

Clinical Indicators

February 2019



Indicator Library: General Methodology Notes



Canadian Institute
for Health Information

Institut canadien
d'information sur la santé

Production of this document is made possible by financial contributions from Health Canada and provincial and territorial governments. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent the views of Health Canada or any provincial or territorial government.

All rights reserved.

The contents of this publication may be reproduced unaltered, in whole or in part and by any means, solely for non-commercial purposes, provided that the Canadian Institute for Health Information is properly and fully acknowledged as the copyright owner. Any reproduction or use of this publication or its contents for any commercial purpose requires the prior written authorization of the Canadian Institute for Health Information. Reproduction or use that suggests endorsement by, or affiliation with, the Canadian Institute for Health Information is prohibited.

For permission or information, please contact CIHI:

Canadian Institute for Health Information
495 Richmond Road, Suite 600
Ottawa, Ontario K2A 4H6
Phone: 613-241-7860
Fax: 613-241-8120
www.cihi.ca
copyright@cihi.ca

ISBN 978-1-77109-793-2 (PDF)

© 2019 Canadian Institute for Health Information

How to cite this document:

Canadian Institute for Health Information. *Indicator Library: General Methodology Notes — Clinical Indicators, February 2019*. Ottawa, ON: CIHI; 2019.

Cette publication est aussi disponible en français sous le titre *Répertoire des indicateurs — notes méthodologiques générales des indicateurs cliniques, février 2019*.

ISBN 978-1-77109-794-9 (PDF)

Table of contents

1	Purpose of the general methodology notes	4
2	Data sources	4
3	Health region assignment	5
4	Population estimates	5
5	Hospitalization data and rates	6
6	Identifying acute care and day procedure data	8
	Select potential acute care and day procedure records	8
7	Grouping methodologies	11
8	Record linkage — Linking cases across hospitals and building episodes of care	11
	Record linkage	11
	Episodes of care	11
9	Peer group methodology	12
10	Calculation of Canada and peer group results	13
11	Risk adjustment	14
12	Defining neighbourhood income quintile	16
	Assigning patients to neighbourhood income quintiles	16
	Construction of income quintiles for dissemination areas	16
	Limitations	17
13	Socio-economic disparity measures	17
14	Major surgery patient group list — CMG+ codes	18
15	Flowchart: 30-day obstetric/patients age 19 and younger/surgical/ medical readmission	19
16	The Charlson Index	20
	Appendix A	22
	Appendix B	23
	References	25

1 Purpose of the general methodology notes

The purpose of these notes is to give users the methodological details behind the clinical health system performance (HSP) indicators so they can better understand the results of these measures.

2 Data sources

Hospitals in all jurisdictions (except Quebec) submit acute care and day procedure data to the Discharge Abstract Database (DAD) and/or National Ambulatory Care Reporting System (NACRS) at the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). Hospitals in Quebec submit data to Maintenance et Exploitation des Données pour l'Étude de la Clientèle Hospitalière (MED-ÉCHO); MED-ÉCHO data is then submitted to CIHI, which integrates it into the Hospital Morbidity Database (HMDB). Please note that prior to 2010–2011, Alberta's day procedure data was submitted to the Alberta Ambulatory Care Reporting System (AACRS) and then provided to CIHI by Alberta Health and Wellness. Hospitalizations in designated adult mental health beds in Ontario are submitted to the Ontario Mental Health Reporting System (OMHRS).

For the indicators 30-Day Readmission for Mental Illness and Repeat Hospital Stays for Mental Illness, the population of interest includes discharges from both general hospitals and free-standing psychiatric hospitals (as identified by CIHI); for the Self-Injury Hospitalization indicator, free-standing psychiatric hospitals are not included. The indicator Hospitalizations Entirely Caused by Alcohol includes discharges from free-standing psychiatric hospitals (in addition to discharges from general hospitals and day surgery clinics). For the DAD, these include all institutions identified as analytical institution type 5; for hospitalization data from Quebec (MED-ÉCHO), these include all "centres hospitaliers de soins psychiatriques." A list of psychiatric hospitals in OMHRS was provided by the OMHRS program area at CIHI. Specialized acute services can be provided in general hospitals or psychiatric hospitals, and service delivery may differ slightly across jurisdictions. Therefore, interjurisdictional comparisons should be done with caution.

OMHRS data submitted up until August of the next fiscal year is included in mental health indicator calculations; for 2015–2016 rates, however, data submitted up to May of the relevant year was used.

3 Health region assignment

- For indicators based on place of residence, to determine what health region a patient belongs to, a patient's postal code at the time of hospitalization is first mapped to census geography using the most up-to-date Statistics Canada's Postal Code Conversion File at the time of indicator calculation; next, it's mapped to a health region using another Statistics Canada product, *Health Regions: Boundaries and Correspondence With Census Geography*.
- Health region-level analyses do not include records with invalid, missing or partial postal codes.

4 Population estimates

- Population estimates are used as denominators for all population-based indicators (expressed as rates per 100,000 population or 10,000 population).
- Population estimates for health regions are preliminary post-censal estimates for July 1 of the corresponding data year. These are based on the latest census, adjusted for census net undercoverage, and on administrative sources on births, deaths and migration. Population estimates by health region are derived from the sub-provincial population estimates, which are produced using the components method by the Demography Division at Statistics Canada, except for the British Columbia estimates and the Quebec estimates. Population estimates for health regions in B.C. were provided by BC Stats and those for Quebec by the Institut de la statistique du Québec. Population estimates are based on the boundaries in effect at the time of indicator calculation.
- Population counts by neighbourhood income quintile were estimated based on dissemination area (DA)-level population counts from the 2006, 2011 and 2016 censuses. Detailed methodology is available upon request. Due to missing income information for about 3% of DAs in each of the census years, the population estimates used for income quintile analysis are usually smaller than the provincial population estimates provided by Statistics Canada.

5 Hospitalization data and rates

- For indicators based on place of residence, data is reported based on the region of the patient's residence, not region of hospitalization. Consequently, these figures reflect the hospitalization experience of residents of the region wherever they are treated, including out of province, as opposed to the comprehensive activity of the region's hospitals (that will also treat people from outside of the region).
- For indicators based on place of service (where the patient was treated), data is reported based on the administrative region of the facility (e.g., region of hospitalization).
- Rates are standardized or risk-adjusted wherever possible to facilitate comparability across provinces/regions/facilities and over time.
- As of 2014–2015, the 2011 Canadian reference population is used to age-standardize indicators. The 2011 population estimates are as follows:

Age (in years)	Age group	Standard population, Canada, July 1, 2011
0–4	1	1,899,064
5–9	2	1,810,433
10–14	3	1,918,164
15–19	4	2,238,952
20–24	5	2,354,354
25–29	6	2,369,841
30–34	7	2,327,955
35–39	8	2,273,087
40–44	9	2,385,918
45–49	10	2,719,909
50–54	11	2,691,260
55–59	12	2,353,090
60–64	13	2,050,443
65–69	14	1,532,940
70–74	15	1,153,822
75–79	16	919,338
80–84	17	701,140
85–89	18	426,739
90+	19	216,331

Source

Statistics Canada, Demography Division.

- The following 2011 population was used to age-standardize indicators calculated for people age 18 and older.

Age (in years)	Age group	Standard population, Canada, July 1, 2011
0–4	1	1,899,064
5–9	2	1,810,433
10–14	3	1,918,164
15–17	4	1,313,471
18–24	5	3,279,835
25–29	6	2,369,841
30–34	7	2,327,955
35–39	8	2,273,087
40–44	9	2,385,918
45–49	10	2,719,909
50–54	11	2,691,260
55–59	12	2,353,090
60–64	13	2,050,443
65–69	14	1,532,940
70–74	15	1,153,822
75–79	16	919,338
80–84	17	701,140
85–89	18	426,739
90+	19	216,331

Source

Statistics Canada, Demography Division.

- To ensure interprovincial comparability of indicators, diagnosis codes representing diabetes without complications (E10.9, E11.9, E13.9, E14.9) were recoded to diabetes with complications as per the Canadian coding standards on applicable records for Quebec MED-ÉCHO data. Details are available upon request.
- Wherever information is available, procedures that have been performed out of hospital and procedures abandoned after onset are excluded from the calculations.

6 Identifying acute care and day procedure data

The following approach is used to identify qualifying acute care and day procedure cases.

Select potential acute care and day procedure records

Table 1A Potential acute care and day procedure records — DAD data

Criteria	Specifications	Codes
Include	All acute care and day procedure records	Facility Type Code* = 1 (acute care) or A (day surgery)
Exclude	Stillbirths and cadaveric donors Potential duplicate records (prior to 2013–2014)	Admission Category Code = S or R Prior to 2013–2014, duplicate records are excluded if they match on the following data elements: Facility Province, Institution Number, Health Card Number, Birth Date, Gender, Patient Postal Code, Admission Date, Admission Time, Weight, Discharge Date, Discharge Time, Most Responsible Diagnosis and Principal Intervention. Beginning in 2013–2014, duplicate records are no longer removed.

Note

* Facility Type Code is a CIHI variable that identifies the level of care of an institution (e.g., acute care, day surgery, subacute).

Table 1B Potential day procedure records — NACRS data

Criteria	Specifications	Codes
Include	Day surgery functional centres	See Table 1D: Day surgery MIS functional centre codes below
	Cardiac catheterization labs in Ontario, Alberta and Nova Scotia	Ambulatory Care Group Code = CL and Ambulatory Type Code = 31 (consisting of MIS functional centre 7*3403700 or 7*4155500)
	Scheduled emergency department (ED) visits	(Ambulatory Care Group Code = ED [consisting of MIS functional centre 7*3100000, 7*3102000, 7*3104000, 7*3106000, 7*3102500 or 7*3107000] and ED_VISIT_INDICATOR = 0)
	Cases with specific procedures of interest that were performed in non-ED centres and that do not fit into any of the above criteria	Hysterectomy: CCI code 1.RM.89.^, 1.RM.91.^ or 1.RM.87.^ with extent attribute = SU Prostatectomy: CCI code 1.QT.59.^ or 1.QT.87.^ Percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI): CCI code 1.IJ.50.^, 1.IJ.57.GQ.^ or 1.IJ.54.GQ-AZ Coronary artery bypass graft (CABG): CCI code 1.IJ.76.^ Hip replacement: CCI code 1.VA.53.^ or 1.SQ.53.^ Knee replacement: CCI code 1.VG.53.^ or 1.VP.53.^ Angiography: CCI code 3.IP.10.VX Cholecystectomy: CCI code 1.OD.89.^ Labour and delivery: CCI code 5.MD.50.^, 5.MD.51.^, 5.MD.52.^, 5.MD.53.^, 5.MD.54.^, 5.MD.56.^, 5.MD.57.^, 5.MD.58.^, 5.MD.59.^ or 5.MD.60.^
Exclude	Potential duplicate records (prior to 2013–2014)	Prior to 2011–2012, duplicate records are excluded if they match on the following data elements: Chart Number, Health Card Number, Date of Registration and Time of Registration. For records from Alberta, additional variables were used to identify potential duplicates: Diagnosis Code, Procedure Code, MIS Functional Centre Code and Provider Number. In 2011–2012 and 2012–2013, a common list of variables was used to identify duplicates in NACRS: Chart Number, Health Card Number, Date of Registration, Time of Registration, Facility Ambulatory Care Number, Gender, Visit Disposition, Main Problem, Main Intervention and MIS Functional Centre Code. Beginning in 2013–2014, duplicate records are no longer removed.
	Main provider is not a physician	Provider_Type = M and Provider_Service_Code = (00000–01003, 01012, 01013)

Table 1C Potential acute care and day procedure records — HMDB data

Criteria	Specifications	Codes
Include	All acute and day surgery records for Quebec only	Facility Type Code* = 1 (acute care) or A (day surgery)
Exclude	Stillbirths and cadaveric donors	Admission Category Code = S or R
	Potential duplicate records (prior to 2013–2014)	Prior to 2013–2014, duplicate records are excluded if they match on the following data elements: Facility Province, Institution Number, Health Card Number, Gender, Admission Date, Admission Time, Weight, Discharge Date, Discharge Time and Most Responsible Diagnosis. Beginning in 2013–2014, duplicate records are no longer removed.

Notes

* Facility Type Code is a CIHI variable that identifies the level of care of an institution (e.g., acute care, day surgery, subacute). Quebec does not submit birthdate, patient postal code or principal intervention data.

Table 1D Day surgery MIS functional centre codes

Fiscal year	Ontario	Nova Scotia
2007–2008	7*260**, 7*262, 7*265**, 7*34020, 7*34025**, 7*34055 (* = 1, 2 or 3; ** = series)	712600000, 722600000, 712602000, 712602500, 712603000, 712604000, 712604500, 712606000, 712606500, 712607000, 712609900, 713402000, 713402500, 713402520, 713403500, 713403700, 713405500
2008–2009	7*260**, 7*262, 7*265**, 7*34025**, 7*34055 (* = 1, 2 or 3; ** = series)	712600000, 722600000, 712602000, 712602500, 712603000, 712604000, 712604500, 712606000, 712606500, 712607000, 712609900, 713402000, 713402500, 713402520, 713403500, 713403700, 713405500
2009–2010	7*260**, 7*262, 7*265, 7*34055, 7*360, 7*362, 7*365, 7*369 (* = 1, 2 or 3; ** = series)	712600000, 722600000, 712602000, 712602500, 712603000, 712604000, 712604500, 712606000, 712606500, 712607000, 712609900, 712650000, 712652000, 712654000, 712656000, 713403500, 713403700, 713405500, 713600000, 713620000, 713650000, 713670000, 713671000, 713672000, 713690000
Fiscal year	All jurisdictions submitting day surgery data to NACRS	
2010–2011 onward	Ambulatory Care Group Code = DS (Day Surgery), consisting of the following MIS functional centre codes: 7*2600000, 7*2602000, 7*2602500, 7*2604000, 7*2604500, 7*2606000, 7*2606500, 7*2607000, 7*2620000, 7*2650000, 7*2652000, 7*2654000, 7*2656000, 7*3600000, 7*3620000, 7*3650000, 7*3670000, 7*3690000, 7*3960000, 7*3405500, 7*2603000, 7*2960000	

7 Grouping methodologies

Acute care inpatient records are grouped to a major clinical category (MCC) as well as to a specific case mix group (CMG). CMGs and MCCs are then used to group patients with similar clinical characteristics. Specifically, they are used in the calculation of some indicators, such as In-Hospital Sepsis, Hospital Deaths Following Major Surgery and the Readmission indicators (see sections 15 and 16). For further details on the acute inpatient grouping methodology, please visit the [CMG+](#) web page.

8 Record linkage — Linking cases across hospitals and building episodes of care

Record linkage

Starting in 2016, a new patient linkage standard was developed and implemented at CIHI. The new standard uses encrypted health card number (HCN) and the HCN-issuing province for record linkage (linkage keys). Prior to this, encrypted HCN and birthdate were used as linkage keys. The impact of changing the patient linkage methodology is minimal. All records with valid linkage keys are eligible for patient linkage.

The linkage methodology allows for linkage across Canada, with the exception of Quebec and Manitoba due to the submission format of their HCNs. For data submitted by Manitoba, we are unable to link Manitoba residents who are admitted/transferred in and out of Manitoba. For data submitted by Quebec, we are unable to link patients who are admitted/transferred in and out of Quebec.

Episodes of care

The unit of analysis for most of the indicators is an episode of care. An episode of care refers to all contiguous inpatient hospitalizations and day procedure visits. This avoids analyzing transfers as 2 separate hospitalizations. To construct an episode of care, a transfer is assumed to have occurred if either of the following conditions is met:

- Admission to an acute care institution or day surgery facility occurs less than 7 hours after discharge from another acute care institution or day surgery facility, regardless of whether either institution codes the transfer; or

- Admission to an acute care institution or day surgery facility occurs between 7 and 12 hours after discharge from another acute care institution or day surgery facility and at least one of the institutions codes the transfer.

Due to the absence of time of admission/discharge variables in the OMHRS database, episode-building involving these mental health records can be linked using only date of admission/discharge variables. A transfer is assumed if admission to an institution occurs within the same date as discharge from another institution (including overlapping hospitalizations on the same day).

All records with valid linkage keys, admission dates/times and discharge dates/times from the DAD, as well as day surgery data from NACRS, are linked across provinces. An acute care or day procedure record from one facility is linked to a subsequent acute care or day procedure record in any facility by matching the linkage keys.

As we are unable to link Manitoba residents who are admitted/transferred in and out of Manitoba, and patients who are admitted/transferred in and out of Quebec, results from regions and hospitals that routinely transfer patients to or from these provinces may be affected. For example, hospitals that routinely transfer patients to Manitoba or Quebec for cardiac procedures may appear to have higher rates for indicators pertaining to acute myocardial infarction. This issue has specifically been identified for the Edmundston Zone in New Brunswick, as patients from this zone are often transferred to Quebec. Please use caution when interpreting these rates.

9 Peer group methodology

The purpose of assigning hospitals to a peer group is to facilitate standard comparisons by categorizing acute care hospitals that have similar structural and patient characteristics.

The **standard peer groups** were developed based on literature reviews and consultations with internal and external experts. Hospitals were assigned to 1 of 4 standard peer groups: T (Teaching), H1 (Community — Large), H2 (Community — Medium) and H3 (Community — Small).

Hospitals were designated as teaching if they

- Had confirmed teaching status from the provincial ministry; or
- Were identified as teaching in the provincial ministry's submission to the Canadian MIS Database.

Based on 2010–2011 to 2012–2013 data, non-teaching hospitals are allocated to the larger, medium or smaller community hospital peer group based on their volumes (using inpatient cases, total weighted cases and inpatient days). Hospitals are categorized as H1 if they meet 2 of the following 3 criteria:

- More than 8,000 inpatient cases
- More than 10,000 weighted cases
- More than 50,000 inpatient days

Hospitals that do not meet the above criteria were classified as H2 or H3 depending on the hospital's total weighted cases (H2 — 2,000 weighted cases or more, H3 — fewer than 2,000 weighted cases). Borderline cases were reviewed and reassigned based on averages across multiple years. The hospital-level peer group for multi-site hospitals is assigned based on the hierarchy of the site-level peer groups. The hierarchical order is T, H1, H2 and then H3.

10 Calculation of Canada and peer group results

To facilitate the timely release of indicator results, a blended average methodology is used to calculate Canada and peer group results for indicators that include data from Quebec. In this methodology, records from the current fiscal year from all jurisdictions outside of Quebec and records from the previous fiscal year from Quebec are blended to calculate Canada and peer group results.

The Canada and peer group blended results are used for statistical testing, comparisons and reporting. Additionally, the blended Canada average is used in the calculation of risk-adjusted rates ([see Section 11](#)).

This methodology was introduced because CIHI does not receive MED-ÉCHO data from Quebec until about 7 months after the end of the fiscal year (which is then incorporated into DAD-HMDB); this is much later than the closure of the DAD. By using this methodology, CIHI can calculate and release results for DAD-submitting organizations in a more timely manner, since results for DAD-submitting organizations will not change with the inclusion of Quebec data at a later date. Please refer to [Appendix A](#) for the list of indicators that use this methodology.

11 Risk adjustment

When comparing outcomes across various organizations, it is important to account for differences in patient characteristics that may vary among jurisdictions and hospitals; without adjustment, data comparisons can be skewed by differences in patient populations. Risk adjustment is a method used to control for patient characteristics and other risk factors that may affect health care outcomes and improve comparability of results.

Statistical regression modelling, an indirect method of standardization, was used to perform risk adjustment. Risk factors that were controlled for include age, sex and selected pre-admit comorbid diagnoses that were applicable to the indicator. The selected risk factors were identified based on a literature review, clinical evidence and expert group consultations using the principles of appropriateness, viability (i.e., sufficient number of events) and data availability. Risk factors must be listed as significant pre-admit conditions on the patient's abstract for them to be identified for risk adjustment. For indicators relating to readmission after certain medical conditions (e.g., Readmission After Acute Myocardial Infarction, Overall Readmission), diagnoses were flagged as risk factors if they were recorded as pre-admit conditions on any of the records in the same episode of care. For all other indicators, risk factors were flagged if conditions were recorded as pre-admit diagnoses on the record where the outcome/denominator was abstracted.

The logistic regression model was employed, except for indicators that had low outcome rates (<1%); in these cases, the Poisson regression model was used, as it gives more accurate values for rare-event outcomes. Coefficients derived from the regression models were used to calculate the probability of an outcome for each denominator case; these were then summed for each hospital (or for other reporting levels such as regions, provinces and peer groups) to calculate the expected number of cases of each outcome. The risk-adjusted rate was calculated by dividing the observed number of cases by the expected number of cases and then multiplying that result by the Canadian average.

The formula is as follows:

$$\text{Risk-adjusted rate} = \text{Observed cases} \div \text{Expected cases} \times \text{Canada average}$$

Where

Observed cases = the number of observed events (or numerator cases, such as actual number of deaths)

Expected cases = the number of expected events, adjusted for the distribution of risk factors in the hospitals (regions, provinces, etc.). Coefficients are derived from regression models to obtain the expected number of cases.

Canada average = the standard population rate, or the Canadian average rate for all provinces and territories (total number of numerator cases nationally divided by the total number of denominator cases nationally, multiplied by 100 if the indicator is expressed as a rate per 100, or by another pre-defined unit such as 1,000 discharges or 10,000 patient days). To facilitate the timely release of indicator results, for indicators that include data from Quebec, risk-adjusted rates are calculated using a **blended Canada average**. Please refer to [Section 10](#) for further details.

In addition, 95% confidence interval (CI) limits for the risk-adjusted rates were calculated to aid interpretation and comparisons. CIs are used to establish whether the indicator result is statistically different from the average. The width of the CI illustrates the degree of variability associated with the rate. Indicator values are estimated to be accurate within the upper and lower CI 19 times out of 20 (95% CI). Risk-adjusted rates with CIs that do not contain the Canada or peer group result can be considered statistically different. Further details on the calculation of CIs are available upon request.

It is important to note that the expected performance level of an organization in this indirect method of standardization is based on how all organizations across Canada perform, because the number of expected cases is calculated based on regression models fitted on all cases from all hospitals. Furthermore, risk-adjustment modelling cannot entirely eliminate differences in patient characteristics among hospitals, because not all risk factors are adjusted for; if left unadjusted for (due to reasons such as viability), hospitals with the sickest patients or that treat rare or highly specialized groups of patients could still score poorly.

Information on model specifications (coefficients and p-values) and ICD10CA codes used to flag risk factors can be found in the [Model Specifications](#) document. Also, please see the [Resources](#) section in the [Indicator Library](#) for more information about diagnosis types that were used to define risk factors.

12 Defining neighbourhood income quintile

Assigning patients to neighbourhood income quintiles

- Each patient was assigned to a neighbourhood income quintile using Statistics Canada's Postal Code Conversion File Plus (PCCF+).¹ This software links the 6-character postal codes to the standard Canadian census geographic areas (such as DAs, census tracts and census subdivisions). By linking postal codes to the census geography, the file facilitates extraction of the relevant census information (e.g., income) for each geographic area.
- The DA is the smallest geographical unit available for analysis in the Canadian Census, with a targeted population size of 400 to 700 persons.² Using the most up-to-date PCCF+ at the time of indicator calculation, the postal code of the patient's place of residence at the time of hospitalization was mapped to the corresponding Census DA, and the neighbourhood income quintile of that DA was assigned to the patient.
- In the PCCF+, for postal codes that map to more than one DA, probabilistic assignment based on population size is used, meaning that the same postal code can be mapped to a different DA if the program is run more than once. However, a SAS technique is employed to ensure that a postal code is always assigned to the same DA.

Construction of income quintiles for dissemination areas

- The neighbourhood income quintiles available in the PCCF+ were constructed according to the methods developed at Statistics Canada.³ A short description of the method is provided below.
- Neighbourhood income quintiles were based on the average income per single-person equivalent in a DA obtained from the census. This measure uses the person weights implicit in the Statistics Canada low-income cut-offs to derive "single-person equivalent" multipliers for each household size.¹ For example, a single-person household received a multiplier of 1.0, a 2-person household received a multiplier of 1.24 and a 3-person household received a multiplier of 1.53. To calculate average income per single-person equivalent for each DA, total income of the dissemination area was divided by the total number of single-person equivalents. Income quintile for DAs with a household population of less than 250 was imputed based on the neighbouring DAs (where possible), because census data on income for these DAs was suppressed.

- Next, quintiles of population by neighbourhood income were constructed separately for each census metropolitan area, census agglomeration or residual area within each province. DAs within each such area were ranked from the lowest average income per single-person equivalent to the highest, and DAs were assigned to 5 groups, such that each group contained approximately one-fifth of the total non-institutional population of each area.
- The quintile data was then pooled across the areas. Quintiles were constructed within each area before aggregating to the national or provincial level to minimize the potential effect of the differences in income, housing and other living costs across different areas in the country.
- Quintile 1 refers to the least-affluent neighbourhoods, while quintile 5 refers to the most affluent neighbourhoods.

Limitations

- Neighbourhood income quintiles derived from linking postal codes to the census are less accurate in rural areas because rural postal codes cover larger geographical areas. Another limitation is that the measure excludes people living in long-term care facilities because income data from the Canadian census is available for non-institutional residents only. As a result, not all people can be included in the rates by neighbourhood income quintile.

13 Socio-economic disparity measures

Selected indicators are reported by neighbourhood income quintiles and the following 2 disparity measures:

Disparity rate ratio (RR)

This is the ratio of a health indicator rate for the least-affluent neighbourhood income quintile (Q1) to the rate for the most-affluent neighbourhood income quintile (Q5). It provides a summary measure of the magnitude of the socio-economic disparity for a health indicator in a jurisdiction. RR should be evaluated together with other measures, such as the indicator rate for each neighbourhood income quintile and the potential rate reduction (see below). The 95% CI is provided to assist interpretation. When the 95% CI does not contain a value of 1, RR indicates a statistically significant disparity between Q1 and Q5 rates.

Potential rate reduction (PRR)

This is the reduction in a health indicator rate that would occur in the hypothetical scenario that each neighbourhood income group experienced the rate of the most-affluent neighbourhood income quintile (Q5), expressed as percentage. This measure is based on the concept of the excess morbidity or mortality that could be prevented and provides a summary measure of the overall effect of socio-economic disparities on a health indicator. It should be evaluated together with other measures, such as the indicator rate for each neighbourhood income quintile and RR (see above). The 95% CI is provided to assist interpretation. When the 95% CI does not contain a value of 0, PRR indicates a statistically significant potential reduction in the overall indicator rate.

More details on these measures and the formula to calculate them are available upon request.


14 Major surgery patient group list — CMG+ codes

The following CMGs include only CMG+ codes linked to major surgical procedures:

CMG+ 2018

004, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 012, 013, 015, 071, 073, 074, 078, 082, 083, 110, 113, 114, 121, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 180, 181, 182, 188, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227, 233, 270, 271, 274, 289, 290, 300, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 326, 327, 328, 330, 331, 336, 338, 347, 349, 350, 383, 386, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 426, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 457, 462, 463, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 533, 612, 618, 725, 726, 727, 729, 730, 731, 733, 736, 738, 740, 752

15 Flowchart: 30-day obstetric/ patients age 19 and younger/ surgical/medical readmission



16 The Charlson Index

The Charlson Index is an overall comorbidity score. Evidence shows it to be highly associated with mortality, and it has been widely used in clinical research on mortality. Based on Quan's methodology,⁴ using pre-admission comorbidities recorded on the abstract, the comorbid conditions below are used to calculate the Charlson Index score. Conditions within each group are counted only once (e.g., if I43 and I50 appear on the abstract, the score will be 2). If conditions from different groups are present on the abstract, their weights will be summed (e.g., if I50 and F00 are present on the abstract, the score will be 4).⁵

Comorbid conditions	ICD-10-CA codes [†]	Weight
Congestive heart failure	I099, I255, I420, I425, I426, I427, I428, I429, I43*, I50, P290	2
Dementia	F00*, F01, F02*, F03, F051, G30, G311	2
Chronic pulmonary disease	I278, I279, J40, J41, J42, J43, J44, J45, J47, J60, J61, J62, J63, J64, J65, J66, J67, J684, J701, J703	1
Rheumatological diseases	M05, M06, M315, M32, M33, M34, M351, M353, M360*	1
Mild liver disease	B18, K700, K701, K702, K703, K709, K713, K714, K715, K717, K73, K74, K760, K762, K763, K764, K768, K769, Z944	2
Diabetes with organ failure	E102, E103, E104, E105, E107, E112, E113, E114, E115, E117, E132, E133, E134, E135, E137, E142, E143, E144, E145, E147	1
Hemiplegia or paraplegia	G041, G114, G801, G802, G81, G82, G830, G831, G832, G833, G834, G839	2
Renal disease	N032, N033, N034, N035, N036, N037, N052, N053, N054, N055, N056, N057, N18, N19, N250, Z490, Z491, Z492, Z940, Z992	1
Moderate or severe liver disease	I850, I859, I864, K704, K711, K721, K729, K765, K766, K767, I98.2*	4
HIV infection	B24, O987	4
Primary cancer	C0, C1, C20, C21, C22, C23, C24, C25, C26, C30, C31, C32, C33, C34, C37, C38, C39, C40, C41, C43, C45, C46, C47, C48, C49, C50, C51, C52, C53, C54, C55, C56, C57, C58, C6, C70, C71, C72, C73, C74, C75, C76, C81, C82, C83, C84, C85, C88, C90, C91, C92, C93, C94, C95, C96, C97	2
Metastatic cancer	C77, C78, C79, C80	6

Notes

† Diagnosis codes starting with the 3- or 4-digit codes are listed in the table.

For provinces other than Quebec, only diagnosis types (1) and ((W), (X) and (Y) but not (2)) are used to calculate the Charlson Index score, with the following exceptions:

- Diagnosis type (3) is also used for all diabetes codes.
- Diagnosis type (3) is also used for asterisk (*) codes.

For Quebec, only diagnosis types (C) and ((W), (X) and (Y) but not (2)) are used to calculate the Charlson Index score.

Due to differences in data collection, it is not possible to distinguish comorbidities (DAD diagnosis type (1)) from secondary diagnoses (DAD diagnosis type (3)) in Quebec data. As a result, Quebec patients in the HMDB will get higher probabilities in the logistic regression model and the results for Quebec hospitals will not be comparable with those for the rest of the country. The distribution of the Charlson Index score was shifted for Quebec patients so that patients with higher Charlson Index scores are included in lower Charlson Index score groups.

The distribution is as follows:

Charlson group	Charlson scores in the groups, DAD	Charlson scores in the groups, HMDB Quebec
0	0	0–1
1	1–2	2–4
2	3+	5+

For the In-Hospital Sepsis indicator, a modified version of the Charlson Index is used, as some of the diagnosis codes overlap with other risk factors in the risk-adjustment model. Specifically, Z94.4, N18, Z49, Z94.0, Z99.2, B24 and O98.7 have been removed from the Charlson Index risk factor, as these codes are adjusted for in the Immunocompromised States risk factor. Additionally, diagnosis type (M) is used for all diagnosis codes, and diagnosis type (3) is used for cancer and metastatic carcinoma codes. Scores from Quebec are re-grouped the same way as noted above.

Appendix A

The blended average methodology is applied to the following indicators:

Indicator	Start year
30-Day Acute Myocardial Infarction In-Hospital Mortality	2014–2015*
30-Day Acute Myocardial Infarction Readmission	2015–2016
30-Day Readmission for Mental Illness	2015–2016
30-Day Stroke In-Hospital Mortality	2014–2015*
Hospitalizations Entirely Caused by Alcohol	2015–2016
All Patients Readmitted to Hospital	2013–2014
Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions	2015–2016
Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Rate	2015–2016
Hip Replacement Rate	2015–2016
High Users of Hospital Beds	2016–2017
Hospital Deaths (HSMR)	2013–2014
Hospital Deaths Following Major Surgery	2013–2014
Hospitalized Heart Attacks	2015–2016
Hospitalized Hip Fracture Event	2015–2016
Hysterectomy Rate	2015–2016
In-Hospital Sepsis	2013–2014
Injury Hospitalization	2015–2016
Knee Replacement Rate	2015–2016
Low-Risk Caesarean Sections	2015–2016
Medical Patients Readmitted to Hospital	2013–2014
Obstetric Patients Readmitted to Hospital	2013–2014
Obstetric Trauma	2013–2014
Patients 19 and Younger Readmitted to Hospital	2013–2014
Repeat Hospital Stays for Mental Illness	2015–2016
Self-Injury Hospitalization	2015–2016
Surgical Patients Readmitted to Hospital	2013–2014

Note

* The indicators calculated by place of residence are based on 3 years of pooled data (2013–2014 to 2015–2016); the start year listed represents the middle year. For the indicators calculated by place of service, the start year is 2015–2016.

Appendix B

Text alternative for image in Section 15 — Flowchart: 30-day obstetric/patients age 19 and younger/surgical/medical readmission

The readmission indicators measure the rate of all-cause urgent readmission within 30 days of discharge for episodes of care for the following patient groups:

1. Obstetric
2. Patients age 19 and younger
3. Surgical
4. Medical

Denominator episodes of care are assigned to one of the above mutually exclusive patient groups in the order that they are listed (see also Part B below).

The following steps outline how to assign denominator episodes to a patient group, and how to determine whether a readmission occurred:

Part A: Identify eligible episodes

- Step 1: Start with all acute and day surgery records from the DAD, NACRS and HMDB (as outlined in Section 7 of this document).
- Step 2: Exclude records with the following:
 - Invalid health card number;
 - Invalid province issuing health card number;
 - Invalid admission date or time;
 - Invalid discharge date or time; and
 - Admission category of newborn, stillbirth or cadaveric donor.
- Step 3: Use the remaining records from Step 2 to build episodes of care (as outlined in Section 9 of this document).
- Step 4: Keep episodes where either the start or end of the episode is in an acute care hospital.
- Step 5: Keep episodes from Step 4 and **exclude** the following:
 - Mental illness (MCC = 17) in any record of the episode;
 - Newborns in any record of the episode;
 - Palliative care in any record of the episode;
 - Episodes with discharge between March 2 and March 31; and
 - Episodes with discharge disposition of death, self sign-out or invalid sex.
- The episodes that are left at the end of Step 5 are the **eligible episodes** (i.e., denominator episodes).

Part B: Identify patient group

- Step 1: Assign eligible episodes from Part A to the *Obstetric* patient group if MCC = 13 in any record of the episode.
- Step 2: Of the remaining eligible episodes not assigned in Step 1, assign episodes to the *Patients Age 19 and Younger* group if the patient is age 19 or younger at admission on the last record of the episode.
- Step 3: Of the remaining eligible episodes not assigned in steps 1 and 2, assign episodes to the *Surgical* patient group if the MCC partition = intervention in any record of the episode.
- Step 4: Assign the remaining eligible episodes to the *Medical* patient group.

Part C: Identify denominator episodes with a readmission (numerator)

- Step 1: For each denominator episode, identify the patient's subsequent admission episode to an acute care hospital where the admission date (first record of the episode) is within 30 days of the denominator episode discharge date (if any).
- Step 2: If the condition for Step 1 is met, identify the subsequent admission episode as a readmission (numerator) only if the following conditions apply:
 - First record of the episode is recorded as emergent or urgent.
 - Episode does **not** have any of the following:
 - Obstetric delivery
 - Chemotherapy for neoplasm

References

1. Statistics Canada. [Postal Code Conversion File Plus \(PCCF+\)](#). Accessed January 3, 2019.
2. Statistics Canada. [Census Program](#). Reference materials. Accessed January 3, 2019.
3. Wilkins R, Berthelot JM, Ng E. [Trends in mortality by neighbourhood income in urban Canada from 1971 to 1996](#). *Supplement to Health Reports*. 2002.
4. Quan H, Li B, Couris CM, et al. [Updating and validating the Charlson comorbidity index and score for risk adjustment in hospital discharge abstracts using data from 6 countries](#). *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2011.
5. Canadian Institute for Health Information. [Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio: Technical Notes, November 2016](#). 2016.

**CIHI Ottawa**

495 Richmond Road
Suite 600
Ottawa, Ont.
K2A 4H6
613-241-7860

CIHI Toronto

4110 Yonge Street
Suite 300
Toronto, Ont.
M2P 2B7
416-481-2002

CIHI Victoria

880 Douglas Street
Suite 600
Victoria, B.C.
V8W 2B7
250-220-4100

CIHI Montréal

1010 Sherbrooke Street West
Suite 602
Montréal, Que.
H3A 2R7
514-842-2226

cihi.ca

19202-0119

