et al. Declining genital Warts in young women in England associated with HPV 16/18 vaccination: an ecological study. *J Infect Dis*. 2013;208(9):1397-403.
36. Drolet M, Bénard É, Pérez N, Brisson M. Population-level impact and herd effects following the introduction of human papillomavirus vaccination programmes: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2019;394(10197):497-509.
37. Kavanagh K, Pollock KG, Cuschieri K, Palmer T, Cameron RL, et al. Changes in the prevalence of human papillomavirus following a national bivalent human papillomavirus vaccination programme in Scotland: a 7-year cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*. 2017;17(12):1293-302.
38. Mesher D, Panwar K, Thomas SL, Edmundson C, Choi YH, et al. The Impact of the National HPV Vaccination Program in England Using the Bivalent HPV Vaccine: Surveillance of Type-Specific HPV in Young Females, 2010-2016. *J Infect Dis*. 2018;218(6):911-21.
39. Slurink IAL. Jaarrapport 2018 - Seksueel Overdraagbare Aandoeningen (SOA). Nivel; 2019. <https://www.nivel.nl/nl>.
40. Gilson R, Nugent D, Werner RN, Ballesteros J, Ross J. 2019 IUSTI-Europe guideline for the management of anogenital warts. *Journal of the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology*. 2020;34(8):1644-53.

41. Raymakers AJN, Sadatsafavi M, Marra F, Marra CA. Economic and Humanistic Burden of External Genital Warts. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2012;30(1):1-16.
42. Annemans L, Rémy V, Lamure E, Spaepen E, Lamotte M, et al. Economic burden associated with the management of cervical cancer, cervical dysplasia and genital warts in Belgium. *Journal of Medical Economics*. 2008;11(1):135-50.
43. Hillemanns P, Breugelmans JG, Giesecking F, Bénard S, Lamure E, et al. Estimation of the incidence of genital warts and the cost of illness in Germany: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2008;8(1):76.
44. López N, Torné A, Franco A, San-Martin M, Viayna E, et al. Epidemiologic and economic burden of HPV diseases in Spain: implication of additional 5 types from the 9-valent vaccine. *Infect Agent Cancer*. 2018;13:15.
45. Moríña D, Fernández-Fontelo A, Cabaña A, Puig P, Monfil L, et al. Quantifying the under-reporting of uncorrelated longitudinal data: the genital warts example. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2021;21(1):6.
46. Hempenius M, Rijken S, Groenwold RHH, Hek K, de Boer A, et al. Primary nonadherence to drugs prescribed by general practitioners: A Dutch database study. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2023;89(1):268-78.
47. van Dijk CE, de Jong JD, Verheij RA, Jansen T, Korevaar JC, et al. Compliance with referrals to medical specialist care: patient and general practice determinants: a cross-sectional study. *BMC Fam Pract*. 2016;17:11.
48. Tyros G, Mastrafsi S, Gregoriou S, Nicolaidou E. Incidence of anogenital warts: epidemiological risk factors and real-life impact of human papillomavirus vaccination. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2021;32(1):4-13.
49. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). How You Can Prevent Sexually Transmitted Diseases. [04-05-2023]. Retrieved from: <https://www.cdc.gov/std/prevention/default.htm>.