

ALL PATIENT REFINED DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (APR-DRGs)

Version 20.0

Methodology Overview

3M Health Information Systems

Richard F. Averill
Norbert Goldfield, M.D.
Jack S. Hughes, M.D.
Janice Bonazelli
Elizabeth C. McCullough
Barbara A. Steinbeck
Robert Mullin, M.D.
Ana M. Tang

National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, Inc.

John Muldoon
Lisa Turner

Medical Advisory Committee for NACHRI APR-DRG Research Project

James Gay, M.D.

Copyright © 2003, 3M. All rights reserved.

3M Health Information Systems has prepared this document for use only by 3M HIS personnel and 3M customers who have executed an Order Agreement. This document, and the information contained within, are confidential and proprietary to 3M, and may not be used, copied, reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in whole or in part without the prior written permission of 3M. No permission is granted for this document, or an portion of this document, to be disclosed to, or used by, any party other than the 3M customer to whom this document is delivered by 3M HIS.

It is the policy of 3M Health Information Systems to improve products as new technology and software become available. Because of this, 3M HIS reserves the right to make changes in the specifications and materials contained herein without notice.

3M HIS shall not be liable for any direct, indirect, special, consequential, or other damages or economic loss arising out of any use of, errors in using, or inability to use this document.

This product includes commercial technical data and/or computer databases and/or commercial computer software and/or commercial computer software documentation, which were developed exclusively at private expense by 3M Company, 575 West Murray Boulevard, Murray, Utah 84123-4611. U.S. Government rights to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose these technical data and/or computer databases and/or computer software and/or computer software documentation are subject to the limited rights restrictions of DFARS 252.227-7015(b)(2) (June 1995) and/or subject to the restrictions of DFARS 227.7202-1(a) (June 1995) and DFARS 227.7202-3(a) (June 1995), as applicable for U.S. Department of Defense procurements and the limited rights restrictions of FAR 52.227-14 (June 1987) and/or subject to the restricted rights provisions of FAR 52.227-14 (June 1987) and FAR 52.227-19 (June 1987), as applicable, and any applicable agency FAR Supplements, for non-Department of Defense Federal procurements.

3M Health Information Systems
www.3Mhis.com
100 Barnes Road
Wallingford, CT 06492
(203) 949-0303

For product information, call 1-800-367-2447
For customer support, call 1-800-435-7776

This manual was written, designed, and produced by the Clinical Research and Documentation Departments of 3M Health Information Systems, Wallingford, Connecticut and Murray, Utah.

Document number GRP-041
Version 20.0 07/03

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development of the APR-DRGs, Version 20.0, involved the participation of many individual contributors. 3M HIS consultants Ruth Shaber, M.D., Warren Strauss, M.D., Stephen Wittenberg, M.D., David Earle, M.D., James Flink, M.D., James Slaughter, M.D., Robert Keller, M.D., Donald George, M.D., and Benjamin Gitterman, M.D. provided clinical input into the research. Data analysis support for the project was provided by Keith C. Mitchell, Enes Elia, Mona Bao, Julie-Anne Perry, and Oleg Kostenko. The software was produced by Ronald Mills and Laurence W. Gregg. It was tested by Susie Nickman and Carolyn Hogan. Assistance in the design and production of the APR-DRG Definitions Manual was provided by Sue Boucher, Kathy Blake, Marilyn Marino, and Darriell Rolka.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------------|--|----|
| CHAPTER 1 | HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS) | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2 | DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALL PATIENT REFINED DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (APR-DRGS) | 19 |
| CHAPTER 3 | BACKGROUND AND EXPLANATION OF APPROACH FOR REROUTING LOGIC IN APR-DRG, VERSION 20.0 | 57 |
| APPENDIX A | LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0 | 69 |

CHAPTER 1

History of the Development of the Diagnosis Related Groups (DRGs)

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DIAGNOSIS RELATED GROUPS (DRGS)

Background

The Diagnosis Related Groups (DRGs) are a patient classification scheme which provides a means of relating the type of patients a hospital treats (i.e., its case mix) to the costs incurred by the hospital. There are currently three major versions of the DRG in use: basic DRGs, All Patient DRGs, and All Patient Refined DRGs. The basic DRGs are used by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) for hospital payment for Medicare beneficiaries. The All Patient DRGs (AP-DRGs) are an expansion of the basic DRGs to be more representative of non-Medicare populations such as pediatric patients. The All Patient Refined DRGs (APR-DRG) incorporate severity of illness subclasses into the AP-DRGs. Since the APR-DRGs include both the CMS DRGs and the AP-DRGs, the development of all three versions of the DRGs will be reviewed.

The design and development of the DRGs began in the late sixties at Yale University. The initial motivation for developing the DRGs was to create an effective framework for monitoring the quality of care and the utilization of services in a hospital setting. The first large-scale application of the DRGs was in the late seventies in the State of New Jersey. The New Jersey State Department of Health used DRGs as the basis of a prospective payment system in which hospitals were reimbursed a fixed DRG specific amount for each patient treated. In 1982, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act modified the Section 223 Medicare hospital reimbursement limits to include a case mix adjustment based on DRGs. In 1983 Congress amended the Social Security Act to include a national DRG-based hospital prospective payment system for all Medicare patients.

The evolution of the DRGs and their use as the basic unit of payment in Medicare's hospital reimbursement system represent a recognition of the fundamental role which a hospital's case mix plays in determining its costs. In the past, hospital characteristics such as teaching status and bed size have been used to attempt to explain the substantial cost differences which exist across hospitals. However, such characteristics failed to account adequately for the cost impact of a hospital's case mix. Individual hospitals have often attempted to justify higher cost by contending that they treated a more complex mix of patients. The usual contention was that the patients treated by the hospital were sicker. Although there was a consensus in the hospital industry that a more complex case mix results in higher costs, the concept of case mix complexity had historically lacked a precise definition. The development of the DRGs provided the first operational means of defining and measuring a hospital's case mix complexity.

The concept of case mix complexity

The concept of case mix complexity initially appears very straightforward. However, clinicians, administrators and regulators have often attached different meanings to the concept of case mix complexity depending on their backgrounds and purposes. The term case mix complexity has been used to refer to an interrelated but distinct set of patient attributes which include severity of illness, risk of dying, prognosis, treatment difficulty, need for intervention, and resource intensity. Each of these attributes has a very precise meaning which describes a particular aspect of a hospital's case mix.

Severity of Illness. Refers to the extent of physiologic decompensation or organ system loss of function.

Risk of Mortality. Refers to the likelihood of dying.

Prognosis. Refers to the probable outcome of an illness including the likelihood of improvement or deterioration in the severity of the illness, the likelihood for recurrence, and the probable life span.

Treatment Difficulty. Refers to the patient management problems which a particular illness presents to the health care provider. Such management problems are associated with illnesses without a clear pattern of symptoms, illnesses requiring sophisticated and technically difficult procedures, and illnesses requiring close monitoring and supervision.

Need for Intervention. Relates to the consequences in terms of severity of illness that lack of immediate or continuing care would produce.

Resource Intensity. Refers to the relative volume and types of diagnostic, therapeutic, and bed services used in the management of a particular illness.

When clinicians use the notion of case mix complexity, they typically are referring to one or more aspects of clinical complexity. For clinicians, increased case mix complexity refers to greater severity of illness, greater risk of mortality, greater treatment difficulty, poorer prognoses, and/or a greater need for intervention. Thus, from a clinical perspective, case mix complexity refers to the condition of the patients treated and the treatment difficulty associated with providing care. On the other hand, administrators and regulators usually use the concept of case mix complexity to indicate that the patients treated require more resources which results in a higher cost of providing care. Thus, from an administrative or regulatory perspective, case mix complexity refers to the resource intensity demands that patients place on an institution. While the two interpretations of case mix complexity are often closely related, they can be very different for certain kinds of patients. For example, while terminal cancer patients are very severely ill and have a poor prognosis, they require few hospital resources beyond basic nursing care. No measure of case mix complexity can be equally effective for all the different aspects of case mix complexity.

There has sometimes been confusion regarding the use and interpretation of the DRGs because the aspect of case mix complexity measured by the DRGs has not been clearly understood. The purpose of the DRGs is to relate a hospital's case mix to the resource demands and associated costs experienced by the hospital. Therefore, a hospital having a more complex case mix from a DRG perspective means that the hospital treats patients who require more hospital resources, but not necessarily that the hospital treats patient having a greater severity of illness, a greater risk of dying, a greater treatment difficulty, a poorer prognosis, or a greater need for intervention.

Patient classification

Given that the purpose of the DRGs is to relate a hospital's case mix to its resource intensity, it was necessary to develop an operational means of determining the types of patients treated and relating each patient type to the resources they consumed. While all patients are unique, groups of patients have demographic, diagnostic, and therapeutic attributes in common that determine their level of resource intensity. By developing clinically similar groups of patients with similar resource intensity, patients can be aggregated into meaningful patient groups. Moreover, if these patient groups covered the entire range of patients seen in an inpatient setting, then collectively they would constitute a patient classification scheme that would provide a means of establishing and measuring hospital case mix complexity. The DRGs were therefore developed as a patient classification scheme consisting of groups of patients who were similar, both clinically, and in terms of their consumption of hospital resources.

During the process of developing the DRG patient classification scheme, several alternative approaches to constructing the patient groups were investigated. Initially, a normative approach was used which involved having clinicians define the DRGs using the patient characteristics they felt were important for determining resource intensity. There was a tendency for these definitions to include an extensive set of specifications requiring information which might not always be collected through a hospital's medical information system. If the entire range of patients were classified in this manner, there would ultimately be thousands of DRGs, most of which described

patients seen infrequently in a typical hospital. It therefore became evident that the process of DRG definition would be facilitated if data from acute care hospitals could be examined to determine the general characteristics and relative frequency of different patient types. In addition, statistical algorithms applied to this data would be useful to suggest ways of forming DRGs that were similar in terms of resource intensity. However, it was also discovered that statistical algorithms applied to historical data in the absence of clinical input would not yield a satisfactory set of DRGs. The DRGs resulting from such a statistical approach, while similar in terms of resource intensity, would often contain patients with a diverse set of characteristics which could not be interpreted from a clinical perspective. Thus, it became apparent that the development of the DRG patient classification scheme required that physician judgment, statistical analysis and verification with historical data be merged into a single process. It was necessary to be able to examine large amounts of historical data with statistical algorithms available for suggesting alternative ways of forming DRGs but to do so in such a way that physicians could review the results at each step to insure that the DRGs formed were clinically coherent.

Basic characteristics of the DRG patient classification system

Given the limitations of previous patient classification systems and the experience of attempting to develop DRGs with physician panels and statistical analysis, it was concluded that in order for the DRG patient classification system to be practical and meaningful, it should have the following characteristics:

- ◆ The patient characteristics used in the definition of the DRGs should be limited to information routinely collected on hospital abstract systems.
- ◆ There should be a manageable number of DRGs which encompass all patients seen on an inpatient basis.
- ◆ Each DRG should contain patients with a similar pattern of resource intensity.
- ◆ Each DRG should contain patients who are similar from a clinical perspective (i.e., each group should be clinically coherent).
- ◆ Restricting the patient characteristics used in the definition of the DRGs to those readily available insured that the DRGs could be extensively applied. The patient information routinely collected includes age, principal diagnosis, secondary diagnoses and the surgical procedures performed. Creating DRGs based on information that is collected only in a few settings, or on information that is difficult to collect or measure, would have resulted in a patient classification scheme which could not be applied uniformly across hospitals. This is not to say that information beyond that currently collected might not be useful for defining the DRGs. As additional information becomes routinely available, it must be evaluated to determine if it could result in improvements in the ability to classify patients.

Limiting the number of DRGs to manageable numbers (i.e., hundreds of patient groups, not thousands) insures that for most of the DRGs, a typical hospital will have enough experience to allow meaningful comparative analysis to be performed. If there were only a few patients in each DRG, it would be difficult to detect patterns in case mix complexity and cost performance and to communicate the results to the physician staff.

The resource intensity of the patients in each DRG must be similar in order to establish a relationship between the case mix of a hospital and the resources it consumes. Similar resource intensity means that the resources used are relatively consistent across the patients in each DRG. However, some variation in resource intensity will remain among the patients in each DRG. In other words, the definition of the DRG will not be so specific that every patient is identical, but the level of variation is known and predictable. Thus, while the precise resource intensity of a particular

patient cannot be predicted by knowing to which DRG he belongs, the average pattern of resource intensity of a group of patients in a DRG can be accurately predicted.

Since one of the major applications of the DRGs is communicating with the physician community, the patients in each DRG must be similar from a clinical perspective. In other words, the definition of each DRG must be clinically coherent. The concept of clinical coherence requires that the patient characteristics included in the definition of each DRG relate to a common organ system or etiology and that a specific medical specialty should typically provide care to the patients in the DRG. For example, patients who are admitted for a D&C or a Tonsillectomy are similar in terms of most measures of resource intensity, such as length of stay, preoperative stay, operating room time, and use of ancillary services. However, different organ systems and different medical specialties are involved. Thus, the requirement that the DRGs be clinically coherent precludes the possibility of these types of patients being in the same DRG.

A common organ system or etiology and a common clinical specialty are necessary but not sufficient requirements for a DRG to be clinically coherent. In addition, all available patient characteristics, which medically would be expected to consistently affect resource intensity, should be included in the definition of the DRG. Furthermore, the definition of a DRG should not be based on patient characteristics that medically would not be expected to consistently affect resource intensity. For example, patients with appendicitis may or may not have peritonitis. Although these patients are the same from an organ system, etiology, and medical specialist perspective, the DRG definitions must form separate patient groups since the presence of peritonitis would be expected to consistently increase the resource intensity of appendicitis patients. On the other hand, sets of unrelated surgical procedures cannot be used to define a DRG since there would not be a medical rationale to substantiate that the resource intensity would be expected to be similar.

The definition of clinical coherence is, of course, dependent on the purpose for the formation of the DRG classification. For the DRGs, the definition of clinical coherence relates to the medical rationale for differences in resource intensity. On the other hand, if the purpose of the DRGs related to mortality, the patient characteristics which were clinically coherent and therefore included in the DRG definitions might be different. Finally, it should be noted that the requirement that the DRGs be clinically coherent caused more patient groups to be formed than would be necessary for explaining resource intensity alone.

Development of the original DRGs

The first operational set of DRGs was developed at Yale University in the early 1970s. The process of forming the original DRGs was begun by dividing all possible principal diagnoses into 23 mutually exclusive principal diagnosis categories referred to as Major Diagnostic Categories (MDCs).

The MDCs were formed by physician panels as the first step toward ensuring that the DRGs would be clinically coherent. The diagnoses in each MDC correspond to a single organ system or etiology and in general, are associated with a particular medical specialty. Thus, in order to maintain the requirement of clinical coherence, no final DRG could contain patients in different MDCs. In general, each MDC was constructed to correspond to a major organ system (e.g., Respiratory System, Circulatory System, Digestive System) rather than etiology (e.g., malignancies, infectious diseases). This approach was used since clinical care is generally organized in accordance with the organ system affected, rather than the etiology. Diseases involving both a particular organ system and a particular etiology (e.g., malignant neoplasm of the kidney) were assigned to the MDC corresponding to the organ system involved. However, not all diseases or disorders could be assigned to an organ system-based MDC and a number of residual MDCs were created (e.g., Systemic Infectious Diseases, Myeloproliferative Diseases, and Poorly Differentiated Neoplasms).

For example, the infectious diseases such as food poisoning and Shigella dysentery are assigned to the Digestive System MDC, while pulmonary tuberculosis is assigned to the Respiratory System MDC. On the other hand, infectious diseases such as miliary tuberculosis and septicemia, which usually involve the entire body, are assigned to the Systemic Infectious Disease MDC.

Once the MDCs were defined, each MDC was evaluated to identify those additional patient characteristics which would have a consistent effect on the consumption of hospital resources. Since the presence of a surgical procedure which required the use of the operating room would have a significant effect on the type of hospital resources (e.g., operating room, recovery room, anesthesia) used by a patient, most MDCs were initially divided into medical and surgical groups. The medical-surgical distinction is also useful in further defining the clinical specialty involved.

Patients were considered surgical if they had a procedure performed which would require the use of the operating room. Since the patient data generally available does not precisely indicate whether a patient was taken to the operating room, surgical patients were identified based on the procedures which were performed. Physician panels classified every possible procedure code based on whether the procedure would normally be performed in the operating room. Thus, closed heart valvotomies, cerebral meninges biopsies and total cholecystectomies would be expected to require the operating room, while thoracentesis, bronchoscopy and skin sutures would not. If a patient had any procedure performed which was expected to require the operating room, that patient would be classified as a surgical patient.

Once each MDC was divided into medical and surgical groups, the surgical patients were usually further defined based on the precise surgical procedure performed, while the medical patients were further defined based on the precise principal diagnosis for which they were admitted to the hospital. The general structure of a typical MDC is shown by the tree diagram in figure 1-1. In general, specific groups of surgical procedures were defined to distinguish surgical patients according to the extent of the surgical procedure performed. For example, the procedure groups defined for the Endocrine, Nutritional and Metabolic MDC are amputations, adrenal and pituitary procedures, skin grafts and wound debridement, procedures for obesity, parathyroid procedures, thyroid procedures, thyroglossal procedures, and other procedures relating to Endocrine, Nutritional, or Metabolic diseases.

Since a patient can have multiple procedures related to their principal diagnosis during a particular hospital stay, and a patient can be assigned to only one surgical group, the surgical groups in each MDC were defined in a hierarchical order. Patients with multiple procedures would be assigned to the surgical group highest in the hierarchy.

Thus, if a patient received both a D&C and a hysterectomy, the patient would be assigned to the hysterectomy surgical group. It should be noted that as a result of the surgical hierarchy, the ordering of the surgical procedures on the patient abstract has no influence on the assignment of the surgical group and DRG.

In general, specific groups of principal diagnoses were defined for medical patients. Usually the medical groups in each MDC would include a group for neoplasms, symptoms and specific conditions relating to the organ system involved. For example, the medical groups for the Respiratory System MDC are pulmonary embolism, infections, neoplasms, chest trauma, pleural effusion, pulmonary edema and respiratory failure, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, simple pneumonia, RSV pneumonia and whooping cough, interstitial lung disease, pneumothorax, bronchitis and asthma, respiratory symptoms and other respiratory diagnoses.




Figure 1–1. Typical DRG structure for a Major Diagnostic Category

In each MDC there is usually a medical and a surgical group referred to as “other medical diseases” and “other surgical procedures,” respectively. The “other” medical and surgical groups are not as precisely defined from a clinical perspective. The other groups would include diagnoses or procedures which were infrequently encountered or not well-defined clinically. For example, the “other” medical group for the Respiratory System MDC would contain the diagnoses psychogenic respiratory disease and respiratory anomalies not otherwise specified, while the “other” surgical group for the female reproductive MDC would contain surgical procedures such as liver biopsy and exploratory laparotomy.

The “other” surgical group contains surgical procedures which, while infrequent, could still reasonably be expected to be performed for a patient in the particular MDC. However, there are also patients who receive surgical procedures which are completely unrelated to the MDC to which the patient was assigned. An example would be a patient with a principal diagnosis of pneumonia whose only surgical procedure is a transurethral prostatectomy. Such patients are assigned to surgical groups referred to as “unrelated operating room procedures.”

The process of defining the surgical and medical groups in an MDC required that each surgical or medical group be based on some organizing principle. Examples of organizing principles would be anatomy, surgical approach, diagnostic approach, pathology, etiology or treatment process. In order for a diagnosis or surgical procedure to be assigned to a particular group, it would be required to correspond to the particular organizing principle for that group. For example, in MDC 11 (Diseases & Disorders of the Kidney & Urinary Tract), a surgical group was formed for all patients with a procedure on the urethra (i.e., organizing principle based on anatomy). This surgical group was then further divided based on whether the procedure performed was transurethral (i.e., organizing principle based on surgical approach).

Once the medical and surgical groups for an MDC were formed, each group of patients was evaluated to determine if complications, comorbidities, or the patient’s age would consistently affect the consumption of hospital resources. Physician panels classified each diagnosis code based on whether the diagnosis, when present as a secondary condition, would be considered a substantial complication or comorbidity. A substantial complication or comorbidity was defined as a condition, that because of its presence with a specific principal diagnosis, would cause an increase in length of stay by at least one day for at least 75 percent of the patients. For example, sarcoidosis, chronic airway obstruction, and pneumococcal pneumonia are considered substantial complications or comorbidities for certain diseases, while simple goiter and benign hypertension are not. Each medical and surgical group within an MDC was tested to determine if the presence of any substantial comorbidities or complications would consistently affect the consumption of hospital resources. For example, the presence of complications or comorbidities was not significant for patients receiving a carpal tunnel release, but was very significant for patients with arrhythmia and conduction disorders. The same basic list of complications and comorbidities is used across most DRGs. However, depending on the principal diagnosis of the patient, some diagnoses in the basic list of complications and comorbidities may be excluded if they are closely related to the principal diagnosis. For example, urinary retention is a complication or comorbidity for a patient admitted for congestive heart failure, but not for a patient admitted for benign prostatic hypertrophy. In addition, in some cases, such as acute myocardial infarction patients, special complications and comorbidity definitions were used in defining the DRGs.

The patient’s age was sometimes used in the definition of the DRGs. Pediatric patients (age 17 years or less) were often assigned to separate DRGs. For example, pediatric asthma patients were defined as a specific DRG.

The final variable used in the definition of the DRGs was the patient discharge status. Separate DRGs were formed for burn patients and newborns if the patients were transferred to another acute care facility. In addition, separate DRGs were formed for patients with alcoholism or drug abuse who left against medical advice and for acute myocardial infarction patients and newborns who died.

There are five DRGs for patients whose medical record abstracts contain clinically atypical or invalid information.

- ◆ DRG 468 Extensive O.R. Procedure Unrelated to the Principal Diagnosis
- ◆ DRG 476 Prostatic O.R. Procedure Unrelated to the Principal Diagnosis

- ◆ DRG 477 Non-Extensive O.R. Procedure Unrelated to the Principal Diagnosis
- ◆ DRG 469 Principal Diagnosis Invalid as Discharge Diagnosis
- ◆ DRG 470 Ungroupable

Patients are assigned to DRGs, 468, 476 or 477 when all the operating room procedures performed are unrelated to the major diagnostic category of the patient's principal diagnosis. Typically, these are patients admitted for a particular diagnosis requiring no surgery, who develop a complication unrelated to the principal diagnosis and who have an operating room procedure performed for the complication or who have a diagnostic procedure performed for a secondary diagnosis. The unrelated operating room procedures have been divided into three groups based on hospital resource use: extensive, prostatic and non-extensive.

For example, a patient with a principal diagnosis of congestive heart failure who develops acute cholecystitis and whose only procedure is a cholecystectomy, will be assigned to DRG 468 since a cholecystectomy is considered an extensive procedure. However, if a patient has a principal diagnosis of arrhythmia and has a biopsy performed for a breast mass discovered while in the hospital, the patient will be assigned to DRG 477 since the biopsy is considered a nonextensive procedure. Finally, a patient with benign prostatic hypertrophy who develops prostatic obstruction while hospitalized for a medical problem such as pneumonia will be assigned to DRG 476 if a transurethral prostatectomy is performed.

Patients are assigned to DRG 469 when a principal diagnosis is coded which, although it is a valid ICD-9-CM code, is not precise enough to allow the patient to be assigned to a clinically coherent DRG. For example, ICD-9-CM code 64690 is an unspecified complication of pregnancy with the episode of care unspecified. This diagnosis code does not indicate the type of complication nor whether the episode of care was antepartum, postpartum or for delivery. Since the DRG definitions assign patients to different sets of DRGs depending on whether the episode of care was antepartum, postpartum or for delivery, a patient with a principal diagnosis of 64690 will be assigned to DRG 469.

It should be noted that patients with a principal diagnosis not typically considered a reason for hospitalization are not assigned to DRG 469. For example, ICD-9-CM code V503, ear piercing, is assigned to DRG 467 and not to DRG 469.

Patients are assigned to DRG 470 if certain types of medical record errors which may affect DRG assignment are present. Patients with an invalid or nonexistent ICD-9-CM code as principal diagnosis will be assigned to DRG 470. Patients will also be assigned to DRG 470 if their age, sex, or discharge status is both invalid and necessary for DRG assignment. For example, if a patient with a principal diagnosis of a valvular disorder has a non-numeric age or has an age coded greater than 124 (age greater than 124 is considered invalid), the assignment will be to DRG 470 since patients with valvular disorders will be assigned to different DRGs depending on their age. On the other hand, if the same patient had a principal diagnosis of hypertension, the assignment will not be to DRG 470 since age is not used in the determination of the DRG for hypertensive patients.

The actual process of forming the DRGs was highly iterative, involving a combination of statistical results from test data with clinical judgment. At any point during the definition of the DRGs, there would often be several patient characteristics which appeared important for understanding the impact on hospital resources. The selection of the patient characteristics to be used, and the order in which they would be used, was a complex task with many factors examined and weighed simultaneously. The end result of this process was the formation of a comprehensive set of DRGs that described all patients treated in acute care hospitals.

Revisions of the DRGs for Medicare

The DRG definitions originally developed at Yale were intended to describe all the types of patients seen in an acute care hospital. Thus, the DRGs encompassed both the elderly patient population as well as the newborn, pediatric, and adult populations. With the implementation of the Medicare prospective payment system (PPS) in October, 1983, the responsibility for the maintenance and modification of the DRG definitions became the responsibility of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). Since the inception of the Medicare PPS, the DRG definitions have been updated annually. Under contract with the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 3M Health Information Systems has performed all revisions of the DRG definitions, related software, and documentation. The focus of all DRG modifications instituted by CMS has been on problems relating to the elderly population. For example, limitations in the DRGs relating to the newborn and pediatric populations have never been addressed by the CMS modifications. The health care industry has utilized the DRGs across a wide array of applications. Hospitals have used DRGs as the basis of internal management systems. Medicaid programs and Blue Cross plans have used DRGs as the basis of payment systems. State data commissions have used DRGs as the basis for statewide comparative reporting systems. Most of these applications have utilized the DRGs across the entire patient population. Thus, the failure of the DRG update process to address DRG problems for the non-elderly population became a serious limitation for most applications of the DRGs.

Development of the AP-DRGs

In 1987, the state of New York passed legislation instituting a DRG-based prospective payment system for all non-Medicare patients. The legislation included a requirement that the New York State Department of Health (NYDH) evaluate the applicability of the DRGs to a non-Medicare population. In particular, the legislation required that the DRGs be evaluated with respect to neonates and patients with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infections. NYDH entered into an agreement with 3M HIS to assist with the evaluation of the need for DRG modifications as well as to make the necessary changes in the DRG definitions and software. The DRG definitions developed by NYDH and 3M HIS are referred to as the All Patient DRGs (AP-DRGs).

Extensive research had been performed by the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions (NACHRI) on alternative approaches to reformulating the DRG categories for neonates and other pediatric patients. The system developed by NACHRI is called the Pediatric Modified Diagnosis Related Groups or PM-DRGs. The PM-DRGs created many additional DRGs specifically for pediatric patients. For neonates, a total of 47 DRGs were created. Neonates were defined as newborns and all other patients of age less than 29 days at admission. As part of its evaluation effort, NYDH and 3M HIS examined the NACHRI neonatal definitions and adopted a modified version of the NACHRI system.

The NACHRI system introduced birth weight and duration of mechanical ventilation as two new variables for neonatal patients. The AP-DRGs include birth weight, but in place of the duration of mechanical ventilation use the non-OR procedures for continuous positive airway pressure and mechanical ventilation in the definitions of certain neonatal AP-DRGs. Except for neonates who die or are transferred within the first few days of life, the AP-DRGs define six ranges of birth-weights that represented distinct demands on hospital resources:

- ◆ Less than 750 grams
- ◆ 750-999 grams
- ◆ 1000-1499 grams
- ◆ 1500-1999 grams
- ◆ 2000-2499 grams
- ◆ Greater than 2499 grams

The six birth weight categories are used as the primary variable in forming the neonatal AP-DRGs. Within each birth weight range, the neonates are first subdivided based on the presence of a significant OR procedure, and then further subdivided by the presence of multiple major problems, major problems, minor problems, or other problems. In addition, there are normal newborn categories for the 2,000–2,499 gram and over 2,500 gram birth weight ranges. The definitions for the major problem, minor problem, and other problem diagnoses used in the neonatal AP-DRGs are a modification of the definitions originally developed by NACHRI. In total there are 34 neonatal AP-DRGs. The differences in hospital resources across the different neonatal AP-DRGs is quite substantial. Based on New York hospital data, a neonate under 750 grams discharged alive costs over 159 times more than a normal newborn.

The state of New York had collected birthweight as a standard variable in its statewide hospital database. However, most hospital databases have not historically collected birthweight as a standard variable. In October of 1988, the newborn ICD-9-CM codes were modified to include a fifth digit specifying the birthweight. The birthweight ranges used in ICD-9-CM correspond directly to the birthweight categories used in the AP-DRGs. Thus, the neonatal AP-DRGs can be used with databases which do not explicitly collect the birthweight variable.

The first step in the determination of the DRG had always been the assignment of the appropriate MDC based on the principal diagnosis. The AP-DRGs for neonates represent a first departure from the use of principal diagnosis as the initial variable in DRG assignment. Assignment to the AP-DRG neonatal MDC is based on the patient's age. The CMS DRGs use the principal diagnosis to assign patients to the neonatal MDC. Unfortunately, some diagnoses usually associated with neonates can also be used as principal diagnosis for non-neonate patients (e.g., neonatal diabetes mellitus). Thus, in the original DRGs, some patients who were not neonates could be assigned to the neonatal MDC. The AP-DRGs assign a patient to the neonatal MDC when the age of the patient at admission is less than 29 days, regardless of the principal diagnosis of the patient. Patients with age over 28 days are assigned to the MDC most appropriate to the principal diagnosis. Patients with age over 28 days with a principal diagnosis that is strictly a neonatal diagnosis (e.g., V3000-single live born in hospital) are assigned to AP-DRG 469.

When the original DRGs were developed, HIV infections were not recognized as a separate disease category. Indeed, there were no ICD-9-CM codes available to identify explicitly HIV infections. In October of 1986, ICD-9-CM was expanded to include a series of codes identifying patients with an HIV infection. The increasing number and associated high cost of HIV infection patients required that AP-DRGs for HIV infection patients be created. In the AP-DRGs MDC 24 was created for HIV infection patients. There are many different complications (e.g., Kaposi's sarcoma) of an HIV infection. The ICD-9-CM coding rules for HIV infections do not specify a standard way of coding an HIV infection. The HIV infection may be coded as principal diagnosis with the complication of the HIV infection as a secondary diagnosis. Alternatively, the HIV complication may be coded as principal diagnosis and the HIV infection as a secondary diagnosis. In order to overcome this lack of standardization in coding, it was necessary to make assignment to MDC 24 dependent on both the principal and secondary diagnoses.

Assignment to MDC 24 is based on a principal diagnosis of an HIV infection, or a principal diagnosis of an HIV related complication combined with a secondary diagnosis of an HIV infection (e.g. principal diagnosis of pneumocystosis and a secondary diagnosis of an HIV infection). If a patient has an HIV infection as a secondary diagnosis and a principal diagnosis that is unrelated to the HIV infection (e.g., cholecystitis), then the patient is not assigned to MDC 24 but is assigned to the MDC associated with the principal diagnosis. MDC 24 consists of 17 AP-DRGs.

The initial HIV AP-DRG consists of all HIV patients who had a tracheostomy. The HIV tracheostomy AP-DRG consists primarily of patients who require long term mechanical ventilation. The HIV AP-DRGs are then subdivided based on the presence or absence of an OR procedure into

surgical and medical groups. Both the surgical and medical patients are further subdivided based on the following:

- ◆ Presence or absence of ventilator support or nutritional support
- ◆ Multiple HIV related major infections
- ◆ Major HIV related diagnoses

Major HIV related infections were subdivided into 12 mutually exclusive categories (e.g., pneumocytosis, septicemia, etc.). A patient was considered to have a multiple major infection when a diagnosis was present from two or more different major infection categories. Major HIV related diagnoses include the major infections as well as other major problems, such as central nervous system problems. In addition, medical patients were further subdivided based on the following:

- ◆ Discharged against medical advice
- ◆ Multiple significant HIV related diagnoses
- ◆ Presence or absence of Tuberculosis
- ◆ Significant HIV related diagnoses
- ◆ Other HIV related diagnoses

Significant HIV related diagnoses were subdivided into an additional 31 mutually exclusive categories (e.g., Kaposi's sarcoma, malnutrition, etc.) that were used to identify patients with multiple significant HIV related diagnoses. Other HIV related diagnoses were relatively minor diagnoses such as dermatophytosis and noninfectious gastroenteritis. Medical patients with no HIV-related diagnoses are assigned to a separate AP-DRG.

The database used in the initial development of the AP-DRGs was an all payor database of 722,626 discharges from 85 New York hospitals. In addition to length of stay, the database contained patient cost computed using departmental cost-to-charge ratios.

The initial release of the AP-DRGs consisted of the additions of MDC 24 and the restructuring of the newborn MDC. For the purpose of consistency with the CMS DRGs, the initial AP-DRGs were referred to as Version 5.0 and were effective in New York state beginning on January 1, 1988. Since the initial release, the AP-DRGs have been updated every one to two years.

The treatment of trauma patients has become highly specialized. Selected hospitals are often designated as trauma centers. Because of the high degree of specialization, it is particularly important that the AP-DRGs identify the different types of multiple trauma patients. MDC 25 was added to the AP-DRGs for multiple trauma patients. All trauma diagnoses were reviewed and divided into eight body site categories (head, chest, abdomen, kidney, urinary, pelvis and spine, lower limb, and upper limb). Within each body site, the traumas that were considered significant were identified (e.g., in the chest body site, a flail chest is a significant trauma while a single fractured rib is not). Patients are assigned to the multiple trauma MDC if they have at least two significant trauma diagnoses (as either principal or secondary) from different body sites. The multiple trauma MDC is divided based on the presence of an operating room procedure. Medical and surgical patients with major nontraumatic complications or comorbidities are assigned to separate AP-DRGs. There are five OR procedure AP-DRGs and three medical AP-DRGs in the multiple trauma MDC. Based on New York cost data, a patient assigned to the multiple trauma MDC will cost on average twice as much as trauma patients who do not have multiple traumas.

MDC 20 (Alcohol/Drug Use & Alcohol/Drug Induced Organic Mental Disorders) for alcohol and drug abuse was also completely restructured. Patients were differentiated based on the substance being abused:

- ◆ Opioid abuse
- ◆ Alcohol abuse
- ◆ Cocaine and other drug abuse

Each category of substance abuse was then further subdivided based on whether the patient left against medical advice, and the presence of complications and comorbidities. There are a total of nine AP-DRGs in MDC 20.

Patients who are on long-term mechanical ventilation are extremely expensive. Long-term ventilation patients require that a tracheostomy be performed. Across all MDCs, patients with a tracheostomy were put into one of two tracheostomy AP-DRGs. Patients with certain mouth, larynx, or pharynx diseases are not patients on long-term ventilation support, but are patients who are having the tracheostomy performed for therapeutic reasons as treatment for the mouth, larynx, or pharynx problem. These patients are assigned a separate AP-DRG while all other patients with a tracheostomy represent long-term ventilation patients and are assigned to a different AP-DRG.

Liver transplants, bone marrow transplants, heart transplants, kidney transplants, and lung transplants are very expensive and can be performed for diagnoses in different MDCs (e.g., a liver transplant can be performed for certain poisonings as well as for certain liver diseases). All liver, bone marrow, heart, kidney, lung and simultaneous kidney/pancreas transplant patients are assigned to an AP-DRG independent of the MDC of the principal diagnosis.

Table 1–1. Major Diagnostic Categories

| | |
|----|---|
| 1 | Diseases and Disorders of the Nervous System |
| 2 | Diseases and Disorders of the Eye |
| 3 | Ear, Nose, Mouth, Throat, and Craniofacial Diseases and Disorders |
| 4 | Diseases and Disorders of the Respiratory System |
| 5 | Diseases and Disorders of the Circulatory System |
| 6 | Diseases and Disorders of the Digestive System |
| 7 | Diseases and Disorders of the Hepatobiliary System and Pancreas |
| 8 | Diseases and Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue |
| 9 | Diseases and Disorders of the Skin, Subcutaneous Tissue and Breast |
| 10 | Endocrine, Nutritional and Metabolic Diseases and Disorders |
| 11 | Diseases and Disorders of the Kidney and Urinary Tract |
| 12 | Diseases and Disorders of the Male Reproductive System |
| 13 | Diseases and Disorders of the Female Reproductive System |
| 14 | Pregnancy, Childbirth and the Puerperium |
| 15 | Newborns and Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period |
| 16 | Diseases and Disorders of Blood, Blood Forming Organs and Immunological Disorders |
| 17 | Lymphatic, Hematopoietic, Other Malignancies, Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy |
| 18 | Infectious and Parasitic Diseases, Systemic or Unspecified Sites |
| 19 | Mental Diseases and Disorders |
| 20 | Alcohol/Drug Use and Alcohol/Drug Induced Organic Mental Disorders |
| 21 | Poisonings, Toxic Effects, Other Injuries and Other Complications of Treatment |
| 22 | Burns |

Table 1–1. Major Diagnostic Categories (continued)

| | |
|----|--|
| 23 | Rehabilitation, Aftercare, Other Factors Influencing Health Status and Other Health Service Contacts |
| 24 | Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infections |
| 25 | Multiple Significant Trauma |

Major complications and comorbidities

Some complications and comorbidities (CC) will have a greater impact on hospital resource use than other CCs. For example, a secondary diagnosis of septicemia will in general be more resource intensive than a CC of chronic ulcer. The AP-DRGs designate a subset of the CCs as major CCs.

The impact of the presence of a major CC was evaluated for each MDC. In many MDCs, the presence of a major CC tended to have a dominate effect on the resources used by the patient. In recognition of the impact of major CCs and in order to avoid significantly increasing the number of DRGs, a single major CC AP-DRG across all surgical patients within an MDC and a single major CC AP-DRG across all medical patients within an MDC were formed for some MDCs. It was not always possible to form a single major CC AP-DRG for the medical or surgical portion of an MDC. For example, in MDC 1, it was necessary to form two major CC AP-DRGs for surgical patients consisting of patients with a craniotomy versus patients with any other nervous system procedure. At least two major CC AP-DRGs were created for each MDC with the exception of MDCs 14, 15, 19, 20 and 22–24 in which no major CC AP-DRGs were created. In total, there are 60 major CC AP-DRGs.

AP-DRG hierarchy

The departure in the AP-DRGs from the use of principal diagnosis as the initial variable in DRG assignment made it necessary to form a hierarchy of all the exceptions to the principal diagnosis based assignment to an MDC. The hierarchy for assigning patients to an AP-DRG is shown in table 1–2. For example, based on this hierarchy, if a patient has a tracheostomy and multiple trauma, the patient is assigned to the appropriate tracheostomy AP-DRG.

Table 1–2. AP-DRG Hierarchy

| Exception Hierarchy | MDC/AP-DRG Assignment |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Age less than 29 days | Assign to MDC 15 |
| Principal diagnosis of HIV or secondary diagnoses of HIV and principal diagnosis of HIV related condition | Assign to MDC 24 |
| Liver Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 480 |
| Lung Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 795 |
| Simultaneous Kidney/Pancreas Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 805 |
| Heart Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 103 |
| Kidney Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 302 |
| Allogeneic Bone Marrow Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 803 |
| Autologous Bone Marrow Transplant | Assign to AP-DRG 804 |
| Tracheostomy | Assign to AP-DRG 482 or 483 |
| Principal diagnosis of trauma and at least two significant traumas from different body sites | Assign to MDC 25 |
| Principal Diagnosis | Assign to MDCs 1–14, 16–23 |

Pediatric and other AP-DRG modifications

The AP-DRGs introduce many other changes to the CMS DRGs. Some of these primarily affect pediatric patients while others affect patients of all ages. The pediatric modifications include some of the recommendations originally developed by NACHRI. In the following areas either additional AP-DRGs were created or significant modifications were made:

- ◆ Pediatric ventricular shunts
- ◆ Pediatric cystic fibrosis
- ◆ Lead poisoning
- ◆ Spinal fusion
- ◆ Compulsive nutritional disorders
- ◆ Infant aftercare for weight gain
- ◆ High-risk obstetric care
- ◆ Tertiary aftercare for multiple trauma
- ◆ Acute leukemia
- ◆ Multiple channel cochlear implants
- ◆ Hemophilia factor VIII and IX diseases
- ◆ Traumatic stupor, coma, concussion and intracranial injuries
- ◆ Bronchopulmonary dysplasia
- ◆ Congenital anomalies
- ◆ Sickle cell crisis

In addition, the AP-DRGs subdivide many of the pediatric groups based on CCs, whereas the CMS DRGs do not. The AP-DRGs also modified many of the basic components of the CMS DRGs. For example, diagnoses were deleted from the CC list (e.g., allergic urticaria), the CC exclusion list was modified (e.g., postoperative anemia is not a CC with a principal diagnosis of postoperative hemorrhage) and the surgical hierarchies were modified (e.g., Arthroscopy was moved lower in the surgical hierarchy for MDC 8). There are 653 AP-DRG in Version 18.0, two of which are error DRGs. There are 510 CMS DRGs in Version 20.0, two of which are error DRGs.

Some of the DRG modifications originally developed in the AP-DRGs have subsequently been adopted in the CMS DRGs. For example, in Version 8.0 of the CMS DRGs, an HIV infection MDC was added. However, the CMS HIV infection MDC consists of three DRGs and does not discriminate among HIV infection patients at the level of detail contained in the AP-DRGs.

Other related research

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services funded a project at Yale University to revise the use of complications and comorbidities (CC) in the DRGs. The Yale project categorized all secondary diagnoses that were considered a CC in the CMS DRGs into distinct levels. For surgical patients there were four levels of secondary diagnoses, (minor or non-CC, moderate CC, major CC and catastrophic CC). For medical patients there were three levels of secondary diagnoses (minor or non-CC, moderate or major CC and catastrophic CC). All age splits and CC splits in the existing CMS DRGs were eliminated and replaced by four subclasses for surgical patients, or three subclasses for medical patients.

A patient is assigned to the subclass corresponding to the highest level secondary diagnosis. Thus, a surgical patient with two moderate CCs and one major CC is assigned to the major CC subclass. The number of secondary diagnoses has no effect on the subclass assigned to the patient (i.e., multiple secondary diagnoses at one level do not cause the patient to be assigned to a higher subclass). Thus, although a surgical patient may have four moderate CCs present, the patient is still assigned to the moderate CC subclass. The result of the applications of the Yale research was the creation of a total of nearly 1200 DRGs.

While the original Yale research demonstrated that significant improvement in the prediction of hospital cost could be achieved by the addition of CC subclasses, there were several major limitations of the Yale research.

- ◆ The base DRGs were the CMS DRGs and, therefore, the non-Medicare population was not adequately addressed.
- ◆ Death was used to define the base DRGs and, therefore, the system could not be used for any type of mortality analysis.
- ◆ The subclasses were formed based on resource intensity and did not address severity of illness or risk of mortality.
- ◆ There was no recognition of the impact of multiple secondary diagnoses.
- ◆ The only secondary diagnoses that were utilized in the assignment of a patient to a CC subclass were the secondary diagnoses that were considered a CC in the CMS DRGs.
- ◆ The formation of four subclasses for surgical patients and three subclasses for medical patients was inconsistent and confusing.

Despite these limitations, the Yale research team demonstrated that meaningful CC subclasses could be created within DRGs.

CHAPTER 2

Development of the All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Groups (APR-DRGs)

DEVELOPMENT OF THE ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS (APR-DRGS)

Expanding the scope of the DRG system

The original objective of the DRGs was to develop a patient classification system that related the types of patients treated to the resources they consumed. Thus, the DRGs focused exclusively on resource intensity. The CMS DRGs (formerly the HCFA DRGs) and the AP-DRGs have remained focused on this limited objective. As the health care industry has evolved there has been increased demand for a patient classification system that can be used for applications beyond resource use, cost, and payment. In particular, a patient classification system is needed for:

- ◆ The comparison of hospitals across a wide range of resource and outcome measures. Such comparisons are typically disseminated to the public by state data commissions
- ◆ The evaluation of differences in inpatient mortality rates
- ◆ The implementation and support of critical pathways
- ◆ The identification of continuous quality improvement projects
- ◆ The basis of internal management and planning systems
- ◆ The management of capitated payment arrangements

In order to meet these needs, the objective of the DRG system needed to be expanded in scope to address patient severity of illness and risk of mortality as well as resource intensity. As previously defined, these patient attributes have the following meaning:

Severity of illness. The extent of physiologic decompensation or organ system loss of function.

Risk of mortality. The likelihood of dying.

Resource intensity. The relative volume and types of diagnostic, therapeutic, and bed services used in the management of a particular disease.

The APR-DRGs expand the basic DRG structure by adding four subclasses to each DRG. The addition of the four subclasses addresses patient differences relating to severity of illness and risk of mortality. Severity of illness and risk of mortality relate to distinct patient attributes. For example, a patient with acute cholelithiasis (acute gallstone attack) as the highest secondary diagnosis may be considered a major severity of illness but only a minor risk of mortality. The severity of illness is major since there is significant organ system dysfunction associated with acute cholelithiasis. However, it is unlikely that the acute episode alone will result in patient mortality and thus, the risk of mortality for this patient is minor. If additional, more serious diagnoses are also present, patient severity of illness and risk of mortality may increase. For example, if peritonitis is present along with the acute cholelithiasis, the patient may be considered an extreme severity of illness and a major risk of mortality. Since severity of illness and risk of mortality are distinct patient attributes, separate subclasses are assigned to a patient for severity of illness and risk of mortality. Thus, in the APR-DRG system a patient is assigned three distinct descriptors:

- ◆ The base APR-DRG (e.g., APR-DRG 194 Heart Failure or APR-DRG 440 Kidney Transplant)
- ◆ The severity of illness subclass
- ◆ The risk of mortality subclass

The four severity of illness subclasses and the four risk of mortality subclasses are numbered sequentially from 1 to 4 indicating respectively, minor, moderate, major, or extreme severity of illness or risk of mortality. For applications such as evaluating resource use or establishing patient

care guidelines, the APR-DRG in conjunction with severity of illness subclass is used. For evaluating patient mortality the APR-DRG in conjunction with the risk of mortality subclass is used.

Although the subclasses are numbered 1–4, the numeric values represent categories and not scores. For example, severity subclass 4 congestive heart failure patients are not comparable to severity subclass 4 patients with a fractured leg. Thus, it is not meaningful to average the numeric values (i.e., 1–4) of the severity of illness or risk of mortality subclasses across a group of patients to compute an average severity score. However, the APR-DRG severity and risk of mortality subclasses can be used to compute an expected value for a measure of interest (e.g., length of stay, cost, mortality), using statistical techniques such as indirect rate standardization.

The underlying clinical principle of APR-DRGs is that the severity of illness or risk of mortality subclass of a patient is highly dependent on the patient's underlying problem and that patients with high severity of illness or risk of mortality are usually characterized by multiple serious diseases or illnesses. In the APR-DRGs, the assessment of the severity of illness or risk of mortality of a patient is specific to the base APR-DRG to which a patient is assigned. In other words, the determination of the severity of illness and risk of mortality is disease-specific. Thus, the significance attributed to complicating or comorbid conditions is dependent on the underlying problem. For example, certain types of infections are considered a more significant problem in a patient who is immunosuppressed than in a patient with a fractured arm. In APR-DRGs, high severity of illness or risk of mortality are primarily determined by the interaction of multiple diseases. Patients with multiple comorbid conditions involving multiple organ systems represent difficult-to-treat patients who tend to have poor outcomes.

The development process

The process used in the development of the APR-DRGs involved an iterative process of formulating clinical hypotheses and then testing the hypotheses with historical data. Separate clinical models were developed for each of the base APR-DRGs. Once the clinical model for severity of illness and risk of mortality was developed for each base APR-DRG, it was evaluated with historical data in order to review the clinical hypotheses. If there was a discrepancy between clinical expectations and the data results, the clinical content of the ICD-9-CM diagnosis and procedure codes was closely examined to determine if ambiguities in the definition or content of the codes could explain the discrepancy. Any discrepancies between clinical expectations and data results were always resolved by using clinical expectations as the basis for the APR-DRGs. Thus, the APR-DRGs are a clinical model that has been extensively tested with historical data. The historical data used in the development of Version 20.0 of the APR-DRGs was a nationwide database of 8.5 million discharges, which included all payer discharges from 1,000 general hospitals from 10 states, and all payer discharges from 47 children's hospitals in the United States.

Development of the base APR-DRG

The AP-DRGs (see chapter 1) were initially used as the base DRGs in the formation of the initial APR-DRGs. A series of consolidations, additions, and modifications were then made to these initial APR-DRGs to create the base APR-DRGs. Similar to the Yale research, the first step in forming the APR-DRGs was to consolidate all age, CC and major CC splits. The APR-DRGs also consolidated all splits based on discharge status of death. This was necessary so that death as an outcome variable could be examined across all the APR-DRGs.

In addition to these uniform consolidations, the APR-DRG system introduced an extensive set of consolidations, additions, and refinements to the initial APR-DRG categories. This includes the diagnoses and procedures and birthweight ranges (for newborns) that define an APR-DRG, the procedure codes that are considered OR procedures, and the placement of surgical APR-DRGs in their respective MDC surgical hierarchies. The APR-DRG system has also introduced numer-

ous changes to the definition of MDCs and the pre-MDC hierarchies and categories. Finally, the APR-DRG system has introduced a new kind of logic referred to as “rerouting logic,” that reassigns a patient to a new MDC and APR-DRG in certain circumstances where the principal diagnosis is overly broad or the sequencing of principal and secondary diagnosis is unclear. Altogether these changes result in a set of base APR-DRGs that are very different from those of other DRG classification systems. Following is a summary description of these changes.

Consolidate APR-DRGs based on complicated principal diagnosis

APR-DRGs that were defined based on complicated principal diagnoses were consolidated. For example, in the initial version of APR-DRGs, appendectomies with a complicated principal diagnosis (e.g., appendicitis with peritonitis) were assigned to a different APR-DRG than uncomplicated appendectomies. The APR-DRGs for appendectomies were consolidated and recognition of the complicated principal diagnosis was subsequently incorporated into the subclass assigned within the APR-DRG. Other examples of this kind of consolidation include vaginal delivery with complicating diagnoses and other antepartum diagnoses with complicating diagnoses.

Consolidate APR-DRGs based upon complicated OR procedures

The APR-DRG system consolidated certain surgical categories that, in both the CMS DRGs and AP-DRGs, are subdivided based upon more complicated types of OR procedures. Examples of surgical category consolidations are cholecystectomy with common duct exploration versus cholecystectomy without common duct exploration, and total mastectomy versus subtotal mastectomy. Surgical procedures were consolidated when the different procedures represented fundamentally the same type of patient and the difference in complexity could be captured through the APR-DRG severity of illness and risk of mortality subclasses.

Consolidate APR-DRGs based on case volume

The general trend toward outpatient surgery made some of the initial APR-DRGs extremely low in volume. Such APR-DRGs were consolidated into other similar APR-DRGs. For example, carpal tunnel releases are now rarely performed on an inpatient basis. Thus, the APR-DRG for carpal tunnel release was consolidated into the APR-DRG for nervous system procedures for peripheral nerve disorders, which includes procedures such as tarsal tunnel release, and, subsequently, all of these procedures were consolidated into the APR-DRG for other nervous system and related OR procedures. Since the early 1990’s when the APR-DRGs were first developed, there have been many areas where hospitalization rates have decreased. This is examined carefully and in each subsequent update of the APR-DRG classification system, there have been a number of further consolidations for low volume APR-DRG categories for both medical and surgical patients.

Pediatric additions

While the AP-DRGs incorporated some of the pediatric modifications from the PM-DRGs (see chapter 1), the APR-DRGs incorporated the remaining significant pediatric modifications in the PM-DRGs. In addition, in conjunction with NACHRI, the APR-DRGs were reviewed with a national pediatric database. As a result of this review, additional APR-DRGs were created. For example, scoliosis (curvature of the back) is one of the primary reasons spinal fusions are performed on pediatric patients. Spinal fusions for scoliosis tend to be more complex than spinal fusions for other clinical reasons such as a herniated disk. Thus, the APR-DRG for spinal fusions was subdivided based on a principal diagnosis of scoliosis. Another example is the creation of an APR-DRG for major cardiothoracic repair of heart anomaly.

Restructure newborn APR-DRGs

The base APR-DRGs for newborns were completely restructured. Age was used instead of principal diagnosis to define the newborn MDC; birthweight ranges were used as the starting point framework for newborn APR-DRGs; surgical APR-DRGs were created within each birthweight range; and medical hierarchies were created within birthweight ranges that have more than one medical APR-DRG. A medical hierarchy is necessary because newborns do not have a principal diagnosis in the usual sense. Most newborns have a live newborn status code as their principal diagnosis. This does not permit assignment to a medical APR-DRG based on principal diagnosis. Thus, it was necessary to create a medical hierarchy for newborns.

As in the AP-DRGs, the APR-DRG newborn MDC was initially defined to include all neonates, with age 0–28 days at time of admission. For Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, the age definition for MDC 15 was redefined and narrowed to be more consistent with its title, “Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period.” MDC 15 is now defined to include patients age 0–7 days and a subset of patients age 8–14 days who are low birthweight patients and may still have perinatal complications during this time period necessitating transfer to another hospital. This removes from MDC 15 virtually all readmissions to the hospital for community acquired infections and other problems that occur after the first week of life. The new age definition for MDC 15 increases the clinical similarity of MDC 15 patients, better aligns MDC 15 patients with the organization of patient care units and physician specialties, allows for the elimination of certain low volume APR-DRGs in MDC 15, and places the older neonatal patients (8–28 days) in other MDCs where they can be assigned to more disease specific APR-DRGs.

Initially, the newborn MDC was organized into six birthweight ranges—the same as in AP-DRGs. For Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, the number of birthweight ranges was expanded to eight and the number of different APR-DRG categories within each birthweight range was decreased. The net effect of all APR-DRG category changes in MDC 15 was a reduction in the number of base APR-DRGs from 35 in Version 15.0 to 28 in Version 20.0.

Version 20.0 of APR-DRGs also incorporates the use of gestational age codes that were introduced into ICD-9-CM in October 2002. Gestational age is used as part of the severity of illness and risk of mortality subclass assignment for newborns.

Add APR-DRGs for mortality

The same base APR-DRGs are used in conjunction with both the severity of illness subclasses and risk of mortality subclasses. Thus, some new APR-DRGs were necessary in order to reflect differences in mortality. For example, initial APR-DRG 45 (Specific Cerebrovascular Disorders Except TIA) was subdivided into APR-DRG 45 (CVA With Infarct) and APR-DRG 44 (Intracranial Hemorrhage) as a result of the significantly higher mortality rate for intracranial hemorrhage patients. In Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, neonates <500 grams (1.1 pounds) were placed in a new APR-DRG separate from neonates 500–749 grams (1.1–1.6 pounds) because the mortality rates are so much higher for neonates <500 grams.

Other APR-DRG additions and refinements

Chapter 1 of the APR-DRG Definitions Manual explains that the process of defining the medical and surgical categories in an MDC requires that each category be based on some organizing principle. The end goal is to create categories that are clinically coherent and have sufficient case volume to be useful. Following are examples of ways in which Version 20.0 APR-DRG modifications improve clinical coherence:

- ◆ Consolidate APR-DRGs if there aren't meaningful clinical differences; e.g., combine APR-DRG 202 Angina Pectoris and APR-DRG 198 Coronary Atherosclerosis.
- ◆ Improve the clinical distinction between related APR-DRGs; e.g., redefine APR-DRGs 301 and 302 for joint replacement to be based on the joint replaced (i.e., hip versus knee) instead of the etiology (i.e., trauma versus non trauma).
- ◆ For MDC 22 (Burns), re-conceptualize the APR-DRGs to give further emphasis to third degree burns.
- ◆ For MDC 24 (Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infections), refine the list of major HIV related conditions and significant HIV related conditions.
- ◆ For MDC 25 (Multiple Significant Trauma), redefine the APR-DRGs giving more emphasis to the surgical categories.
- ◆ Throughout the MDCs, consistently define APR-DRGs for which the reason for the hospitalization is a complication of treatment. These APR-DRGs now exist in MDCs 5, 6, 8, 11, 18, and 21.
- ◆ Throughout the MDCs, refine and make more consistent the definition of Other Related OR Procedures APR-DRGs.
- ◆ Substantially redefine the three APR-DRGs for OR Procedures Unrelated to Principal Diagnosis so that each is defined by a distinct level of surgical complexity.

Reclassification of OR Procedures

The APR-DRG system has reevaluated the procedure codes considered OR procedures which in turn affects whether a patient will be assigned to a surgical or medical APR-DRG. Version 20.0 APR-DRGs removed 62 procedure codes from the APR-DRG list of OR procedures, leading to two-and-a-half percent fewer patients classified into surgical APR-DRGs. The highest impact reclassified procedure is excisional debridement. Next most common is endoscopic lung biopsy followed by certain other biopsies of bone, soft tissue, blood vessel, cervix, uterus, and bladder. Other reclassified procedures with volume are interruption of vena cava and linear repair eyelid laceration. The APR-DRGs most affected by these procedure code reclassifications are the APR-DRGs previously defined on the basis of skin graft or excisional wound debridement in MDCs 8, 9, 10, and 21 and the "other OR procedure" APR-DRGs throughout the various MDCs.

Revise MDC definitions

The APR-DRG system has introduced numerous changes to MDC definitions, especially with Version 20.0 APR-DRGs.

- ◆ The age definition for MDC 15 (Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period) was narrowed as described previously.
- ◆ MDC 25 (Multiple Significant Trauma) was updated with respect to the lists of significant trauma diagnoses and the introduction of OR procedures to clarify whether certain diagnoses represent significant trauma. The net effect was to decrease the number of MDC 25 medical patients and increase the number of MDC 25 surgical patients.
- ◆ MDC 24 (Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infections) was updated with respect to the definition of HIV related diagnoses, leading to somewhat fewer patients assigned to MDC 24.
- ◆ MDC 21 was redefined and had its title changed from "Injuries, Poisonings & Toxic Effects of Drugs" to "Poisonings, Toxic Effects, Other Injuries and Other Complications of Treatment." The title change reflects that most of the injury diagnoses previously in MDC 21 have been moved to other body system specific MDCs, namely MDCs 1, 3, 5, 8, and 9. "Other Complica-

tions of Treatment” was added into the title of MDC 21 since these diagnoses have always been in MDC 21.

- ◆ Cranial and face bone diagnoses, previously dispersed across MDCs 3, 8, and 21, were consolidated into MDC 3 which is reflected in the revised title for MDC 3, “Ear, Nose, Mouth, Throat and Craniofacial Diseases and Disorders.”
- ◆ Prematurity diagnoses (for older neonates and infants) and orthopedic aftercare diagnoses were moved to MDC 23 (Rehabilitation, Aftercare, Other Factors Influencing Health Status & Other Health Service Contacts).

In addition, other individual diagnoses were assigned to different MDCs.

Revise MDC surgical hierarchies

The APR-DRG system has introduced a number of changes to the MDC surgical hierarchies. Version 20.0 introduces changes to the surgical hierarchies for MDCs 1, 3, 5, 6, and 8. To illustrate, in MDC 6 (Diseases & Disorders of the Digestive System), APR-DRG 224 (Peritoneal Adhesiolysis) was moved lower in the surgical hierarchy following the APR-DRGs for appendectomy, anal procedures, and hernia procedures because the peritoneal adhesiolysis is usually adjunct to these procedures and not the patient’s primary surgical procedure. Most of the patients who remain in APR-DRG 224 are having peritoneal adhesiolysis performed for intestinal obstruction.

A similar example in MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue), is APR-DRG 312 Skin Graft, Except Hand for Musculoskeletal and Connective Tissue Diagnoses, which was moved lower in the surgical hierarchy. It now follows the APR-DRGs for knee/lower leg procedures, foot & toe procedures, and shoulder, upper arm & forearm procedures because the skin graft is usually an adjunct to these procedures and not the patient’s primary surgical procedure. The skin graft procedure is indicative of the complexity of the procedure and is taken into consideration in the severity of illness and risk of mortality logic that deals with select combinations of OR procedures.

Revise Pre-MDC hierarchies and categories

The initial APR-DRGs started with the same pre-MDC hierarchies and categories as AP-DRGs: MDC 15 (Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period), MDC 24 (Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infections), Transplants, two Tracheostomy APR-DRGs and MDC 25 (Multiple Significant Trauma). For Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, this was reordered as follows: Transplants, MDC 15, Tracheostomy APR-DRGs, MDC 25, and MDC 24. The reordering of the pre-MDC hierarchies provided a clearer focus for classifying the most defining aspects of the hospitalization for these patients.

Version 20.0 APR-DRGs redefined and narrowed the definition of the two pre-MDC Tracheostomy APR-DRGs. The previous approach included virtually all tracheostomy patients with separate APR-DRGs based on whether the principal diagnosis pertained to the face, mouth, or neck, implying that the tracheostomy was a therapeutic treatment for an upper airway problem versus all other principal diagnoses, which implies that the tracheostomy was performed to allow the patient to be on extended mechanical ventilation. The new approach requires that all patients assigned to the tracheostomy APR-DRGs receive mechanical ventilation 96+ hours and subdivides the tracheostomy APR-DRGs based on whether there is an extensive OR procedure. The new approach in effect narrows the definition to patients on extended mechanical ventilation and classifies other tracheostomy patients to the regular APR-DRG categories—particularly in MDC 3 (Ear, Nose, Mouth, Throat & Craniofacial Diseases and Disorders).

Rerouting logic

The basic organizing approach to classification in the APR-DRG system is to first assign a patient to a Major Diagnostic Group (MDC) based upon principal diagnosis, and then to a specific APR-DRG category based upon principal diagnosis (if medical) or operating room procedure (if surgical). This works well in the vast majority of cases and results in the patient being assigned to the MDC and APR-DRG that best describes the reason for the hospitalization.

There are several different kinds of situations, however, where using the principal diagnosis as the starting point for establishing the MDC and APR-DRG needs to be supplemented by additional information to yield the most useful classification of the patient. One such situation occurs when there is a clear patient characteristic that should take priority, such as for a patient with an organ transplant or a tracheostomy in the absence of an ENT problem. This situation is handled by Pre-MDC assignment logic mentioned above. Another situation occurs when the principal diagnosis is overly broad, or the sequencing of principal diagnosis and secondary diagnosis is unclear, or a surgical procedure provides clarification of the principal diagnosis. These situations are handled through what is referred to as APR-DRG “rerouting logic” which considers secondary diagnoses, procedures, and sometimes age, most often in conjunction with the principal diagnosis, to clarify the reason for the hospitalization. The rerouting logic either reassigns the patient to a new APR-DRG within the same MDC (Within MDC Rerouting) or to a new MDC and APR-DRG (Across MDC Rerouting).

These situations are not unique to the APR-DRG classification system. They represent ambiguities that confront any DRG classification system. What is unique to the APR-DRG classification system is the rerouting logic developed to assign these patients to the most appropriate and useful category.

An example of a medical rerouting within an MDC is a patient with a principal diagnosis of chest pain and a secondary diagnosis of angina pectoris or coronary atherosclerosis. The chest pain diagnosis is a symptom of the angina or coronary atherosclerosis and should have been recorded as a secondary diagnosis. The rerouting logic will assign this patient to APR-DRG 198 Angina Pectoris & Coronary Atherosclerosis instead of APR-DRG 203 Chest Pain, and will resequence the diagnosis of angina or coronary atherosclerosis as the principal diagnosis so that these diagnoses do not make a redundant contribution to the severity of illness and risk of mortality subclass assignment.

An example of a medical patient rerouting across MDCs is a patient with a principal diagnosis of hypovolemia (dehydration) and a secondary diagnosis of gastroenteritis. There is some ambiguity in the sequencing of principal and secondary diagnosis, while the patient fundamentally is a gastroenteritis patient who has some level of dehydration. So, in this example there would be a rerouting from MDC 10, APR-DRG 422 Hypovolemia to MDC 6, APR-DRG 249 Non-Bacterial Gastroenteritis, Nausea & Vomiting.

An example of a surgical patient rerouting across MDCs is amputation. In previous versions of APR-DRGs and other DRG systems, there are distinct amputation DRGs in MDCs 5, 8, and 10. In Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, most of these patients are rerouted to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) and grouped according to the MDC 8 surgical hierarchy. The end result is that clinically similar amputation patients are grouped together rather than dispersed into separate lower volume amputation groups.

The sequencing of principal diagnosis and secondary diagnosis on the patient discharge records is not altered by any of these resequencing processes. Rather, the APR-DRG grouper is redesignating principal diagnosis and secondary diagnosis for specified steps that are part of its logic. In the example of principal diagnosis hypovolemia and secondary diagnosis gastroenteritis, the

APR-DRG grouper resequences principal diagnosis and secondary diagnosis for grouping purposes but when users examine their own discharge records hypovolemia will still be the principal diagnosis. This also means that when users examine their patients in MDC 6 (Diseases & Disorders of the Digestive System) and especially APR-DRG 249 Non-Bacterial Gastroenteritis, Nausea & Vomiting, some of the patients will have a principal diagnosis of hypovolemia, which is ordinarily assigned to MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders). A fuller explanation of the APR-DRG rerouting logic and a more extensive set of illustrations is in chapter 3.

The end result of the consolidation and refinement process for Version 12.0 of the APR-DRG classification system released in 1995 was the creation of 382 base APR-DRGs (plus two ungroupable or invalid APR-DRGs). This was further consolidated to 355 base APR-DRGs for Version 15.0 released in 1998 and to 314 base APR-DRGs (plus two ungroupable or invalid APR-DRGs) for Version 20.0 released in 2003. The modifications to the base APR-DRGs were sufficiently extensive that a complete renumbering of the base APR-DRGs was included as part of the Version 15.0 update. The Version 20.0 list of APR-DRGs is contained in appendix A.

There were many changes to the APR-DRG category definitions introduced as part of Version 20.0 of the APR-DRG system. Overall, this reduced the number of base APR-DRGs by 41 from 357 to 316 as a result of the elimination of 55 base APR-DRGs and the addition of 14 new base APR-DRGs. In addition, 66 base APR-DRGs had major definitional changes and 102 base APR-DRGs had moderate definitional changes. Version 20.0 reduced the number of final APR-DRG severity of illness and risk of mortality subclass categories from 1,422 to 1,258 (including two ungroupable or invalid APR-DRGs that do not have subclasses).

Once the definition of the base APR-DRGs was completed, four severity of illness subclasses and four risk of mortality subclasses for each of the APR-DRGs were evaluated and updated for each new release of the APR-DRGs.

Overview of APR-DRG subclass assignment

The process of determining the subclasses for an APR-DRG begins by first assigning a severity of illness level and a risk of mortality level to each secondary diagnosis. The term “level” is used when referring to the categorization of a secondary diagnosis. The term “subclass” is used when referring to one of the subdivisions of an APR-DRG. For secondary diagnoses, there are four distinct severity of illness levels and four distinct risk of mortality levels. The four levels are numbered sequentially from 1 to 4 indicating, respectively, minor, moderate, major or extreme severity of illness or risk of mortality. Each secondary diagnosis is assigned to one of the four severity of illness levels and one of the four risk of mortality levels. The severity of illness level and risk of mortality level associated with a patient’s secondary diagnoses is just one factor in the determination of a patient’s overall severity of illness subclass and risk of mortality subclass.

The assignment of a patient to a severity of illness or risk of mortality subclass takes into consideration not only the level of the secondary diagnoses but also the interaction among secondary diagnoses, age, principal diagnosis, and the presence of certain OR procedures and non-OR procedures. The subdivision of each of the 314 APR-DRGs into the four subclasses, combined with the two error APR-DRGs (955, 956), which are not subdivided, results in 1,258 APR-DRGs.

The process of determining the severity of illness or risk of mortality subclass of a patient consists of three phases. In Phase I, the level of each secondary diagnosis is determined. Once the level of each individual secondary diagnosis is established, then Phase II determines a base subclass for the patient based on all of the patient’s secondary diagnoses. In Phase III, the final subclass for the patient is determined by incorporating the impact of principal diagnosis, age, OR procedure, non-OR procedures, multiple OR procedures, and combinations of categories of secondary

diagnoses. A detailed description of the determination of the severity of illness subclass and the risk of mortality subclass will be presented separately.

The three-phase process of determining the severity of illness subclass is summarized in figure 2–1. There are six steps to Phase I, three steps to Phase II, and nine steps to Phase III for a total of 18 steps.




Figure 2-1. Three-phase process for determining patient severity of illness subclass

Phase I—Determining the severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis

1. Eliminate secondary diagnoses associated with the principal diagnosis

If a secondary diagnosis is closely related to the principal diagnosis and does not add any distinguishing information, the secondary diagnosis is excluded from the determination of the severity of illness subclass. For example, a secondary diagnosis of urinary retention is excluded from the determination of the severity of illness subclass if the principal diagnosis is benign prostate hypertrophy because the urinary retention is caused by the benign prostate hypertrophy and will usually be present for patients hospitalized for benign prostate hypertrophy. For Version 20.0 APR-DRGs, the secondary diagnosis and principal diagnosis exclusion list was comprehensively reviewed and extensively modified. The updated list contains 529,658 pairs of secondary diagnosis–principal diagnosis exclusions.

2. Assign each secondary diagnosis to its standard severity of illness level

Each secondary diagnosis is assigned to one of the four distinct severity of illness levels. Examples of the different severity of illness levels are contained in table 2–1.

Table 2–1. Examples of severity of illness levels

| Severity of Illness Level | Examples | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Minor | Uncomplicated Diabetes | Bronchitis |
| Moderate | Diabetes with Renal Manifestations | Asthma with Status Asthmaticus |
| Major | Diabetes with Ketoacidosis | Viral Pneumonia |
| Extreme | Diabetes with Hyperosmolar Coma | Respiratory Failure |

The severity of illness level for diabetes progresses from minor for uncomplicated diabetes to extreme for diabetes with hyperosmolar coma. Similarly, the severity of illness level for respiratory diagnoses progresses from minor for bronchitis to extreme for respiratory failure.

For version 20.0 APR-DRGs, the standard severity of illness level was comprehensively reviewed for all secondary diagnoses codes. There were a number of revisions introduced—the majority of which were to lower the standard severity of illness level. In situations where there was a great deal of variability within an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code, the approach was to lower the standard severity of illness level and then in later steps of Phase I, consider whether modifications to the standard severity of illness level are indicated based upon specific age ranges, APR-DRGs, or non-OR procedures. For example, the secondary diagnosis code 51882 Other pulmonary insufficiency NEC includes a very specific and severe condition such as adult respiratory distress syndrome, but is sufficiently broad to include other much less severe forms of pulmonary insufficiency. Version 20.0 APR-DRGs lowers this secondary diagnosis from extreme to moderate, but then in a later Phase I step adjusts the severity of illness level up to major if the patient receives mechanical ventilation <96 hours, and up to extreme if the patient receives mechanical ventilation 96+ hours. The mechanical ventilation is an indicator of more severe pulmonary insufficiency and is often needed for patients with adult respiratory distress syndrome.

For version 20.0 APR-DRGs there are a total of 12,988 ICD-9-CM diagnoses codes. These codes are assigned to the following severity of illness levels: 8,332 minor, 2,927 moderate, 894 major, 835 extreme. Compared to version 15.0 APR-DRGs, there are a slightly higher proportion of secondary diagnoses classified as minor and moderate severity of illness diagnoses and a slightly lower proportion classified as major and moderate severity of illness diagnoses.

There is no direct correspondence between the severity of illness level assigned to a secondary diagnosis and the non-CC and CC designation in the AP-DRGs and the CMS DRGs. However, non-CCs in AP-DRGs and CMS DRGs tend, in general, to be assigned a minor severity of illness level, while CCs tend, in general, to be assigned a moderate, major, or extreme severity of illness level. While this general correspondence exists, there are extensive exceptions. For example, there are 1,812 secondary diagnoses in the AP-DRGs and 1,957 secondary diagnoses in the CMS DRGs that are considered a non-CC, but were assigned to the moderate, major or extreme severity of illness level in the APR-DRGs. Some examples of these diagnoses, with the APR-DRG severity level in parentheses, are contained in table 2–2.

Table 2–2. Examples of secondary diagnoses that are a non-CC in CMS DRGs

| | |
|-------|--------------------------------------|
| 82129 | Fx Low End Femur - Closed (major) |
| 5723 | Portal Hypertension (moderate) |
| 5762 | Obstruction of Bile Duct (major) |
| 4589 | Hypotension NOS (moderate) |
| 41412 | Dissection Coronary Artery (extreme) |

Conversely, some diagnoses considered by the APR-DRG system as low severity of illness diagnoses are considered a CC in the AP-DRGs and CMS DRGs. This, in part, is the result of the fact that the last complete reevaluation of the designation of secondary diagnoses as a non-CC or CC was performed in 1980 when the ICD-9-CM version of the DRGs was created. There are 514 secondary diagnoses in AP-DRGs and 547 secondary diagnoses in CMS DRGs that are considered a CC but are assigned a minor severity of illness level in the APR-DRGs. Some examples of these diagnoses are contained in table 2–3.

Table 2–3. Examples of secondary diagnoses that are a CC in CMS DRGs

| | |
|-------|-------------------------------------|
| 5781 | Blood in stool (minor) |
| 684 | Impetigo (minor) |
| 99653 | Lens Prosthesis Malfunction (minor) |

The relatively large number of diagnoses moved to the minor severity of illness level was in part due to the decision to assign to the minor severity of illness level most secondary diagnoses related to pregnancy that were coded with an unspecified episode of pregnancy care (e.g., ICD-9-CM code 65100 Twin pregnancy without an indication of whether the encounter was for antepartum care, post partum care, or delivery). The only exceptions were diabetes mellitus, venous complications in pregnancy, and obstetrical pyemic and septic embolism, which were assigned to a higher severity of illness level. Another reason is that the APR-DRG system has assigned to the minor severity of illness level most diagnoses that are described as complications of treatment. While complications of treatment are sometimes unavoidable and not due to poor quality of care, the APR-DRG system has been very conservative in allowing these diagnoses to contribute to the patient’s severity of illness level (the same is true for risk of mortality). Most of the ICD-9-CM complications of treatment diagnosis codes in the 990 series and the obstetrical complications of the administration of anesthesia were changed to minor severity of illness level in the version 15.0 APR-DRGs. In addition, there are some other complications of treatment diagnosis codes that were changed to minor severity of illness level in version 20.0 APR-DRGs (e.g., tracheostomy, gastrostomy, colostomy complications, and iatrogenic pneumothorax).

There are some secondary diagnoses that can have different meanings or implications in different circumstances and these received special attention in version 20.0 APR-DRG through the various Phase I steps. To illustrate, there are circumstances where secondary diagnosis code 3481 Anoxic brain damage may be part of the patient's acute presenting condition (e.g., major trauma, poisoning, major neurological, respiratory, cardiac or infectious condition) and an indicator of high severity of illness. There are other instances where anoxic brain damage is not ordinarily expected and may represent the use of code 3481 for long standing anoxic brain damage (from a prior event), or possibly an unexpected complication of treatment. To take into account these different circumstances, version 20.0 APR-DRGs lowered the standard severity of illness level for anoxic brain damage from extreme to minor, but then, in a later Phase I step, adjusts the severity level back up to extreme for selected APR-DRGs where it is reasonable to expect that the anoxic brain damage may be part of the patient's presenting condition. (This was handled the same way for risk of mortality.)

Another set of secondary diagnoses that received special attention is the secondary diagnoses of cardiac arrest, ventricular fibrillation and ventricular flutter. In version 15.0 APR-DRGs, these diagnoses were all assigned a severity of illness level of extreme (likewise for risk of mortality.) These secondary diagnoses unquestionably represent very extreme acute diagnoses. At the same time, there is a unique aspect to these diagnoses in that they can potentially be coded for most patients who die and whose admitting condition is not cardiac or cardiac related. If this was to occur, the subclass assignment logic, especially for risk of mortality, could become somewhat circular. To avoid this possibility, the standard severity of illness level (and standard risk of mortality level) in version 20.0 APR-DRGs was changed from extreme to minor, and then for a small subset of APR-DRGs adjusted back up to extreme. The subset includes APR-DRGs for major neurological, respiratory, cardiovascular, and infectious conditions, and poisonings. For these APR-DRGs, the patients are at a clear risk of having a cardiac arrest, ventricular fibrillation, or ventricular flutter and so these secondary diagnoses contribute to the severity of illness (and risk of mortality) assignment. This is different from other APR-DRGs where the patient is not at an apparent risk of a cardiac arrest, ventricular fibrillation, or ventricular flutter. Patients in these other APR-DRGs could still have a cardiac arrest, ventricular fibrillation, or ventricular flutter as part of the course of their hospitalization, but since their principal diagnosis is not cardiac or cardiac related, there is the concern for potential overcoding of these secondary diagnoses for patients who die. Version 20.0 APR-DRGs do not let these occurrences contribute to the patient's severity of illness level or risk of mortality level.

The process of determining the severity of illness subclass for a patient begins by assigning each secondary diagnosis its standard severity of illness level. The next step is to modify the standard severity of illness level based on other patient attributes. The patient attributes which can modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis are the age of the patient, the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis, the APR-DRG, and the presence of certain non-operating room procedures. These potential modifiers are evaluated and applied sequentially through Phase I.

3. Modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis based on age

The age of the patient will modify the standard severity of illness level assignment for some secondary diagnoses. For pediatric patients there are some secondary diagnoses that are modified to a higher level throughout all childhood years. For example, hypertension is modified from minor to major and really represents a different disease in children than adults. There are other secondary diagnoses that are modified only for certain childhood ages, most often early childhood. For example, many congenital anomalies and syndromes have their most difficult presentation in the neonatal time period and the first year of life, and are modified to a higher level for these ages. For example, hypoplastic left heart syndrome and combined immune deficiency are both modified from major to extreme for children less than one year of age. There are also some secondary

diagnoses that are modified to a lower level for pediatric patients. For example, thrush is modified from moderate to minor for children less than one year of age.

In general, for elderly patients, for select secondary diagnoses, the severity of illness level is increased. For example, the secondary diagnoses of hypovolemia (dehydration) and chronic bronchitis are modified from minor to moderate and asthma with status asthmaticus is modified from moderate to major for patients age >69 years.

4. Modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis

The standard severity of illness level for some secondary diagnoses may be modified depending on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis of the patient. In version 20.0, this logic is applied only to APR-DRG 190 Acute Myocardial Infarct. In general, secondary diagnoses that are closely related to the principal diagnosis are excluded from the determination of the severity of illness subclass. However, for a patient admitted for an acute anterior wall myocardial infarction, an acute anterolateral myocardial infarction represents an extension of the acute anterior wall myocardial infarction. Therefore, the acute anterolateral myocardial infarction is not excluded and is assigned a severity of illness level of moderate.

5. Modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG

The standard severity of illness level for many secondary diagnoses may be modified depending on the APR-DRG to which the patient is assigned. Altogether, there are 3,681 modifications of the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis depending upon the APR-DRG. The APR-DRG specific modifications to the severity of illness level of individual secondary diagnoses reflects the disease-specific nature of the determination of severity of illness.

Some examples of APR-DRG modifications are shown in table 2–4. Chronic renal failure significantly increases the severity of illness level for patients with diabetes and, thus, is increased to a major severity of illness for the APR-DRG for diabetes. Cardiomegaly is not only common for congestive heart failure patients, but it is also an integral part of the disease and is reduced to a minor severity of illness level for the APR-DRG for congestive heart failure. Uncomplicated diabetes is a minor secondary diagnosis, but for a vaginal delivery, represents a more difficult delivery and is therefore increased to a moderate severity of illness level.

Table 2–4. Examples of modification of standard Severity of Illness level based on APR-DRG

| Secondary Diagnosis | Standard Severity of Illness Level | APR-DRG | Modified Severity of Illness Level |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|---|
| Chronic Renal Failure | Moderate | Diabetes | Major |
| Cardiomegaly | Moderate | Congestive Heart Failure | Minor |
| Uncomplicated Diabetes | Minor | Vaginal Delivery | Moderate |

In general, for surgical APR-DRGs, secondary diagnoses that constituted or were associated with the reason for performing the procedure had their standard severity of illness level decreased. In general, for medical APR-DRGs, secondary diagnoses that were closely related to the reason for the admission had their standard severity of illness level decreased. In essence, the standard severity of illness level of every secondary diagnosis was reviewed with every APR-DRG and modified when appropriate. For version 20.0 APR-DRGs, there were a substantial number of additions and modifications made on this basis.

6. Modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis based on non-OR procedures

Some secondary diagnoses can vary significantly in terms of their severity and clinical impact on patients. The presence of certain non-OR procedures can indicate a more extensive disease process. This type of modification is applied to only nine sets of non-OR procedure codes and to only a limited number of secondary diagnoses. The most important of these are the procedure codes for mechanical ventilation. Mechanical ventilation <96 hours is used to increase the standard severity level of a secondary diagnosis by an increment of one up to major; e.g., asthma with status asthmaticus would increase from level moderate to major if the patient had mechanical ventilation <96 hours. Mechanical ventilation 96+ hours is used to increase the standard severity level of illness of a secondary diagnosis by an increment of two up to extreme; e.g., other pulmonary insufficiency not elsewhere classified (which includes adult respiratory distress syndrome) increases the standard severity of illness level from moderate to extreme and a diagnosis such as pneumonia NOS which is already a level of major increases to extreme if the patient had mechanical ventilation 96+ hours. In each of these instances, the need for mechanical ventilation is indicative of a patient with more severe pulmonary illness, especially those who require ventilation for 96+ hours.

Among the other non-OR procedures that are used as part of this step, renal dialysis is used to increase the severity level of nephritis by an increment of one up to a maximum of major; total parenteral nutrition (TPN) is used to increase regional enteritis and ulcerative colitis by an increment of one up to major; and temporary pacemaker is used to increase heart block diagnoses such as trifascicular block by an increment of one up to major. Overall, non-OR procedures as part of this step in the APR-DRG severity of illness logic are used more sparingly in version 20.0 than previous versions.

Phase II—Determine the base severity of illness subclass for the patient

Once each secondary diagnosis has been assigned its standard severity of illness level and the standard severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis has been modified based on age, APR-DRG and principal diagnosis, APR-DRG, and presence of certain non-OR procedures, the Phase II base severity of illness subclass for the patient can be determined. The process of determining the base patient severity of illness subclass of the patient begins with the elimination of certain secondary diagnoses that are closely related to other secondary diagnoses. The elimination of these diagnoses prevents the double counting of clinically similar diagnoses in the determination of the severity of illness subclass of the patient. Once redundant diagnoses have been eliminated, the base severity of illness subclass is determined based on all of the remaining secondary diagnoses. There are three steps to Phase II.

7. Eliminate certain secondary diagnoses from the determination of the severity of illness subclass of the patient

Closely related secondary diagnoses are grouped together with clinically similar diagnoses. If more than one secondary diagnosis from the same secondary diagnosis group is present, then only the secondary diagnosis with the highest severity of illness level is preserved. All other secondary diagnoses in the group have their severity level reduced to minor, virtually eliminating them from contributing to the patient's base subclass determination. There are 289 secondary diagnosis groups defined for this step. For example, the secondary diagnoses of cerebral embolism with infarct and precerebral occlusion are in the same secondary diagnosis group, Cerebrovascular Diagnoses. Since the cerebral embolism with infarct is an extreme severity of illness level, and the precerebral occlusion is a moderate severity of illness level, the cerebral embolism with infarct will be preserved and the severity of illness level of the precerebral occlusion will be reduced to one when they are both present as secondary diagnoses.

8. Combine all secondary diagnoses to determine the base severity of illness subclass of the patient

Once secondary diagnoses that are related to other secondary diagnoses have had their severity levels reduced to minor, the base patient severity of illness subclass is set equal to the maximum severity of illness level across all of the remaining secondary diagnoses. For example, if there are five remaining secondary diagnoses and one is a major severity of illness level and four are a moderate severity of illness level then the base patient subclass is major.

9. Reduce the base severity of illness subclass of patients with a major or extreme subclass unless the patient has multiple secondary diagnoses at a high severity level

In order to be assigned to the major or extreme severity of illness subclass, a patient must have multiple secondary diagnoses at a high severity of illness level. High severity of illness patients are usually characterized by the presence of multiple high severity of illness secondary diagnoses. Patients with a base severity of illness subclass of extreme must have two or more secondary diagnoses that are an extreme severity of illness level, or one secondary diagnosis at an extreme severity of illness level plus at least two other secondary diagnoses at a major severity of illness level—otherwise the base severity of illness subclass is reduced to major. Patients with a base severity of illness subclass of major must have two or more secondary diagnoses that are a major severity of illness level, or one secondary diagnosis at a major severity of illness level plus at least two other secondary diagnoses at a moderate severity of illness level—otherwise the base severity of illness subclass is reduced to moderate. Thus, a secondary diagnosis of AMI is not sufficient to assign a patient to an extreme severity of illness subclass. In addition to the AMI, there must be at least one additional extreme severity of illness secondary diagnosis (e.g., acute renal failure) or two or more additional major severity of illness secondary diagnoses (e.g., congestive heart failure and diabetic ketoacidosis).

Phase III—Determine the final severity of illness subclass of the patient

Once the base patient severity of illness subclass is computed, the patient severity of illness subclass may be increased or decreased based on specific values of the following patient attributes:

- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and principal diagnosis
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and age, or APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and age
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and non-OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and pairs of OR procedures
- ◆ Combination of APR-DRG for ECMO and presence/absence of certain OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and principal diagnoses and non-OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses

Phase III examines these eight patient attributes, seven of which are APR-DRG specific, and then as its ninth step, computes the patient's final severity of illness subclass assignment.

In Phase I, age and non-OR procedures were used to modify the standard severity of illness level of a secondary diagnosis. However, age and non-OR procedures can also have an impact that is specific to the patient's APR-DRG or to a specific principal diagnosis within the APR-DRG. Thus, the impact of age and non-OR procedures is reassessed in Phase III as part of the determination of the severity of illness subclass of the patient. Based on the patient attributes listed above, a series of modifications to the base patient severity of illness subclass are made during Phase III.

The final patient severity of illness subclass is computed based on the Phase II base patient severity of illness subclass and the modifications to the base severity of illness subclass made in Phase III.

10. Modify severity of illness subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and principal diagnosis

This step is used extensively in Phase III to modify a patient's severity of illness subclass. The ICD-9-CM coding system will sometimes include in a single diagnosis code both the underlying disease and an associated manifestation of the disease. For example, if the principal diagnosis code is 25020 Diabetes with hyperosmolar coma, the patient is assigned to the APR-DRG for diabetes. Ordinarily, if the patient had no secondary diagnoses then the severity of illness subclass would be minor. Since the principal diagnosis includes not only the underlying diagnosis but also a major manifestation, the diabetic patient with hyperosmolar coma should be assigned to a higher patient severity of illness subclass. In order to accommodate this idiosyncrasy of ICD-9-CM, if the principal diagnosis is an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code that represents multiple diagnoses, or a diagnosis as well as a high severity manifestation, the severity of illness subclass of the patient is increased by a specified increment up to a specified maximum subclass. For example, if diabetes with hyperosmolar coma is the principal diagnosis, the severity of illness subclass of the patient is increased by one up to a maximum subclass of major. Other examples of principal diagnoses that include an important manifestation include: head trauma with prolonged or deep coma, intractable epilepsy, ruptured aortic aneurism, acute stomach ulcer with perforation and obstruction, acute appendicitis with peritonitis, and open fracture of the femur shaft.

Within specific APR-DRGs there are also some principal diagnoses that are indicative of higher severity of illness relative to the other principal diagnoses in the APR-DRG. For example, the severity of illness subclass of patients in APR-DRG 221 Major Small & Large Bowel Procedures with a principal diagnosis of acute vascular insufficiency of the intestine is increased by one up to a maximum subclass of moderate. Relative to the other principal diagnoses associated with the procedures in APR-DRG 221 (e.g., diverticulosis of colon, bowel malignancies), acute vascular insufficiency of the intestine represents a more severely ill patient. A medical example is hemophilia factor VIII that is increased by two up to major in APR-DRG 661 Coagulation Disorders.

Conversely, within specific APR-DRGs some principal diagnoses are indicative of lower severity of illness relative to the other principal diagnoses in the APR-DRG. For example, within APR-DRG 404 Thyroid, Parathyroid & Thyroglossal Procedures, patients with a principal diagnosis of nontoxic uninodular goiter will have their severity of illness subclass decreased by one if their severity of illness subclass up to this point in the process were major or moderate. Relative to the other principal diagnoses associated with the procedures in APR-DRG 404 (e.g., malignant neoplasm of thyroid), nontoxic uninodular goiter represents a less severely ill patient. A medical example is first degree burns, which is decreased from moderate to minor in APR-DRG 844 Partial Thickness Burns as these patients are less severely ill than second degree burn patients.

11. Modify severity of illness subclass for the patient based combinations of APR-DRG and age, or APR-DRG, principal diagnosis and age

For some principal diagnoses in specific APR-DRGs, the patient's age essentially represents a complicating factor. For specific principal diagnoses and age combinations in certain APR-DRGs, the severity of illness subclass of the patient is increased by a specified increment up to a specified maximum subclass. For example, for pediatric patients in APR-DRG 344 Osteomyelitis, Septic Arthritis & Other Musculoskeletal Infections with bone infection as a principal diagnosis, the severity of illness subclass is increased by one up to a maximum of a moderate subclass. The increase in the severity of illness subclass indicates that bone infection in a pediatric patient represents a more severely ill patient. Elderly patients with certain principal diagnoses have their

severity of illness subclass increased by one to a maximum subclass of moderate. For example, patients age >69 years with certain septicemia principal diagnoses in APR-DRG 720 Septicemia and patients age >79 years with chronic/unspecified ulcer with hemorrhage without obstruction in APR-DRG 241 Peptic Ulcer & Gastritis have their severity of illness subclass increased by one to a maximum of moderate.

For some APR-DRGs the patient's severity of illness subclass is modified for all patients in an age range, not just for those certain principal diagnoses. This modification has been applied to just elderly patients and in just two MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders) APR-DRGs and five MDC 19 (Mental Diseases & Disorders) APR-DRGs. For example, patients age >79 years in APR-DRG 421 Malnutrition, Failure to Thrive and Other Nutritional Disorders and APR-DRG 422 Hypovolemia & Related Electrolyte Disorders will have their severity of illness subclass increased by an increment of one up to a maximum subclass of moderate.

12. Modify the severity of illness subclass for the patient based upon combinations of APR-DRG and non-OR procedures

For some APR-DRGs the presence of certain non-OR procedures represents a complicating factor. The most important of these are the codes for mechanical ventilation. For a number of neurological, respiratory, certain cardiovascular, neonatal, burn, and trauma patients, the need for mechanical ventilation indicates a more severely ill patient and the patient's severity of illness subclass is increased most often by an increment of one to a maximum subclass of major. In the same APR-DRGs, mechanical ventilation 96+ hours is often used to increase the patient's severity of illness subclass by an increment of two up to a maximum subclass of extreme. The exact amount of the increment will vary according to the APR-DRG category. For example, in the instance of neonates the increment varies depending upon birthweight and medical or surgical APR-DRG. In the cardiovascular APR-DRGs, balloon pulsation device is used to increase the severity subclass by an increment of one to a maximum of major for most surgical categories and by an increment of two to extreme for most medical APR-DRGs.

13. Modify the severity of illness subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and OR procedure

This step is used extensively in Phase III to modify a patient's severity of illness subclass. Within specific APR-DRGs, some OR procedures are indicative of higher severity of illness relative to the other OR procedures in the APR-DRG. For example, the severity of illness subclass of patients in APR-DRG 362 Mastectomy Procedures with an OR procedure of bilateral extended radical mastectomy is increased by one up to a maximum of a moderate subclass. Relative to the other OR procedures in APR-DRG 362 (e.g., unilateral simple mastectomy), a bilateral extended radical mastectomy represents a patient that is more severely ill.

Conversely, within specific APR-DRGs, some OR procedures are indicative of lower severity of illness relative to the other OR procedures in the APR-DRG. For example, the severity of illness subclass of patients in APR-DRGs 162 and 163 (Cardiac Valve Procedure With and Without Cardiac Catheterization) with an OR procedure of open heart valvuloplasty, is less complex than patients receiving cardiac valve replacements, and have their severity of illness subclass decreased by one for patients with a severity of illness subclass up to this point in the process that is moderate.

14. Modify the severity of illness subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and pairs of OR procedures

Within specific APR-DRGs some pairs of OR procedures are indicative of higher severity of illness relative to the other patients in the APR-DRG. Areas where multiple procedures are a

significant determinant of severity of illness include: peripheral bypass surgery plus lower limb amputation or skin graft, cranial procedures plus face bone or jaw procedures, multiple spinal fusion procedures (anterior and posterior), and multiple procedures related to trauma such as multiple limb procedures, limb procedure plus back procedure, and limb procedure plus skin or fascia graft. For example, if a patient in APR-DRG 308 Hip & Femur Procedure for Trauma receives both a femur procedure (upper leg) and one of a specified set of tibia/fibula procedures (lower leg) or shoulder/arm procedures, the severity of illness subclass will be increased by one up to a maximum subclass of extreme. Relative to other femur procedure patients, those who also have a procedure for trauma to other extremities have a higher severity of illness.

15. Modify the severity of illness subclass for the patient based upon combination of APR-DRG for ECMO and presence/absence of certain OR procedures

This step is specific to the logic of how one APR-DRG is defined, APR-DRG 583 Neonate With ECMO (Extracorporeal Membrane Oxygenation). All of the patients who receive ECMO are severely ill but there are two subsets of ECMO patients, those who receive ECMO along with a major OR procedure for a congenital diaphragmatic hernia or heart condition and those who receive ECMO because conventional therapy has been unsuccessful at treating pulmonary hypertension and respiratory failure. To distinguish, those neonatal patients who do not have one of the major neonatal surgeries have their severity subclass decreased by one.

16. Modify the severity of illness subclass for the patient based upon combinations of APR-DRG, principal diagnosis and non-OR procedure

Specific principal diagnoses within an APR-DRG in combination with certain non-OR procedures will increase the severity of illness subclass by a specified increment up to a specified maximum severity of illness subclass. This step applies to a limited number of patients, mostly cancer patients receiving chemotherapy or radiation therapy. For example, patients with a principal diagnosis of malignancy in APR-DRG 343 (Musculoskeletal Malignancy and Pathological Fracture Due To Musculoskeletal Malignancy) are increased by one level up to a maximum subclass of major if radiation therapy or chemotherapy is performed.

17. Establish a minimum severity of illness subclass for the patient based on the presence of specific combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses

The presence of certain combinations of secondary diagnoses has great clinical significance. The interaction of specific combinations of secondary diagnoses makes treatment more difficult and typically indicates a more extensive disease process. Therefore, a minimum patient severity of illness subclass greater than minor is established if certain combinations of secondary diagnoses are present. The presence of multiple interacting diagnoses is characteristic of high severity of illness patients. A subset of secondary diagnoses interact with each other causing patient severity of illness to be increased. All of the ICD-9-CM diagnosis codes were classified into either one of the 83 core secondary diagnosis categories applicable to all patients except MDC 15 (Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period) or to one of the 21 secondary diagnosis categories applicable to a subset of MDC 15. The 83 core secondary diagnosis categories are shown in table 2–5. Each of these categories represents a disease process and is further subdivided by severity of illness level. The full numbering of the categories includes the two digits shown in table 2–5 plus a third digit for the severity of illness level of the secondary diagnoses in the category. To illustrate, secondary diagnosis category 15 Cerebrovascular Diagnoses includes diagnoses that span all four severity levels so the full numbering and titling is: 151 Cerebrovascular Diagnoses (1), e.g., cerebral atherosclerosis; 152 Cerebrovascular Diagnoses (2), e.g., occlusion and stenosis of pre-cerebral artery without cerebral infarction; 153 Cerebrovascular Diagnoses (3), e.g., occlusion and stenosis of pre-cerebral artery with cerebral infarction; and 154 Cerebrovascular Diagnoses (4), e.g., cerebral thrombosis with cerebral infarc-

tion. Not all secondary diagnosis categories contain four severity levels. Some describe a disease process that has only three severity levels (e.g., Ear, Nose & Throat; Eye) or only two severity levels (e.g., Asthma; Hypertension). Others describe a more singular disease process that has only one severity level (e.g., Coronary Bypass Graft Status, Acute Myocardial Infarct, Hypovolemia). Altogether, the secondary diagnosis categories together with severity level break-outs contain 240 categories.

Table 2–5. Categories of Secondary Diagnoses

| | Secondary Diagnosis Category | | Secondary Diagnosis Category |
|----|---|----|--|
| 01 | AMI–Subsequent/Unspecified | 35 | Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diagnoses |
| 02 | Abdominal Trauma | 38 | Eye Diagnoses |
| 03 | Abortion | 39 | Gastrointestinal Diagnoses |
| 04 | Acute Myocardial Infarct | 40 | Genitourinary Diagnoses |
| 05 | Alcohol & Drug Abuse | 41 | Gynecological Diagnoses |
| 06 | Arteries, Veins & Other Vascular DX | 42 | HIV |
| 07 | Asthma | 43 | Head & Neck Trauma w/o Coma |
| 08 | Atrial Fibrillation | 44 | Hematological & Immunological Diagnoses |
| 09 | Bacterial Infections | 45 | Hematological Malignancy |
| 10 | Benign Neoplasm and CA in Situ | 46 | Hemiplegia |
| 11 | Brain Malignancy | 47 | Hemorrhoids |
| 12 | Burn | 48 | History of Major Organ Surgery |
| 13 | CABG Status | 49 | History of Malignancy |
| 14 | Congestive Heart Failure | 50 | Hypotension |
| 15 | Cerebrovascular Diagnoses | 51 | Hypovolemia |
| 16 | Cardiac Diagnoses | 52 | Incidental Signs, Symptoms & Findings |
| 17 | Cardiac & Respiratory Arrest | 53 | Incidental V Codes |
| 18 | Chest & Respiratory Trauma | 54 | Fx (Limb), Open Wounds & Other Injuries |
| 19 | Cardiovascular Device Malfunction | 55 | Iron Deficiency Anemia |
| 20 | Hypertension | 56 | Kaposi's Sarcoma |
| 21 | Child & Adult Abuse | 57 | Lung Malignancy |
| 22 | Chronic Renal Failure | 58 | Digestive Malignancy |
| 23 | Cirrhosis | 59 | Malnutrition |
| 24 | Head Trauma W Coma | 60 | Mental Health |
| 25 | Chromosomal Anomaly/Other Specified Syndromes | 61 | Multiple Birth |
| 26 | Decubitus Ulcer | 62 | Musculoskeletal Diagnoses |
| 27 | Delirium Tremens | 63 | Neonatal Diagnoses |
| 28 | Dental & Oral Diagnoses | 64 | Neurological Diagnoses |
| 29 | Dermatologic Diagnoses | 65 | Obstetrics |
| 30 | Diabetes | 67 | Osteoarthritis |
| 31 | Dialysis Status | 68 | Ostomy Status - GI & GU |
| 32 | Dysrhythmia | 69 | Other Complications |
| 33 | Ear, Nose & Throat Diagnoses | 70 | Other Malignancy |
| 34 | Electrolyte Diagnoses Except Hypovolemia | 72 | Pleural Effusion |

| | Secondary Diagnosis Category |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 73 | Poisoning |
| 74 | TB, Fungal, Parasitic Infections |
| 75 | Pulmonary Diagnoses |
| 76 | Acute Renal Failure |
| 77 | Respirator Dependence |
| 78 | Secondary Malignancy |
| 79 | Shock |

| | Secondary Diagnosis Category |
|----|-------------------------------------|
| 80 | Sickle Cell Anemia |
| 81 | Spinal Cord & Vertebral Injuries |
| 82 | Surgical & Device Complications |
| 83 | Thrombophlebitis |
| 84 | Transplant Status |
| 86 | Urinary Tract Infection |
| 87 | Viral Infections |

The secondary diagnosis categories for MDC 15 are shown in table 2–6. These are intended for use with just two groups of MDC 15 patients: APR-DRG 626 Neonate BWT 2000 – 2499 Grams, Normal Newborn Or Neonate With Other Problem and APR-DRG 640 Neonate BWT >2500 Grams, Normal Newborn Or Neonate With Other Problem. The secondary diagnoses on this list are nearly all diagnoses with a severity of illness level of minor, so no further differentiation based on severity level is necessary. It is their purpose to distinguish newborns with multiple minor or other problems from those who are normal newborns or have a single minor problem. This is an important distinction because there is a very large case volume of these newborn patients.

Table 2–6. Categories of Secondary Diagnoses for MDC 15

| MDC 15 Secondary Diagnosis Category | |
|--|--|
| 900 | Craniofacial Anomalies |
| 901 | Musculoskeletal Anomalies |
| 902 | Maternal Infections & Other Maternal Effects Except Noxious Substances |
| 903 | Chromosomal Anomaly NOS |
| 904 | Perinatal Jaundice from Prematurity/Other Specified Causes |
| 905 | Circulatory Disorder Diagnoses |
| 906 | Gastrointestinal Disorder Diagnoses |
| 907 | Newborn Peripheral Nerve Injury |
| 908 | Fetal Malnutrition |
| 909 | Newborn Meconium Aspiration |
| 910 | Other Newborn Respiratory Problem/Other Asphyxia |
| 911 | Newborn Feeding Problem Diagnoses |
| 912 | Hypo-Hypertonia/Other Newborn Problem Diagnoses |
| 913 | Noxious Influences Affecting Fetus Through Placenta/Breast Milk |
| 914 | Infant of Diabetic Mother |
| 915 | Hemolytic Disease Due to Isoimmunization |
| 916 | Other Hematologic Disorders Except Isoimmunization |
| 917 | Dehydration |
| 918 | Hypoglycemia |
| 919 | Fever |
| 920 | Transient Tachypnea |

As summarized in table 2–7 there are nine different types of combinations of secondary diagnosis categories that will result in a minimum severity of illness subclass for a patient. For combination types 1 through 5, four significant secondary diagnoses are required in order to increase the severity of illness subclass of a patient. Two of the four secondary diagnoses must constitute one of the secondary diagnosis category combinations and must not have had their standard severity of illness level decreased as part of the Phase I severity level modifications. The addition of the third and fourth secondary diagnoses increases the likelihood that the specific combination of secondary diagnosis categories represents a more extensive and severe disease process.

Table 2–7. Combinations of Secondary Diagnosis Categories

| Combination Type | Combination of Categories | Additional Secondary Diagnoses Required | Minimum Severity of Illness |
|-------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Specified combinations of two major categories | At least two additional secondary diagnoses of major or higher | Extreme (4) |
| 2 | Specified combinations of a major and moderate category | At least two additional secondary diagnoses of major or higher | Extreme (4) |
| 3 | Specified combinations of two moderate categories | At least two additional secondary diagnoses of moderate or higher | Major (3) |
| 4 | Specified combinations of a moderate and minor category | At least two additional secondary diagnoses of moderate or higher | Major (3) |
| 5 | Specified combinations of two minor categories | At least two additional secondary diagnoses of minor or higher | Moderate (2) |
| 6 | Specified combinations of two moderate categories | None | Major (3) |
| 11 | Specified combinations of two major categories | At least one additional secondary diagnosis of major | Extreme (4) |
| 13 | Specified combinations of two moderate categories | At least one additional secondary diagnosis of moderate | Major (3) |
| 15 | Specified combinations of two minor categories | At least one additional secondary diagnosis of minor | Moderate (2) |

Combination types 11, 13, and 15 only require a total of three significant secondary diagnoses, the two that make up the secondary diagnosis category combination and one additional secondary diagnosis. This reflects that the secondary diagnosis category combination is sufficiently significant that only one additional secondary diagnosis is required. Combination types 11, 13, and 15 are new to version 20.0 of the APR-DRG system. Previous versions contained only types 1 through 6.

A type 1 combination consists of two secondary diagnosis categories that contain major severity of illness level diagnoses, plus any third and fourth secondary diagnosis that is at least a major severity of illness level. When a type 1 combination occurs, the minimum patient severity of illness subclass is extreme. An example of a type 1 combination is a major bacterial infection (category 9) with a major hematological/immunological diagnosis (category 44). If a diagnosis from both these categories is present plus at least two other secondary diagnoses that are at least a major severity of illness level, then the minimum patient severity of illness subclass will be extreme. A type 2 combination is the same as a type one combination except that the two categories consist of a major severity of illness category and a moderate severity of illness category. An example of a type 2 combination is a major bacterial infection (category 9) and brain malignancy (category 11). A type 3 combination consists of two categories that contain moderate severity of illness level

diagnoses plus any third and fourth secondary diagnosis that is at least a moderate level. When a type 3 combination occurs, the minimum patient severity of illness subclass is major. An example of a type 3 combination is a moderate alcohol and drug abuse diagnosis (category 5) and a moderate electrolyte disorder except hypovolemia (category 34).

A type 4 combination consists of a moderate severity of illness category and a minor severity of illness category plus any third and fourth diagnosis that is at least a moderate severity of illness level. When a type 4 combination occurs, the minimum patient severity of illness subclass is major. An example of a type 4 combination is a moderate hematological/immunological diagnosis (category 44) and hypovolemia (category 51). A type 5 combination consists of two categories that contain minor severity of illness level diagnoses plus two additional minor severity of illness level diagnoses. When a type 5 combination occurs the minimum patient severity of illness subclass is moderate. An example of a type 5 combination would be diabetes without mention of complication (category 30) and minor bacterial infection (category 9).

Combination type 6 is a special combination type for APR-DRGs 626 and 640 to distinguish neonates with multiple "other problems," i.e., problems that are generally viewed as minor severity of illness but distinguish a neonate from being a normal newborn. An example is a neonate with transient tachypnea (category 920) and newborn feeding problem (category 911). These diagnoses have a minor severity of illness level, but are each increased to moderate for APR-DRGs 626 and 640 per an earlier Phase I step, and together, as part of this step, result in the patient's severity subclass being increased to major for APR-DRGs 626 and 640.

Combination types 11, 13, and 15 are new to version 20.0 and pertain mostly to multiple trauma patients and a handful of other patients such as transplant status patients. A type 11 combination consists of two secondary diagnosis categories that contain major severity of illness diagnoses, plus any third secondary diagnosis that is at least a major severity of illness. An example is a major severity of illness transplant status diagnosis (category 84) and a major TB, fungal or parasitic infection (category 74). A type 13 combination consists of two secondary diagnosis categories that contain moderate severity of illness level diagnoses, plus any third secondary diagnosis that is at least a moderate severity of illness level. An example is a moderate cardiothoracic trauma diagnosis (category 18) and a moderate head and neck trauma with coma diagnosis (category 24). A type 15 combination consists of two secondary diagnosis categories that contain minor severity of illness level diagnoses, plus any third secondary diagnosis that is at least a minor severity of illness level. An example is a minor severity of illness level head and neck trauma without coma diagnosis (category 43) and a minor severity of illness level pulmonary diagnosis (category 75).

18. Compute the final patient severity of illness subclass

The final patient severity of illness subclass is computed based on the Phase II base patient severity of illness subclass and the Phase III modified patient severity of illness subclasses. If all the Phase III modified severity subclasses are greater than or equal to the Phase II base severity of illness subclass, then the final severity of illness subclass is computed as the maximum of the Phase II and III severity subclasses. If all of the modified Phase III severity of illness subclasses are less than or equal to the Phase II base severity of illness subclass, then the final severity of illness subclass is computed as the Phase II base severity of illness subclass minus one. If the Phase III modified severity of illness subclasses include modified severity of illness subclasses that are both greater and less than the Phase II based severity of illness subclass, then the modified Phase III subclass relating to procedures and combinations of secondary diagnoses will take priority in determining the final severity of illness subclass. The combination of the APR-DRG and the final patient severity of illness subclass constitute the complete APR-DRG description of the severity of illness of the patient.

Summary of APR-DRG severity of illness subclass assignment logic

The following is a summary of the steps involved in computing the APR- DRG severity of illness subclass of a patient.

Phase I—Determine the severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis

1. Eliminate secondary diagnoses that are associated with the principal diagnosis.
2. Assign each secondary diagnosis its standard severity of illness level.
3. Modify the standard severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis based on the age of the patient.
4. Modify the standard severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis based on the principal diagnosis and the APR-DRG to which the patient is assigned (applicable only to APR-DRG 190 Acute Myocardial Infarct).
5. Modify the standard severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG to which the patient is assigned.
6. Modify the standard severity of illness level of each secondary diagnosis based on the presence of certain non-OR procedures.

Phase II—Determine the base severity of illness subclass of the patient

7. Eliminate all secondary diagnoses that are in the same secondary diagnosis group except the secondary diagnosis with the highest severity of illness level.
8. Compute the base patient severity of illness subclass as the maximum of all the secondary diagnosis severity of illness levels.
9. If the base patient severity of illness subclass from Step 8 is major or extreme, then reduce the base patient severity of illness subclass to the next lower severity of illness subclass unless there are multiple secondary diagnoses at a high severity of illness level.

Phase III—Determine the final severity of illness subclass of the patient

10. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis.
11. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on the APR-DRG and age of the patient.
12. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on a combination of the APR-DRG and the presence of certain non-OR procedures.
13. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on the APR-DRG and OR procedure.
14. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on combinations of APR-DRGs and pairs of OR procedures.

15. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on the APR-DRG 583 Neonate with ECMO and the presence/absence of certain OR procedures.
16. Modify the patient severity of illness subclass based on the combination of APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and the presence of certain non-OR procedures.
17. Establish a minimum severity of illness subclass for the patient based on the presence of specific combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses.
18. Compute the final patient severity of illness subclass based on the Phase II base patient severity of illness subclass from Step 9 and the modifications of the patient severity of illness subclasses from Steps 10–17.

Determination of the risk of mortality subclass

The three-phase process of determining the risk of mortality subclass is summarized in figure 2–2. This three-phase process parallels the three phases in the determination of the severity of illness subclass. In Phase I, the risk of mortality of each secondary diagnosis is determined. Once the risk of mortality level of each individual secondary diagnosis is established, then Phase II determines a base risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on all of the patient's secondary diagnoses. In Phase III, the final subclass for the patient is determined by incorporating the impact of principal diagnosis, age, OR procedures, certain non-OR procedures, multiple OR procedures, and combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses.




Figure 2-2. Three-phase process for determining patient risk of mortality subclass

Phase I—Determining the risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis

1. Eliminate secondary diagnoses associated with the principal diagnosis

This step is identical to the corresponding step in the determination of the severity of illness subclass. If a secondary diagnosis is closely related to the principal diagnosis and does not add any distinguishing information, then the secondary diagnosis is completely excluded from the 18 step process to determine the patient's risk of mortality subclass.

2. Assign each secondary diagnosis its standard risk of mortality level

Each secondary diagnosis is assigned one of four distinct risk of mortality levels. In general, except for malignancies and certain extreme acute diseases such as acute renal failure, the risk of mortality level tends to be lower than the severity of illness level for the same diagnosis. Mortality is relatively rare. There are a limited number of diagnoses that significantly increase the risk of mortality. For example, traumatic amputation of the arm, acute cholecystitis, and acute osteomyelitis are all at a major severity of illness level since they represent serious diseases with significant loss of organ function. However, they present relatively low risk of mortality and therefore are assigned to a minor risk of mortality level. Example of secondary diagnoses that would have an extreme risk of mortality are intracranial hemorrhage, acute vascular insufficiency of intestine, acute myocardial infarct, and acute renal failure.

For version 20.0 APR-DRGs, the standard risk of mortality level was comprehensively reviewed for all secondary diagnosis codes. There were a number of revisions introduced, the majority of which were to lower the standard risk of mortality level. In situations where there was a great deal of variability within an ICD-9-CM diagnosis code, the approach was to lower the standard risk of mortality level and then in later steps of Phase I, consider whether modifications to the standard risk of mortality level are indicated based upon specific age ranges, APR-DRGs, or non-OR procedures.

For version 20.0 APR-DRGs, there are a total of 12,988 ICD-9-CM diagnosis codes. These codes are assigned to the following risk of mortality levels: 10,473 minor, 1,564 moderate, 608 major, 343 extreme. Compared to version 15.0 APR-DRGs, there is a slightly higher proportion of secondary diagnoses classified as minor and moderate risk of mortality diagnoses and a slightly lower proportion classified as major and moderate risk of mortality diagnoses. For version 20.0 APR-DRGs, there are 2,515 secondary diagnosis codes that are assigned a standard risk of mortality level of moderate, major, or extreme. This is just slightly more than half the 4,656 secondary diagnosis codes that are assigned a standard severity of illness level of moderate, major, or extreme.

3. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of a secondary diagnosis based on age

The standard risk of mortality for certain secondary diagnoses may be modified depending upon the age of the patient. This age modification is applied much more extensively for risk of mortality, than for severity of illness. For pediatric patients, the standard risk of mortality level of secondary diagnoses is often decreased. For example, the risk of mortality level for diabetes with ketoacidosis is lowered from moderate to minor for pediatric patients. It is also lowered for many other secondary diagnoses including infectious illnesses and traumatic injuries. However, for some pediatric diagnoses, mostly congenital anomalies, the risk of mortality level is increased during the neonatal time period and sometimes the first year of life. For example, the risk of mortality level for hypoplastic left heart syndrome is increased from major to extreme during the neonatal period; renal dysphasia is increased from moderate to major during the neonatal period; and congenital tricuspid atresia/stenosis is increased from moderate to major during the first year of life.

For elderly patients, the standard risk of mortality level is increased to a higher level for many secondary diagnoses. Elderly patients are most often defined as age >65 years or age >69 years but also sometimes for a more narrowly defined subset of elderly patients such as age >79 years. For example, for elderly patients age >65 years the risk of mortality level is increased from minor to moderate for secondary diagnoses such as atrial fibrillation, chronic obstructive lung disease and nephritis, and is increased from moderate to major for acidosis and hypotension. For elderly patients age >69 years, the risk of mortality level is increased from minor to moderate viral pneumonia, mitral valve disorder, and anemia; and from moderate to major for streptococcal, staphylococcal, and other bacterial pneumonias; and from major to extreme for peritonitis. For elderly patients age >79 years, the risk of mortality level is increased from minor to moderate for fracture of femur or pelvis; and from moderate to major for pleural effusion.

4. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of a secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis

The standard risk of mortality level for some secondary diagnoses may be modified depending on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis of the patient. In version 20.0, this logic is applied only to APR-DRG 190 Acute Myocardial Infarct. In general, secondary diagnoses that are closely related to the principal diagnosis are excluded from the determination of the risk of mortality subclass. However, for a patient admitted for an acute anterior wall myocardial infarction, an acute anterolateral myocardial infarction represents an extension of the acute anterior wall myocardial infarction. Therefore, the acute anterolateral myocardial infarction is not excluded and is assigned a risk of mortality level of moderate.

5. Modify the standard risk of mortality of a secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG

The standard risk of mortality level for many secondary diagnoses is modified depending upon the APR-DRG to which the patient is assigned. Altogether, there are 1,474 modifications of the standard risk of mortality level of secondary diagnosis depending on the APR-DRG. As with severity of illness, the APR-DRG specific modifications to the risk of mortality level of individual secondary diagnoses reflects the disease-specific nature of the determination of risk of mortality.

For example, the risk of mortality level for secondary diagnoses is increased from minor to moderate for the following combinations of secondary diagnoses and APR-DRGs: right bundle branch block and APR-DRG for acute myocardial infarct; chronic obstructive lung disease and major chest and major cardiovascular surgery; hypovolemia and APR-DRGs for cancer, cardiovascular disease, and respiratory failure. The risk of mortality level for secondary diagnoses is increased from moderate to major for the following combinations of secondary diagnoses and APR-DRGs: acidosis and APR-DRGs for acute myocardial infarct, congestive heart failure, and septicemia; hypotension and APR-DRGs for respiratory failure, acute myocardial infarct, and liver and pancreas disorders.

There are also many APR-DRGs where the standard risk of mortality level for some secondary diagnoses is decreased, such as for secondary diagnoses that are closely related to the definition of the APR-DRG. For example, the risk of mortality level is decreased from moderate to minor for secondary diagnosis of obstructive hydrocephalus in the APR-DRG for ventricular shunt procedures, since the hydrocephalus is the underlying reason for performing the procedure. The risk of mortality level is decreased from extreme to major for secondary diagnosis of cerebral edema in a number of nervous system APR-DRGs including craniotomy, cerebrovascular disease, and malignancy. If there is essentially complete overlap between the secondary diagnosis and the APR-DRG, the risk of mortality level for the secondary diagnosis may be decreased from extreme or major to minor. For example, acute respiratory failure is decreased from extreme to minor for APR-DRGs for respiratory system diagnosis with mechanical ventilation 96+ hours and tracheostomy with mechanical ventilation 96+ hours. There are many secondary diagnoses for which the

standard risk of mortality level is lowered to minor for a patient in one of eleven elective, non-extensive surgical APR-DRGs. For example, in these APR-DRGs, secondary diagnoses of malignant neoplasm are reduced from major or moderate to minor, since the patient would likely not have these surgical procedures performed if the malignancy was at a stage that represented a significant risk of mortality.

6. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of a secondary diagnosis based on non-OR procedure

Certain non-OR procedures will sometimes be used to modify the standard risk of mortality level of some secondary diagnoses. For risk of mortality, this step is just used with one non-OR procedure, pulsation balloon implant. For example, subendocardial infarction has a standard risk of mortality level of moderate but is increased by an increment of two up to extreme if the patient had a pulsation balloon implanted. The need for the pulsation balloon is an indicator of the extent of the subendocardial infarction.

Phase II—Determine the base risk of mortality subclass for the patient

Once each secondary diagnosis has been assigned its standard risk of mortality level and the standard risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis has been modified based on the patient's age, APR-DRG and principal diagnosis, APR-DRG, and certain non-OR procedure, the Phase II base risk of mortality subclass for the patient can be determined. The process of determining the base patient risk of mortality subclass begins with the elimination of certain secondary diagnoses that are closely related to other secondary diagnoses. The elimination of these diagnoses prevents the double counting of clinically similar diagnoses in the determination of the risk of mortality subclass of the patient. Once redundant diagnoses have been eliminated, the base risk of mortality subclass is determined based on all of the remaining secondary diagnoses. There are three steps to Phase II for risk of mortality. The first two are the same as for severity of illness. The third step is similar to severity of illness but has some additional exceptions logic.

7. Eliminate certain secondary diagnoses from the determination of the risk of mortality subclass of the patient

This step is identical to the corresponding step in the determination of the severity of illness subclass. Secondary diagnoses that are related to other secondary diagnoses have their risk of mortality level reduced to minor.

8. Combine all secondary diagnoses to determine the base risk of mortality subclass of the patient

Once secondary diagnoses that are related to other secondary diagnoses have their risk of mortality level reduced to minor, the base patient risk of mortality subclass is set equal to the maximum risk of mortality level across all of the remaining secondary diagnoses. This is done the same way as for severity of illness. For example, if there are five remaining secondary diagnoses and one is a major risk of mortality level and four are a moderate risk of mortality level, then the base patient risk of mortality subclass is major.

9. Reduce the base risk of mortality subclass if the patient does not have multiple secondary diagnoses with a significant risk of mortality, except for certain secondary diagnoses for which this requirement is removed or modified

In general, high risk of mortality patients are characterized by multiple secondary diagnoses with a significant risk of mortality. In order for the base risk of mortality subclass to be extreme, there must be two or more extreme risk of mortality secondary diagnoses present or a single extreme

risk of mortality secondary diagnosis plus two or more major risk of mortality secondary diagnoses. If this multiple criteria is not met, the patient's base risk of mortality subclass is lowered to either major or moderate. If the multiple criteria is not met, but in addition to a single extreme risk of mortality secondary diagnosis there is at least one other major or moderate secondary diagnosis, then the patient's risk of mortality subclass is lowered to major. If there is not at least one other major or moderate secondary diagnosis in addition to an extreme risk of mortality secondary diagnosis, then the patient's base risk of mortality subclass is lowered to moderate. There are, however, two exceptions to these criteria. There is one set of secondary diagnoses that have such an inherent high risk of mortality that no other secondary diagnoses are required for the patient's base risk of mortality subclass to be extreme. Examples include: pulmonary anthrax, ruptured aortic aneurism, hepatorenal syndrome, head trauma with deep coma, and 60-90% body burn/50-59% third degree. There is a second set of secondary diagnoses that also have an inherently high risk of mortality and for which only one other major secondary diagnosis is required for the patient's base risk of mortality to be extreme. Examples included: defibrination syndrome, acute myocardial infarct, intracranial hemorrhage, cerebral thrombosis with infarct, dissection of aortic aneurism, acute respiratory failure, acute renal failure, and shock.

Patients with a base risk of mortality subclass of major are reduced to moderate unless, in addition to the major risk of mortality secondary diagnosis, there is at least one additional major risk of mortality secondary diagnosis or two more additional secondary diagnoses with a moderate risk of mortality. If this multiple criteria is not met then the patient's base risk of mortality subclass is lowered to moderate. There are, however, two exceptions to these criteria. There is one set of secondary diagnoses that have a sufficiently high inherent risk of mortality that no other secondary diagnoses are required for the patient's base risk of mortality subclass to be set at major. Examples include: flail chest, major liver laceration, 40-49% body burns/10-19% third degree. There is a second set of secondary diagnoses that have a significant inherent risk of mortality so that only one moderate secondary diagnoses is required for the patient's base risk of mortality subclass to be set at major. Examples include: food/vomit pneumonia, acute lung edema, and perforation of intestine.

Patients with a base risk of mortality subclass of moderate are reduced to minor unless there are at least two moderate risk of mortality secondary diagnoses present. There is, however, one exception to this criteria. These moderate risk of mortality secondary diagnoses do not require any other secondary diagnoses to be present. Examples include: malignant neoplasm diagnoses that are moderate risk of mortality level diagnoses, acidosis, bacterial pneumonia, congestive heart failure, chronic renal failure, Alzheimer's disease, and decubitus ulcer.

Phase III—Determine the final risk of mortality subclass of the patient

Once the base patient risk of mortality subclass is computed then the risk of mortality subclass may be increased or decreased in Phase III based on specific values of certain patient attributes. In Phase III, the risk of mortality algorithm examines six of the eight patient attributes utilized in Phase III of the severity of illness logic. The two that are not used by risk of mortality are only used to a very limited extent in the severity of illness logic. The patient attributes are:

- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and principal diagnosis
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and age, or APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and age, or APR-DRG and birthweight and absence of certain non-OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and non-OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and OR procedures
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and pairs of OR procedures

- ◆ Combination of the APR-DRG for ECMO and presence/absence of certain OR procedures (not applicable for risk of mortality)
- ◆ Combinations of APR-DRG and principal diagnoses and non-OR procedures (not applicable for risk of mortality)
- ◆ Combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses

In Phase I, age and non-OR procedures were used to modify the standard risk of mortality level of a secondary diagnosis. However, age and non-OR procedures can also have an impact that is specific to the patient's APR-DRG or a specific principal diagnosis within an APR-DRG. Thus, the impact of age and non-OR procedures is reassessed as part of the determination of the risk of mortality subclass of the patient. Based on the patient attributes listed above, a series of modifications to the base patient risk of mortality subclass are made during Phase III. The final patient risk of mortality subclass will be computed based on the Phase II base patient risk of mortality subclass and the modifications to the base risk of mortality subclass made in Phase III.

10. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis

Within specific APR-DRGs some principal diagnoses are indicative of higher or lower risk of mortality relative to the other principal diagnoses in the APR-DRGs. This is one of the most important and extensively used modifications to the patient's base risk of mortality subclass that occurs as part of the Phase III risk of mortality logic. The majority of the modifications are increases to the patient risk of mortality subclass, but there are also some decreases to the patient risk of mortality subclass. Some of the increases are an increment of one up to a maximum subclass of moderate, while others pertain to more dramatic clinical situations and provide greater increases to the patient risk of mortality subclass. Most of the decreases reduce the patient risk of mortality subclass by one from major or moderate. Following are examples:

- ◆ APR-DRG 309 Hip & Femur Procedures For Non-Trauma Except Joint Replacement and principal diagnosis of secondary malignancy of bone: increase patient risk of mortality subclass by one up to a maximum of moderate.
- ◆ APR-DRG 135 Major Chest & Respiratory Trauma and principal diagnosis of flail chest: increase patient risk of mortality subclass by one up to a maximum of major.
- ◆ APR-DRG 221 Major Large & Small Bowel Procedures and principal diagnosis of perforation of intestine: increase patient risk of mortality subclass by two up to a maximum of major.
- ◆ APR-DRG 169 Major Thoracic & Abdominal Procedures and principal diagnosis of ruptured abdominal aortic aneurism: increase patient risk of mortality subclass by three up to extreme.
- ◆ APR-DRG 44 Intracranial Hemorrhage and principal diagnosis of subdural hemorrhage: decrease patient risk of mortality subclass by one from moderate.
- ◆ APR-DRG 52 Non traumatic Stupor & Coma and principal diagnosis of transient alteration of awareness: decrease patient risk of mortality subclass by one from extreme, major, or moderate.

11. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on combinations of the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and age, or APR-DRG and age, or APR-DRG and birthweight and presence/absence of certain non-OR procedures

For some principal diagnoses in specific APR-DRGs, the patient's age essentially represents a complicating factor. For specific principal diagnosis and age combinations in certain APR-DRGs, the risk of mortality subclass of the patient is increased by a specified increment up to a specified maximum subclass. For example, elderly patients age >79 years in APR-DRG 137 Major Respira-

tory Infections & Inflammations with a principal diagnosis of staphylococcal pneumonia and elderly patients age >79 years in APR-DRG 710 Septicemia & Disseminated Infections with most of the septicemia principal diagnoses, have their risk of mortality subclass increased by one up to a maximum subclass of moderate. Elderly patients age >69 years in APR-DRG 44 Intracranial Hemorrhage with a principal diagnosis of intracerebral hemorrhage have their risk of mortality subclass increased by one up to a maximum subclass of moderate. The increase indicates that intracranial hemorrhage in an elderly patient represents a higher risk of mortality.

This step is also sometimes implemented for all patients in a specified age range in an APR-DRG rather than just for patients with a particular principal diagnoses. This approach is used for elderly patients age >84 years for 19 APR-DRGs involving major surgery. For example, patients age >84 years in APR-DRG 120 Major Chest & Respiratory Procedures have their risk of mortality subclass increased by one to a maximum subclass of moderate.

The last part of this step examines the relationship between APR-DRG and birthweight and presence/absence of certain non-OR procedures for extremely low birthweight neonates in MDC 15. Many of the neonates at an extremely low birthweight (<750 grams or 1.6 pounds) are non-viable and receive comfort-only care. Nearly all of these newborns die and most of the time this is within a few days of being born. There are no ICD-9-CM diagnosis codes for non-viability due to extreme prematurity, which, if such codes existed, would allow a risk of mortality subclass of extreme to be assigned. In its place, the APR-DRG system has developed logic to identify these cases. Since newborns <750 grams will virtually always receive some therapeutic interventions if the goal is to maintain life (e.g., respiratory therapy, tube feedings), the absence of any of these non-OR procedures can be used to infer the newborn is receiving comfort-only measures and their risk of mortality subclass is increased to extreme for APR-DRGs 589 and 591. Without this logic, most of these newborns would be a risk of mortality subclass minor or moderate because of the lack of codes for identifying non-viability.

12. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and non-OR procedure

For some APR-DRGs the presence of certain non-OR procedures is indicative of a more extensive disease process with a higher risk of mortality. In these instances, the risk of mortality subclass is increased by a specific increment up to a specified maximum. There are three non-OR procedures used for this step: mechanical ventilation 96+ hours, mechanical ventilation <96 hours, and balloon pulsation device. For example, for patients in APR-DRG 194 Heart Failure the risk of mortality subclass is increased by two up to a maximum subclass of extreme if mechanical ventilation 96+ hours is performed and is increased by one up to a maximum subclass of major if mechanical ventilation <96 hours is performed.

13. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and OR procedure

Within specific APR-DRGs, some OR procedures are indicative of higher risk of mortality relative to the other OR procedures in the APR-DRG. For example, the risk of mortality subclass of patients in APR-DRG 443 Kidney and Urinary Tract Procedures for Non-Malignancy, is increased by two up to a maximum of major if the procedure bilateral nephrectomy is performed. Relative to other procedures in DRG 443, a bilateral nephrectomy represents a patient that has a higher risk of mortality.

Within specific APR-DRGs, there are also some OR procedures that are indicative of lower risk of mortality relative to other patients in the same APR-DRG. For example, a patient in APR-DRG 220 Major Stomach Esophageal & Duodenal Procedures who receives a procedure to create esogastric sphincteric competence has a lower risk of mortality than other surgical patients in

APR-DRG 220 (e.g., esophagectomy, gastrectomy), and if up to this point in the process their risk of mortality subclass is moderate, it is decreased by 1 to minor.

14. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on combinations of APR-DRG and pairs of OR procedures

Within specific APR-DRGs the presence of certain pairs of OR procedures is indicative of a more extensive disease process and a higher risk of mortality relative to other patients in the same APR-DRG. For risk of mortality, this logic is applicable primarily for patients who receive both a peripheral bypass procedure and a lower limb amputation. For example, a patient in either APR-DRG 173 Other Vascular Procedures or APR-DRG 305 Amputation of Lower Limb who receives both a peripheral bypass procedure and a lower leg amputation has their risk of mortality subclass increased by an increment of one up to a maximum subclass of major.

15. Modify the risk of mortality subclass for the patient based upon combination of the APR-DRG for ECMO and presence/absence of certain OR procedures

This step is not applicable to risk of mortality.

16. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and certain non-OR procedures

This step is not applicable to risk of mortality.

17. Establish a minimum risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses

The presence of certain combinations of secondary diagnoses has great clinical significance. The interaction of specific combinations of secondary diagnoses increases the risk of mortality. Therefore, a minimum patient risk of mortality subclass greater than subclass minor is established if certain combinations of secondary diagnoses are present. The presence of multiple interacting diagnoses is characteristic of high risk of mortality patients. A subset of secondary diagnoses will interact with each other causing patient risk of mortality to be increased.

The categories of secondary diagnoses used for this step in risk of mortality are the same 83 core secondary diagnosis categories that are used for severity of illness (see table 2–5). The only difference is that these same 83 secondary diagnosis categories are then subdivided by risk of mortality level, not severity of illness level. The additional 21 secondary diagnosis categories developed for use with neonatal APR-DRGs 626 and 640 are not used for risk of mortality. These additional 21 secondary diagnosis categories are intended to differentiate neonates with multiple minor or other problems from those who are normal newborns or who have a single minor problem, which is significant for severity of illness but is not applicable for risk of mortality since these diagnoses do not increase the risk of dying.

All of the secondary diagnosis category combination types for risk of mortality are the same as those defined for severity of illness (see table 2–7). Of the nine possible combination types, six are applicable for risk of mortality. These are combination types 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 13.

A type 1 combination consists of two categories that contain major risk of mortality level diagnoses, plus any two additional secondary diagnoses that are at least major level. When a type 1 combination occurs, the minimum patient risk of mortality subclass is extreme. An example of a type 1 combination is a major pulmonary diagnosis (category 75) such as acute pulmonary edema and a major neurological diagnosis (category 64) such as cerebral thrombosis without infarct combined with any other two major secondary diagnoses. A type 2 combination is the same

as type 1 except that the two categories consist of a major risk of mortality category and a moderate risk of mortality category. For a type 2 combination, the minimum patient risk of mortality subclass is extreme. An example of a type 2 combination is a major bacterial infection (category 9) such as peritonitis and a moderate level secondary malignancy (category 78) combined with any other two major secondary diagnoses.

A type 3 combination consists of two categories that contain moderate risk of mortality level diagnoses, plus any two additional secondary diagnoses that are at least a moderate risk of mortality level. For a type 3 combination, the minimum patient risk of mortality is major. An example of a type 3 combination is a moderate bacterial infection (category 9) such as staphylococcal enteritis with chronic renal failure (category 20) combined with any other two moderate secondary diagnoses. A type 4 combination consists of a moderate risk of mortality category and a minor risk of mortality category, plus any two additional secondary diagnoses that are at least moderate. For a type 4 combination, the minimum patient risk of mortality subclass is major. An example of a type 4 combination is a decubitus ulcer (category 26) and hypovolemia (category 51) combined with two other secondary diagnoses that are at least moderate.

A type 5 combination consists of two categories that contain minor risk of mortality level diagnoses, plus any two additional secondary diagnoses that are at least a minor risk of mortality level. For a type 5 combination, the minimum patient risk of mortality is moderate. An example of a type 5 combination is atrial fibrillation (category 8) and hypovolemia (category 51) combined with any other two minor secondary diagnoses.

A type 13 combination consists of two secondary diagnosis categories that contain moderate risk of mortality diagnoses, plus any third secondary diagnosis that is at least a moderate risk of mortality diagnosis. For a type 13 combination, the minimum patient risk of mortality subclass is major. An example of a type 13 combination is cirrhosis (category 23) and hypotension (category 50) combined with any other moderate secondary diagnosis.

18. Compute the final risk of mortality subclass

The final patient risk of mortality subclass is computed based on the Phase II base patient risk of mortality subclass and the Phase III modified patient risk of mortality subclasses. If all the Phase III modified risk of mortality are greater than or equal to the Phase II base risk of mortality subclass, then the final risk of mortality subclass is computed as the maximum of the Phase II and III risk of mortality subclasses. If all of the modified Phase III risk of mortality subclasses are less than or equal to the Phase II base risk of mortality subclass, the final risk of mortality subclass is computed as the Phase II base risk of mortality subclass minus one. If the Phase II modified risk of mortality subclasses includes modified risk of mortality subclasses that are both greater and less than the Phase II base risk of mortality subclass, the modified Phase III subclass relating to procedures and combinations of secondary diagnoses will take priority in determining the final risk of mortality subclass. The combination of the APR-DRG and the final patient risk of mortality subclass constitute the complete APR-DRG description of the risk of mortality of the patient.

Summary of APR-DRG risk of mortality subclass assignment logic

The following is a summary of the steps involved in computing the APR-DRG risk of mortality subclass of a patient.

Phase I—Determine the risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis

1. Eliminate all secondary diagnoses that are associated with the principal diagnosis of the patient.

2. Assign each secondary diagnosis its standard risk of mortality.
3. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis based on the age of the patient.
4. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis (applicable only to APR-DRG 190 Acute Myocardial Infarct).
5. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis based on the APR-DRG to which the patient is assigned.
6. Modify the standard risk of mortality level of each secondary diagnosis based on the presence of certain non-OR procedures.

Phase II—Determine the base risk of mortality subclass of the patient

7. Eliminate all secondary diagnoses that are in the same secondary diagnosis group except the secondary diagnosis with the highest risk of mortality level.
8. Compute the base patient risk of mortality subclass as the maximum of all the secondary diagnosis risk of mortality levels.
9. Reduce the base patient risk of mortality subclass if the patient does not have multiple secondary diagnoses at a significant risk of mortality, except for certain secondary diagnoses for which this requirement is removed or modified.

Phase III—Determine the final risk of mortality subclass of the patient

10. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis.
11. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG and age, or APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and age, or APR-DRG and birthweight and absence of certain non-OR procedures.
12. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on a combination of the APR-DRG and certain non-OR procedures.
13. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG and OR procedure.
14. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG and certain pairs of OR procedures.
15. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based on the APR-DRG 583 Neonate With ECMO and the presence/absence of certain OR procedures (this step is applicable only to severity of illness, not to risk of mortality).
16. Modify the patient risk of mortality subclass based upon the APR-DRG and principal diagnosis and certain non-OR procedures (this step applicable only to severity of illness, not to risk of mortality).

17. Establish a minimum risk of mortality subclass for the patient based on the presence of specific combinations of categories of secondary diagnoses.
18. Compute the final patient risk of mortality subclass based on the Phase II base patient risk of mortality subclass from Step 9 and the modifications of the patient risk of mortality subclass from Steps 10–17.

Conclusion

The APR-DRGs form a clinically coherent set of severity of illness and risk of mortality adjusted patient groups. The APR-DRGs are designed to describe the complete cross-section of patients seen in acute care hospitals.

Through APR-DRGs, hospitals, consumers, payers, and regulators can gain an understanding of the patients being treated, the costs incurred, and, within reasonable limits, the services and outcomes expected. Through APR-DRGs, areas for improvement in efficiency and areas with potential quality problems can be identified. The classification of patients into APR-DRGs is constantly evolving. As the ICD-9-CM coding scheme changes or as medical technology or practice changes, the APR-DRG definitions will continue to be updated to reflect these changes.

CHAPTER 3

Background and Explanation of Approach for Rerouting Logic in APR-DRG, Version 20.0

BACKGROUND AND EXPLANATION OF APPROACH FOR REROUTING LOGIC IN VERSION 20.0 APR-DRGS

Background

The basic organizing approach to classification in the APR-DRG system is to first assign a patient to a Major Diagnostic Group (MDC), based upon principal diagnosis, and then to a specific APR-DRG category based upon principal diagnosis (if medical) or operating room procedure (if surgical). This works well in the vast majority of cases to categorize the patient into an MDC and APR-DRG that most aptly describes the reason for the hospitalization.

There are several different kinds of situations, however, where the principal diagnosis (PDX) based approach, as the starting point for establishing the MDC and APR-DRG, needs to be supplemented by additional information and logic to yield the most useful classification. One situation is where there is an overwhelming consideration that should take priority. This is handled by a Pre-MDC Assignment Logic, which is described in detail in chapter 2 of the APR-DRG Definitions Manual. The Pre-MDC Assignment Logic handles assignment to the major organ transplant APR-DRGs, the neonatal MDC (based on age), the two tracheostomy APR-DRGs, the Multiple Significant Trauma MDC, and the HIV MDC.

The other situation where the PDX-based starting point for APR-DRG classification needs to be supplemented by additional information and logic, is where the PDX is overly broad or the sequencing of PDX and SDX is unclear, or in some instances the OR procedure is unclear. These are handled through what is referred to as APR-DRG “rerouting logic.” This is the logic that considers secondary diagnoses, procedures and sometimes age, most often in conjunction with the PDX, to clarify the reason for the hospitalization. The rerouting logic either reassigns the patient to a new APR-DRG within the same MDC (Within MDC Rerouting) or to a new MDC and APR-DRG (Across MDC Rerouting).

These situations are not unique to the APR-DRG classification system. They represent ambiguities that confront any DRG classification system. What is unique to the APR-DRG classification system is the rerouting logic developed to assign these patients to the most appropriate and useful category. Version 20.0 of the APR-DRG system incorporates a number of updates to the previously existing Within MDC Reroutings and introduces for the first time, Across MDC Reroutings.

Following is a description of the need for APR-DRG rerouting logic, an explanation of the methodology for the APR-DRG reroutings, and a set of detailed examples of Within MDC Reroutings and Across MDC Reroutings. Attached is a table summarizing all of the APR-DRG reroutings. For code level specifications, please see the full Version 20.0 APR-DRG Definitions Manual.

Need for APR-DRG Rerouting Logic

Within MDC Reroutings: This is the situation where the PDX provides sufficient information for MDC assignment but does not provide sufficient information for assignment to the most appropriate DRG. It also includes the situation where the OR procedure is unclear. For example:

- ◆ The PDX provides no information about the patient’s health status but the SDXs do. For example, the V3000–V3921 live newborn codes accurately describe the reason for admission to the hospital (being born), but provide no information as to whether the neonate has any medical problems. To assign these patients to a meaningful APR-DRG, it is necessary to examine the SDXs for various possible problems and to create a hierarchy amongst these problems in the event the neonate has multiple problems.

- ◆ The PDX is imprecise but Age clarifies. For example, PDX aftercare not elsewhere classified and Age < 90 days clarifies that the admission is for neonatal aftercare.
- ◆ There is ambiguity in sequencing of PDX and SDX, but either way the same patient is being described. For example, PDX pneumonia and SDX cystic fibrosis.
- ◆ A symptom code has been missequenced as the PDX. For example, PDX chest pain and SDX angina pectoris or coronary atherosclerosis.
- ◆ The OR procedure is imprecise but the PDX clarifies. For example, bone ostectomy not elsewhere classified (includes vertebra) and PDX back/neck disorder clarifies that the patient would better be assigned to an APR-DRG for other back/neck procedures than other musculoskeletal procedures.

Across MDC Reroutings: This is the situation where the PDX does not provide sufficient information for assignment to either the most appropriate MDC or APR-DRG. This includes many of the same PDX ambiguities as the Within MDC Reroutings except that the PDX ambiguity affects MDC assignment as well as APR-DRG assignment. For example:

- ◆ The PDX describes body system more broadly than the MDCs of the APR-DRG system. For example, PDX 9961 mechanical complication of other vascular devices (MDC 5) includes both peripheral vascular devices (MDC 5) and renal dialysis shunt (MDC 11).
- ◆ The PDX does not describe the specific body system manifestation. For example, PDX 25080–25083 diabetes with manifestations not elsewhere classified (MDC 10) includes manifestations that affect other body systems—skin ulcer (MDC 9), bone involvement in other diseases (MDC 8), and osteomyelitis (MDC 8).
- ◆ The sequencing of PDX and SDX is ambiguous. For example, PDX hypovolemia (MDC 10) and SDX gastroenteritis (MDC 6). This is fundamentally a gastroenteritis patient with hypovolemia (dehydration), which is common to patients hospitalized for gastroenteritis.
- ◆ A symptom code is missequenced as the PDX. For example, PDX fever (MDC 18) and SDX agranulocytosis/neutropenia (MDC 16). Another example is PDX pulmonary edema (MDC 4) and SDX congestive heart failure (MDC 5).
- ◆ The PDX spans several MDCs but the OR procedure differentiates. For example, PDX abdominal pain (MDC 6) and hepatobiliary OR procedure (MDC 7).
- ◆ The PDX or the PDX and SDX together identify that the patient has diabetes with circulatory (MDC 5) and possibly other related manifestations (MDCs 1, 8, 9) and the patient receives a lower limb or toe amputation procedure. This is the most frequent and important surgical rerouting.

To explain this last example further, diabetes is a complex disease with many manifestations, several of which relate to the possible need for lower limb or toe amputation. These patients may be admitted with many different principal diagnoses, including diabetes with circulatory manifestation, diabetes with neuropathy, or diabetes with manifestations not elsewhere classified (includes skin ulcer, bone involvement in other disease, and osteomyelitis). They may also be admitted with principal diagnoses of peripheral vascular disease, gangrene, skin ulcer, or osteomyelitis and a secondary diagnosis of diabetes. All of these patients who receive a lower limb or toe amputation and who do not have another more defining surgical procedure (e.g., major cardiovascular procedure) are clinically similar patients and it is more helpful to group them together than to let them be dispersed across different MDCs and APR-DRGs.

Following is a further description of the methodology for the APR-DRG reroutings. All of the reroutings have the same objective, to group together clinically similar patients. The exact logic

and technical details vary from one rerouting to another. To make the reroutings easier to understand they are organized into various types or a typology.

Methodology for APR-DRG Rerouting Logic

As identified earlier, the assignment of patients to an MDC is usually very straightforward based upon the PDX. Likewise, the assignment to an APR-DRG is usually straightforward based upon the PDX for medical patients and OR procedure for surgical patients. Occasionally, the surgical APR-DRGs split into separate categories based upon PDX or non-OR procedure.

There are situations however, where it is necessary to consider several different factors together to assign the patient to the most appropriate and useful MDC and APR-DRG. There are five different factors considered for this: PDX, SDX, OR procedure, non-OR procedure, and age. The entire logic and specifications for the APR-DRG reroutings contain three elements:

1. Whether the rerouting applies within MDC or across MDCs;
2. The combination of factors that define the rerouting;
3. Whether there is any special handling of SDXs, specifically, any resequencing of SDX and PDX for grouping purposes.

There are ten specific combinations of factors used in the Version 20.0 APR-DRG rerouting logic. Some are very similar to each other, but are technically different. The most frequently used combination of factors is #1, PDX or SDX and Medical. This means a diagnosis, whether recorded as PDX or SDX, determines the APR-DRG category assignment for medical patients. This logic existed in Version 15.0 APR-DRGs for APR-DRGs in MDCs 4, 15, 20, and 24. Version 15.0 APR-DRGs also contained one instance of #7, PDX and SDX and Medical (PDX head trauma and SDX head trauma with coma > 1 hour or hemorrhage) and a surgical rerouting for certain MDC 11 patients receiving a prostate procedure for benign prostatic hypertrophy. All the rest of the combinations of factors are new for Version 20.0 APR-DRGs.

0 – PDX or SDX and Medical

1 – PDX and Age and Medical

2 – PDX and Non-OR Procedure and Medical

3 – PDX and OR Procedure (and other OR procedures allowed if lower in MDC surgical hierarchy)

4 – PDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures

5 – SDX and OR Procedure (and any other OR procedures are allowed)

6 – DX and SDX and Medical

7 – DX and SDX and Either Surgical/Medical

8 – PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures

9 – PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure

There are fundamentally two ways that SDXs are used as part of the rerouting logic. One way is for the SDX to clarify the PDX. The APR-DRG grouper uses the clarifying information of the SDX to reassign the patient to a new APR-DRG, but does not, for grouping purposes, alter the sequence of PDX and SDX. This can be done within or across MDCs. An example of a Within MDC Rerouting is PDX liver disease and SDX alcoholic liver disease, clarifying that the patient should be assigned to APR-DRG 280 Alcoholic Liver Disease. An example of an Across MDC Rerouting is PDX complication of other vascular device (includes both peripheral vascular devices and renal dialysis shunt) and SDX renal failure (without heart failure) clarifying that the patient should be reassigned to MDC 11 (Diseases & Disorders of the Kidney & Urinary Tract), APR-DRG 466 Malfunction, Reaction, Complication of Genitourinary Device or Procedure.

The second way the SDXs are used as part of the rerouting logic is to function as the PDX for APR-DRG grouping purposes. There are two ways that the APR-DRG system implements this: one way for Within MDC Reroutings and another way for Across MDC Reroutings. These are technically different approaches but accomplish the same end result.

In the instance of Within MDC Reroutings, the technical approach is for the APR-DRG grouper to reassign the patient to a new APR-DRG and then resequence the SDX as PDX for Severity of Illness (SOI) and Risk of Mortality (ROM) purposes. For example, a patient with a PDX of chest pain and an SDX of angina pectoris is reassigned from DRG 203 Chest Pain to DRG 198 Angina Pectoris and Coronary Atherosclerosis, and since the SDX of angina pectoris drove the APR-DRG assignment, it is resequenced as the PDX for the subsequent steps of assigning SOI and ROM levels. This prevents angina pectoris from contributing as a redundant SDX to the SOI and ROM levels.

In the instance of Across MDC Reroutings, the technical approach is for the APR-DRG grouper to resequence the PDX and SDX as its first action step and then proceed through all of its regular steps—MDC assignment, APR-DRG assignment, and SOI and ROM level assignment. For example, if a patient has a PDX of hypovolemia (dehydration) and an SDX of gastroenteritis, the APR-DRG grouper resequences the PDX and SDX so that gastroenteritis becomes the PDX and the patient is assigned to MDC 6 (Diseases & Disorders of the Digestive System) and to the appropriate APR-DRG per the logic and specifications of MDC 6. Since gastroenteritis is already resequenced as the PDX, it will not contribute as a redundant SDX to the SOI and ROM levels. Hypovolemia, which is resequenced as the SDX, would contribute to the SOI and ROM levels if judged to be a significant comorbidity or complication by the APR-DRG system (which, in this case it is not).

Note, the sequencing of PDX and SDX on the patient discharge record is not altered by any of these resequencing processes. Rather, the APR-DRG grouper is redesignating PDX and SDX for specified steps that are part of its logic. In the example of PDX hypovolemia and SDX gastroenteritis, the APR-DRG grouper resequences PDX and SDX for grouping purposes, but when users examine their own discharge records, hypovolemia will still be the principal diagnosis. This also means that when users examine their patients in MDC 6 (Diseases & Disorders of the Digestive System) and especially APR-DRG 249 Non-Bacterial Gastroenteritis, Nausea & Vomiting, some of the patients will have a PDX of hypovolemia, which is ordinarily assigned to MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders).

Following is a list that summarizes the different types of logic used for the APR-DRG reroutings. There are three characters to the APR-DRG rerouting type number. Each character captures the following aspects of the rerouting logic:

- ◆ The first character refers to whether the rerouting occurs within or across MDCs.
 - W = Within MDC Rerouting

- A = Across MDC Rerouting
- ◆ The second character refers to the combination of diagnostic, procedure and demographic factors used in rerouting (values 0–9 described earlier).
- ◆ The third character refers to special handling of SDXs, if any.
 - P = Resequence SDX as PDX for new APR-DRG assignment and SOI/ROM purposes.
 - S= Resequence SDX as PDX for SOI/ROM purposes (after assignment to new APR-DRG).
 - X = SDX clarifies PDX; no special handling of SDX needed. Type C also includes where Age or Procedure clarify the APR-DRG assignment.

| Type | Within or Across MDC | Combination of Factors | Special Handling of SDXs |
|------|----------------------|--|--|
| W0S | Within MDC | PDX or SDX and Medical | Resequence SDX as PDX for SOI/ROM. |
| W1X | Within MDC | PDX and Age and Medical | |
| W3X | Within MDC | PDX and OR Procedure (and other OR procedures lower in MDC surgical hierarchy are allowed) | |
| W6S | Within MDC | PDX and SDX and Medical | Resequence SDX as PDX for SOI/ROM. |
| W6X | Within MDC | PDX and SDX and Medical | SDX clarifies PDX; no special handling needed. |
| A2X | Across MDC | PDX and Non-OR Procedure | |
| A3X | Across MDC | PDX and OR Procedure (and other OR procedures lower in MDC surgical hierarchy are allowed) | |
| A4X | Across MDC | PDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures | |
| A5X | Across MDC | SDX and OR Procedure (and any other OR procedures are allowed) | |
| A6P | Across MDC | PDX and SDX and Medical | Resequence SDX as PDX. |
| A6X | Across MDC | PDX and SDX and Medical | SDX clarifies PDX; no special handling needed. |
| A7P | Across MDC | PDX and SDX and Surg/Med | Resequence SDX as PDX. |
| A8P | Across MDC | PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures | Resequence SDX as PDX. |
| A9P | Across MDC | PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure | Resequence SDX as PDX. |

The rerouting type numbers have no special significance in and of themselves. They are just a way to organize and explain the three elements to APR-DRG rerouting logic. The best way to fully understand the APR-DRG rerouting is to review specific examples.

Following are detailed examples of all of these different types of APR-DRG reroutings. The examples illustrate the specific rerouting approach and logic used. For full code level specifications, please see the full Version 20.0 APR-DRG Definitions Manual.

Detailed Examples of Within MDC Reroutings:

WOS: PDX or SDX and Medical → Occurrence of specified diagnosis as either PDX or SDX determines APR-DRG assignment within same MDC in accordance with medical APR-DRG hierarchies for that MDC; since the specified diagnosis defines the APR-DRG, it is resequenced as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes regardless of whether it is recorded as PDX or SDX.

This is the most frequently used rerouting logic and existed in Version 15.0 of the APR-DRGs. It affects the following types of patients: MDC 4 cystic fibrosis patients and bronchopulmonary dysplasia patients; many MDC 15 medical neonatal APR-DRGs; all MDC 20 alcohol and substance abuse APR-DRGs; and all MDC 24 HIV APR-DRGs. Examples are provided for each of these areas.

- If medical patient in MDC 4 (Diseases & Disorders of the Respiratory System) other than those with mechanical ventilation 96+ hours has a PDX or SDX of cystic fibrosis, then assign patient to APR-DRG 131 Cystic Fibrosis and rescreens cystic fibrosis as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes unless the patient has another PDX or SDX that is higher in the MDC 4 medical hierarchy. (Note, APR-DRG 132 Bronchopulmonary Dysplasia is the only other MDC 4 APR-DRG defined this way and it is lower in the MDC 4 medical hierarchy).
- If medical patient in MDC 15 (Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period) is > 2,499 grams and has a PDX or SDX from a list of congenital/perinatal infections, then assign patient to APR-DRG 636 Neon BWT > 2499G W Congenital/Perinatal Infection and resequence the congenital/perinatal infection diagnosis as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes unless the patient has a PDX or SDX that is higher in the MDC 15 medical hierarchy (e.g., major anomaly, respiratory distress syndrome).
- If medical patient in MDC 20 (Alcohol/Drug Use & Alcohol/Drug Induced Organic Mental Disorders) has a PDX or SDX from a list of cocaine abuse diagnoses, then assign patient to APR-DRG 774 Cocaine Abuse & Dependence and resequence the cocaine abuse diagnosis as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes unless there is a PDX or SDX higher in the MDC 20 medical hierarchy (e.g., opioid abuse). MDC 20 patients are often admitted for multiple alcohol and drug abuse problems and so patients are assigned to a specific APR-DRG based upon a pre-existing medical hierarchy that examines all principal and secondary diagnoses.
- If medical patient in MDC 24 (Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infections) has a PDX of major HIV related condition and SDX of HIV Infection, then assign patient to APR-DRG 892 HIV With Major HIV Related Condition and resequence HIV Infection as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes. The sequencing of PDX and SDX for HIV patients is somewhat ambiguous and so this approach assures consistency in assignment to APR-DRG category and SOI/ROM levels.

Note, if there exists more than one secondary diagnosis from the specified diagnosis list for this type of rerouting logic, then the APR-DRG system provides additional selection logic for designation of the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes. The selection logic is specific to each APR-DRG. In most instances, the logic selects the diagnosis with the highest severity level to capture the PDX that most fully describes the reason for hospitalization, e.g., intermediate coronary syndrome (unstable angina) would be selected over coronary atherosclerosis NOS. The main exception to this approach is MDC 15 (Newborns & Other Neonates with Conditions Originating in the Perinatal Period) APR-DRGs. These APR-DRGs tend to be defined more broadly and can include patients with multiple problems at birth. In order to ensure that neonates with multiple problems have their most serious problems considered in the SOI/ROM algorithms, the diagnosis with the lowest severity is selected as the designated PDX (e.g., neonate with multiple anomalies).

W1X: PDX and Age and Medical → Age clarifies PDX and assignment to new APR-DRG within same MDC.

- If medical patient in MDC 23 (Rehabilitation, Aftercare, Other Factors Influencing Health Status & Other Health Service Contacts) has PDX Aftercare NEC and Age < 90 days, then assign patient to APR-DRG 863 Neonatal Aftercare instead of APR-DRG 862 Other Aftercare & Convalescence.

W3X: PDX and OR Procedure → PDX and OR Procedure together clarify APR-DRG assignment within same MDC in accordance with the MDC's surgical hierarchy.

- If surgical patient in MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) has a PDX of back/neck disorder and one of a designated set of musculoskeletal procedures not elsewhere classified (which includes back procedures), then reassign patient to APR-DRG 310 Intervertebral Disc Excision & Decompression unless the patient has another OR procedure that is higher in the MDC 8 surgical hierarchy.

W6S: PDX and SDX and Medical → Occurrence of PDX-SDX determines APR-DRG assignment within same MDC; since the SDX is primarily responsible for the APR-DRG assignment, it is resequenced as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes.

- If a medical patient in MDC 1 (Diseases & Disorders of the Nervous System) has a PDX of head trauma and an SDX of head trauma with coma >1 hour or hemorrhage, then assign patient to APR-DRG 55 Head Trauma W Coma >1 Hour or Hemorrhage and resequence the SDX of head trauma with coma >1 hour or hemorrhage as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes.
- If medical patient in MDC 5 (Diseases & Disorders of the Circulatory System) has a PDX of angina pectoris, coronary atherosclerosis or chest pain, and an SDX of acute myocardial infarct, then assign to APR-DRG 190 Acute Myocardial Infarct instead of APR-DRG 198 Angina Pectoris & Coronary Atherosclerosis or APR-DRG 203 Chest Pain, and resequence the acute myocardial infarct as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes.
- If medical patient in MDC 5 (Diseases & Disorders of the Circulatory System) has a PDX of chest pain and an SDX of angina pectoris or coronary atherosclerosis, then assign patient to APR-DRG 198 Angina Pectoris & Coronary Atherosclerosis instead of APR-DRG 203 Chest Pain and resequence the diagnosis of angina pectoris or coronary atherosclerosis as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes.
- If medical patient in MDC 23 (Rehabilitation, Aftercare, Other Factors Influencing Health Status & Other Health Service Contacts) has a PDX of Aftercare NEC and an SDX of Prematurity, then assign patient to APR-DRG 863 Neonatal Aftercare instead of APR-DRG 862 Other Aftercare & Convalescence, and resequence the diagnosis of prematurity as the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes.

Note, if there exists more than one secondary diagnosis from the specified diagnosis list for this type of rerouting, then the APR-DRG system provides additional selection logic for designation of the PDX for SOI/ROM purposes. The selection logic is specific to each APR-DRG. It is the same kind of selection logic as that described for APR-DRG rerouting type W0S.

W6X: PDX and SDX and Medical → SDX clarifies PDX and assignment to new APR-DRG within same MDC; there is no need to resequence PDX and SDX.

- If medical patient in MDC 7 (Diseases & Disorders of the Hepatobiliary System and Pancreas) has a PDX of liver disease and an SDX of alcoholic liver disease, then assign patient to APR-DRG 280 Alcoholic Liver Disease instead of APR-DRG 283 Other Disorders of Liver.

Detailed Examples of Across MDC Reroutings:

A2X: PDX and Non-OR Procedure and Medical → PDX and Non-OR Procedure together clarify assignment to new MDC and APR-DRG.

- If medical patient in MDC 1 (Diseases & Disorders of the Nervous System) has PDX brain neoplasm and non-OR procedure Stereotactic Radiosurgery, then reassign patient to MDC 17 (Lymphatic, Hematopoietic, Other Malignancies, Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy), APR-DRG 693 Radiotherapy.
- Same logic and specifications apply to medical patients in MDC 10 with pituitary neoplasms.

A3X: PDX and OR Procedure → PDX and OR Procedure together clarify assignment to new MDC and APR-DRG assignment is made based upon the surgical hierarchy of the new MDC.

- If surgical patient in MDC 5 (Diseases & Disorders of the Circulatory System) has PDX peripheral vascular disease and a lower limb amputation procedure except toe and no major cardiovascular OR procedure, then reassign patient to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) where APR-DRG assignment will be made based upon the MDC 8 surgical hierarchy. Note, all or nearly all of these patients will be assigned to APR-DRG 305 Amputation Of Lower Limb Except Toe.
- If surgical patient in MDC 5 (Diseases & Disorders of the Circulatory System) has PDX peripheral vascular disease and a toe amputation and no other MDC 5 surgical procedures except those in APR-DRG 180 Other Circulatory System Procedures, then reassign patient to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) where APR-DRG assignment will be made based upon the MDC 8 surgical hierarchy. Note, most of these patients will be assigned to APR-DRG 314 Foot & Toe Procedures.

A4X: PDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures → PDX and OR procedure together clarify MDC and APR-DRG assignment is made based upon the surgical hierarchy of the new MDC.

- If surgical patient in MDC 11 (Diseases & Disorders of the Kidney & Urinary Tract) has PDX complication of genitourinary device and penile prosthesis procedure and no other OR procedure except related penile procedures, then reassign patient to MDC 12 (Diseases & Disorders of the Male Reproductive System) where APR-DRG assignment is made based upon the surgical hierarchy of MDC 12.

A5X: SDX and OR Procedure → OR Procedure clarifies assignment to new MDC and APR-DRG assignment is made based upon the surgical hierarchy of the new MDC.

- If surgical patient in MDC 9 (Diseases & Disorders of the Skin, Subcutaneous Tissue & Breast) has SDX diabetes and lower limb amputation procedure, then reassign to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) where the patient will be assigned to a specific APR-DRG based upon the MDC 8 surgical hierarchy. Note, most of these patients have a PDX of chronic skin ulcer or cellulitis.

A6P: PDX and SDX and Medical → Resequence PDX-SDX for APR-DRG grouping purposes and assign patient to new MDC and APR-DRG.

- If medical patient in MDC 18 (Infectious & Parasitic Diseases, Systemic or Unspecified Sites) has a PDX of fever or viral infection NOS and an SDX of agranulocytosis/neutropenia, then for APR-DRG grouping purposes, resequence the PDX-SDX so agranulocytosis/neutropenia is the PDX and assign patient to MDC 16 (Diseases & Disor-

ders of Blood, Blood Forming Organs & Immunological Disorders) and APR-DRG 660 Major Hematologic/Immunologic Diag Exc Sick Cell Crisis & Coagul.

Note, if there exists more than one secondary diagnosis from the specified diagnosis list for this type of rerouting, then the APR-DRG grouper provides additional selection logic to designate a PDX for grouping purposes. The approach is to select the diagnosis with the highest severity level to capture the PDX that most fully describes the reason for the hospitalization. If there are several secondary diagnoses from the diagnosis list and they have the same severity level, the APR-DRG grouper selects the first one occurring in ICD-9-CM code order. This selection logic also applies to rerouting types 18A, 19A and 20A, which involve resequencing of PDX and SDX for grouping purposes.

A6X: PDX and SDX and Medical → SDX clarifies PDX and assignment to new MDC and APR-DRG; there is no need to resequence PDX and SDX.

- If medical patient in MDC 5 (Diseases & Disorders of the Circulatory System) has a PDX of complication of other vascular device, implant and graft and an SDX of renal failure without heart failure, then reassign the patient from MDC 5, APR-DRG 206 Malfunction, Reaction, Complication of Cardiac/Vascular Device or Procedure to MDC 11 (Diseases & Disorders of the Kidney & Urinary Tract), APR-DRG 466 Malfunction, Reaction, Complication of Genitourinary Device or Procedure.

A7P: PDX and SDX and whether Surgical or Medical → Resequence the PDX-SDX for APR-DRG grouping purposes and assign patient to new MDC and appropriate surgical or medical APR-DRG based upon the hierarchies and logic of the new MDC.

- If patient in MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders) has a PDX of diabetes manifestation not elsewhere classified and an SDX of osteomyelitis, then for APR-DRG grouping purposes, resequence the PDX-SDX so that osteomyelitis is the PDX and patient is assigned to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue) and to the appropriate surgical or medical APR-DRG per MDC 8 logic.
- If patient in MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders) has a PDX of diabetes manifestation not elsewhere classified and an SDX of skin ulcer, then for APR-DRG grouping purposes resequence the PDX-SDX so that skin ulcer is the PDX and patient is assigned to MDC 9 (Diseases & Disorders of the Skin, Subcutaneous Tissue & Breast) and to the appropriate surgical or medical APR-DRG per MDC 9 logic.
- If a patient in MDC 10 (Endocrine, Nutritional & Metabolic Diseases and Disorders) has a PDX of diabetes manifestation not elsewhere classified and SDXs of both osteomyelitis and skin ulcer, then regroup with osteomyelitis resequenced as the new PDX and assign patient to MDC 8 (Diseases & Disorders of the Musculoskeletal System and Connective Tissue).

A8P: PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure Except Related OR Procedures → Resequence the PDX-SDX for APR-DRG grouping purposes and assign patient to new MDC and APR-DRG assignment is made based upon the surgical hierarchy of the new MDC.

- If surgical patient in MDC 6 (Diseases & Disorders of the Digestive System) has a PDX of abdominal pain and an SDX of cholecystitis and a cholecystectomy procedure and no other OR procedures except related procedures, then resequence for APR-DRG grouping purposes the PDX-SDX so that cholecystitis is the PDX and reassign the patient to MDC 7 (Diseases & Disorders of the Hepatobiliary System and Pancreas) where the patient will be assigned to a specific APR-DRG based upon the MDC 7 surgical hierarchy.

A9P: PDX and SDX and Only OR Procedure → Resequence PDX-SDX for APR-DRG grouping

purposes and assign patient to new MDC and APR-DRG assignment is made based upon surgical hierarchy of the new MDC.

- If surgical patient in MDC 11 (Diseases & Disorders of the Kidney & Urinary Tract) has a PDX from a select list of kidney & urinary diagnoses (e.g., retention of urine) and an SDX of benign prostatic hypertrophy and a prostate procedure and no other OR procedure, then resequence the PDX-SDX for APR-DRG grouping purposes so that benign prostatic hypertrophy is the PDX, and reassign the patient to MDC 12 (Diseases & Disorders of the Male Reproductive System) where the patient will be assigned to a specific APR-DRG based upon the MDC 12 surgical hierarchy.

APPENDIX A

List of All Patient Refined DRGs, Version 20.0

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

Appendix A contains a list of each APR-DRG with a specification of the MDC and whether the APR-DRG is medical or surgical. Some APR-DRGs which contain patients from multiple MDCs (e.g., 3 Bone Marrow Transplant) do not have an MDC specified. The letter “M” is used to designate a medical APR-DRG and the letter “P” is used to designate a surgical APR-DRG.

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 001 | P | | LIVER TRANSPLANT |
| 002 | P | | HEART &/OR LUNG TRANSPLANT |
| 003 | P | | BONE MARROW TRANSPLANT |
| 004 | P | | TRACHEOSTOMY W LONG TERM MECHANICAL VENTILATION W EXTENSIVE PROCEDURE |
| 005 | P | | TRACHEOSTOMY W LONG TERM MECHANICAL VENTILATION W/O EXTENSIVE PROCEDURE |
| 006 | P | | PANCREAS TRANSPLANT |
| 020 | P | 01 | CRANIOTOMY FOR TRAUMA |
| 021 | P | 01 | CRANIOTOMY EXCEPT FOR TRAUMA |
| 022 | P | 01 | VENTRICULAR SHUNT PROCEDURES |
| 023 | P | 01 | SPINAL PROCEDURES |
| 024 | P | 01 | EXTRACRANIAL VASCULAR PROCEDURES |
| 026 | P | 01 | OTHER NERVOUS SYSTEM & RELATED PROCEDURES |
| 040 | M | 01 | SPINAL DISORDERS & INJURIES |
| 041 | M | 01 | NERVOUS SYSTEM MALIGNANCY |
| 042 | M | 01 | DEGENERATIVE NERVOUS SYSTEM DISORDERS EXC MULT SCLEROSIS |
| 043 | M | 01 | MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS & OTHER DEMYELINATING DISEASES |
| 044 | M | 01 | INTRACRANIAL HEMORRHAGE |
| 045 | M | 01 | CVA & PRECEREBRAL OCCLUSION W INFARCT |
| 046 | M | 01 | NONSPECIFIC CVA & PRECEREBRAL OCCLUSION W/O INFARCT |
| 047 | M | 01 | TRANSIENT ISCHEMIA |
| 048 | M | 01 | PERIPHERAL, CRANIAL & AUTONOMIC NERVE DISORDERS |
| 049 | M | 01 | BACTERIAL & TUBERCULOUS INFECTIONS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM |
| 050 | M | 01 | NON-BACTERIAL INFECTIONS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM EXC VIRAL MENINGITIS |
| 051 | M | 01 | VIRAL MENINGITIS |
| 052 | M | 01 | NONTRAUMATIC STUPOR & COMA |
| 053 | M | 01 | SEIZURE |
| 054 | M | 01 | MIGRAINE & OTHER HEADACHES |
| 055 | M | 01 | HEAD TRAUMA W COMA >1 HR OR HEMORRHAGE |
| 056 | M | 01 | BRAIN CONTUSION/LACERATION & COMPLICATED SKULL FX, COMA < 1 HR OR NO COMA |
| 057 | M | 01 | CONCUSSION, CLOSED SKULL FX NOS, UNCOMPLICATED INTRACRANIAL INJURY, COMA < 1 HR OR NO COMA |
| 058 | M | 01 | OTHER DISORDERS OF NERVOUS SYSTEM |
| 070 | P | 02 | ORBITAL PROCEDURES |
| 073 | P | 02 | EYE PROCEDURES EXCEPT ORBIT |
| 080 | M | 02 | ACUTE MAJOR EYE INFECTIONS |
| 082 | M | 02 | EYE DISORDERS EXCEPT MAJOR INFECTIONS |
| 089 | P | 03 | MAJOR CRANIAL/FACIAL BONE PROCEDURES |
| 090 | P | 03 | MAJOR LARYNX & TRACHEA PROCEDURES |
| 091 | P | 03 | OTHER MAJOR HEAD & NECK PROCEDURES |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 092 | P | 03 | FACIAL BONE PROCEDURES EXCEPT MAJOR CRANIAL/FACIAL BONE PROCEDURES |
| 093 | P | 03 | SINUS & MASTOID PROCEDURES |
| 095 | P | 03 | CLEFT LIP & PALATE REPAIR |
| 097 | P | 03 | TONSIL & ADENOID PROCEDURES |
| 098 | P | 03 | OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH & THROAT PROCEDURES |
| 110 | M | 03 | EAR, NOSE, MOUTH, THROAT, CRANIAL/FACIAL MALIGNANCIES |
| 111 | M | 03 | VERTIGO & OTHER LABYRINTH DISORDERS |
| 113 | M | 03 | INFECTIONS OF UPPER RESPIRATORY TRACT |
| 114 | M | 03 | DENTAL & ORAL DISEASES & INJURIES |
| 115 | M | 03 | OTHER EAR, NOSE, MOUTH, THROAT & CRANIAL/FACIAL DIAGNOSES |
| 120 | P | 04 | MAJOR RESPIRATORY & CHEST PROCEDURES |
| 121 | P | 04 | OTHER RESPIRATORY & CHEST PROCEDURES |
| 130 | M | 04 | RESPIRATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSIS W VENTILATOR SUPPORT 96+ HOURS |
| 131 | M | 04 | CYSTIC FIBROSIS - PULMONARY DISEASE |
| 132 | M | 04 | BPD & OTH CHRONIC RESPIRATORY DISEASES ARISING IN PERINATAL PERIOD |
| 133 | M | 04 | PULMONARY EDEMA & RESPIRATORY FAILURE |
| 134 | M | 04 | PULMONARY EMBOLISM |
| 135 | M | 04 | MAJOR CHEST & RESPIRATORY TRAUMA |
| 136 | M | 04 | RESPIRATORY MALIGNANCY |
| 137 | M | 04 | MAJOR RESPIRATORY INFECTIONS & INFLAMMATIONS |
| 138 | M | 04 | BRONCHIOLITIS & RSV PNEUMONIA |
| 139 | M | 04 | OTHER PNEUMONIA |
| 140 | M | 04 | CHRONIC OBSTRUCTIVE PULMONARY DISEASE |
| 141 | M | 04 | ASTHMA |
| 142 | M | 04 | INTERSTITIAL LUNG DISEASE |
| 143 | M | 04 | OTHER RESPIRATORY DIAGNOSES EXCEPT SIGNS, SYMPTOMS & MINOR DIAGNOSES |
| 144 | M | 04 | RESPIRATORY SIGNS, SYMPTOMS & MINOR DIAGNOSES |
| 160 | P | 05 | MAJOR CARDIOTHORACIC REPAIR OF HEART ANOMALY |
| 161 | P | 05 | CARDIAC DEFIBRILLATOR & HEART ASSIST IMPLANT |
| 162 | P | 05 | CARDIAC VALVE PROCEDURES W CARDIAC CATHETERIZATION |
| 163 | P | 05 | CARDIAC VALVE PROCEDURES W/O CARDIAC CATHETERIZATION |
| 165 | P | 05 | CORONARY BYPASS W CARDIAC CATH OR PERCUTANEOUS CARDIAC PROCEDURE |
| 166 | P | 05 | CORONARY BYPASS W/O CARDIAC CATH OR PERCUTANEOUS CARDIAC PROCEDURE |
| 167 | P | 05 | OTHER CARDIOTHORACIC PROCEDURES |
| 169 | P | 05 | MAJOR THORACIC & ABDOMINAL VASCULAR PROCEDURES |
| 170 | P | 05 | PERMANENT CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPLANT W AMI, HEART FAILURE OR SHOCK |
| 171 | P | 05 | PERM CARDIAC PACEMAKER IMPLANT W/O AMI, HEART FAILURE OR SHOCK |
| 173 | P | 05 | OTHER VASCULAR PROCEDURES |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|---|
| 174 | P | 05 | PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W AMI |
| 175 | P | 05 | PERCUTANEOUS CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURES W/O AMI |
| 176 | P | 05 | CARDIAC PACEMAKER & DEFIBRILLATOR DEVICE REPLACEMENT |
| 177 | P | 05 | CARDIAC PACEMAKER & DEFIBRILLATOR REVISION EXCEPT DEVICE REPLACEMENT |
| 180 | P | 05 | OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM PROCEDURES |
| 190 | M | 05 | ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION |
| 191 | M | 05 | CARDIAC CATHETERIZATION W CIRC DISORD EXC ISCHEMIC HEART DISEASE |
| 192 | M | 05 | CARDIAC CATHETERIZATION FOR ISCHEMIC HEART DISEASE |
| 193 | M | 05 | ACUTE & SUBACUTE ENDOCARDITIS |
| 194 | M | 05 | HEART FAILURE |
| 196 | M | 05 | CARDIAC ARREST |
| 197 | M | 05 | PERIPHERAL & OTHER VASCULAR DISORDERS |
| 198 | M | 05 | ANGINA PECTORIS & CORONARY ATHEROSCLEROSIS |
| 199 | M | 05 | HYPERTENSION |
| 200 | M | 05 | CARDIAC STRUCTURAL & VALVULAR DISORDERS |
| 201 | M | 05 | CARDIAC ARRHYTHMIA & CONDUCTION DISORDERS |
| 203 | M | 05 | CHEST PAIN |
| 204 | M | 05 | SYNCOPE & COLLAPSE |
| 205 | M | 05 | CARDIOMYOPATHY |
| 206 | M | 05 | MALFUNCTION,REACTION,COMPLICATION OF CARDIAC/VASC DEVICE OR PROCEDURE |
| 207 | M | 05 | OTHER CIRCULATORY SYSTEM DIAGNOSES |
| 220 | P | 06 | MAJOR STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES |
| 221 | P | 06 | MAJOR SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES |
| 222 | P | 06 | OTHER STOMACH, ESOPHAGEAL & DUODENAL PROCEDURES |
| 223 | P | 06 | OTHER SMALL & LARGE BOWEL PROCEDURES |
| 224 | P | 06 | PERITONEAL ADHESIOLYSIS |
| 225 | P | 06 | APPENDECTOMY |
| 226 | P | 06 | ANAL PROCEDURES |
| 227 | P | 06 | HERNIA PROCEDURES EXCEPT INGUINAL, FEMORAL & UMBILICAL |
| 228 | P | 06 | INGUINAL, FEMORAL & UMBILICAL HERNIA PROCEDURES |
| 229 | P | 06 | OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM & ABDOMINAL PROCEDURES |
| 240 | M | 06 | DIGESTIVE MALIGNANCY |
| 241 | M | 06 | PEPTIC ULCER & GASTRITIS |
| 242 | M | 06 | MAJOR ESOPHAGEAL DISORDERS |
| 243 | M | 06 | OTHER ESOPHAGEAL DISORDERS |
| 244 | M | 06 | DIVERTICULITIS & DIVERTICULOSIS |
| 245 | M | 06 | INFLAMMATORY BOWEL DISEASE |
| 246 | M | 06 | GASTROINTESTINAL VASCULAR INSUFFICIENCY |
| 247 | M | 06 | INTESTINAL OBSTRUCTION |
| 248 | M | 06 | MAJOR GASTROINTESTINAL & PERITONEAL INFECTIONS |
| 249 | M | 06 | NON-BACTERIAL GASTROENTERITIS, NAUSEA & VOMITING |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 251 | M | 06 | ABDOMINAL PAIN |
| 252 | M | 06 | MALFUNCTION, REACTION & COMPLICATION OF GI DEVICE OR PROCEDURE |
| 253 | M | 06 | OTHER & UNSPECIFIED GASTROINTESTINAL HEMORRHAGE |
| 254 | M | 06 | OTHER DIGESTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES |
| 260 | P | 07 | MAJOR PANCREAS, LIVER & SHUNT PROCEDURES |
| 261 | P | 07 | MAJOR BILIARY TRACT PROCEDURES |
| 262 | P | 07 | CHOLECYSTECTOMY EXCEPT LAPAROSCOPIC |
| 263 | P | 07 | LAPAROSCOPIC CHOLECYSTECTOMY |
| 264 | P | 07 | OTHER HEPATOBILIARY, PANCREAS & ABDOMINAL PROCEDURES |
| 279 | M | 07 | HEPATIC COMA & OTHER MAJOR ACUTE LIVER DISORDERS |
| 280 | M | 07 | ALCOHOLIC LIVER DISEASE |
| 281 | M | 07 | MALIGNANCY OF HEPATOBILIARY SYSTEM & PANCREAS |
| 282 | M | 07 | DISORDERS OF PANCREAS EXCEPT MALIGNANCY |
| 283 | M | 07 | OTHER DISORDERS OF THE LIVER |
| 284 | M | 07 | DISORDERS OF GALLBLADDER & BILIARY TRACT |
| 301 | P | 08 | HIP JOINT REPLACEMENT |
| 302 | P | 08 | KNEE JOINT REPLACEMENT |
| 303 | P | 08 | DORSAL & LUMBAR FUSION PROC FOR CURVATURE OF BACK |
| 304 | P | 08 | DORSAL & LUMBAR FUSION PROC EXCEPT FOR CURVATURE OF BACK |
| 305 | P | 08 | AMPUTATION OF LOWER LIMB EXCEPT TOES |
| 308 | P | 08 | HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES FOR TRAUMA EXCEPT JOINT REPLACEMENT |
| 309 | P | 08 | HIP & FEMUR PROCEDURES FOR NON-TRAUMA EXCEPT JOINT REPLACEMENT |
| 310 | P | 08 | INTERVERTEBRAL DISC EXCISION & DECOMPRESSION |
| 312 | P | 08 | SKIN GRAFT, EXCEPT HAND, FOR MUSCULOSKELETAL & CONNECTIVE TISSUE DIAGNOSES |
| 313 | P | 08 | KNEE & LOWER LEG PROCEDURES EXCEPT FOOT |
| 314 | P | 08 | FOOT & TOE PROCEDURES |
| 315 | P | 08 | SHOULDER, UPPER ARM & FOREARM PROCEDURES |
| 316 | P | 08 | HAND & WRIST PROCEDURES |
| 317 | P | 08 | TENDON, MUSCLE & OTHER SOFT TISSUE PROCEDURES |
| 320 | P | 08 | OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE PROCEDURES |
| 321 | P | 08 | CERVICAL SPINAL FUSION & OTHER BACK/NECK PROC EXC DISC EXCIS/ DECOMP |
| 340 | M | 08 | FRACTURE OF FEMUR |
| 341 | M | 08 | FRACTURE OF PELVIS OR DISLOCATION OF HIP |
| 342 | M | 08 | FRACTURES & DISLOCATIONS EXCEPT FEMUR, PELVIS & BACK |
| 343 | M | 08 | MUSCULOSKELETAL MALIGNANCY & PATHOL FRACTURE D/T MUSCSKEL MALIG |
| 344 | M | 08 | OSTEOMYELITIS, SEPTIC ARTHRITIS & OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL INFECTIONS |
| 346 | M | 08 | CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISORDERS |
| 347 | M | 08 | OTHER BACK & NECK DISORDERS, FRACTURES & INJURIES |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 349 | M | 08 | MALFUNCTION, REACTION, COMPLIC OF ORTHOPEDIC DEVICE OR PROCEDURE |
| 351 | M | 08 | OTHER MUSCULOSKELETAL SYSTEM & CONNECTIVE TISSUE DIAGNOSES |
| 361 | P | 09 | SKIN GRAFT FOR SKIN & SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE DIAGNOSES |
| 362 | P | 09 | MASTECTOMY PROCEDURES |
| 363 | P | 09 | BREAST PROCEDURES EXCEPT MASTECTOMY |
| 364 | P | 09 | OTHER SKIN, SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE & RELATED PROCEDURES |
| 380 | M | 09 | SKIN ULCERS |
| 381 | M | 09 | MAJOR SKIN DISORDERS |
| 382 | M | 09 | MALIGNANT BREAST DISORDERS |
| 383 | M | 09 | CELLULITIS & OTHER BACTERIAL SKIN INFECTIONS |
| 384 | M | 09 | CONTUSION, OPEN WOUND & OTHER TRAUMA TO SKIN & SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE |
| 385 | M | 09 | OTHER SKIN, SUBCUTANEOUS TISSUE & BREAST DISORDERS |
| 401 | P | 10 | PITUITARY & ADRENAL PROCEDURES |
| 403 | P | 10 | PROCEDURES FOR OBESITY |
| 404 | P | 10 | THYROID, PARATHYROID & THYROGLOSSAL PROCEDURES |
| 405 | P | 10 | OTHER PROCEDURES FOR ENDOCRINE, NUTRITIONAL & METABOLIC DISORDERS |
| 420 | M | 10 | DIABETES |
| 421 | M | 10 | MALNUTRITION, FAILURE TO THRIVE & OTHER NUTRITIONAL DISORDERS |
| 422 | M | 10 | HYPOVOLEMIA & RELATED ELECTROLYTE DISORDERS |
| 423 | M | 10 | INBORN ERRORS OF METABOLISM |
| 424 | M | 10 | OTHER ENDOCRINE DISORDERS |
| 425 | M | 10 | ELECTROLYTE DISORDERS EXCEPT HYPOVOLEMIA RELATED |
| 440 | P | 11 | KIDNEY TRANSPLANT |
| 441 | P | 11 | MAJOR BLADDER PROCEDURES |
| 442 | P | 11 | KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT PROCEDURES FOR MALIGNANCY |
| 443 | P | 11 | KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT PROCEDURES FOR NONMALIGNANCY |
| 444 | P | 11 | RENAL DIALYSIS ACCESS DEVICE PROCEDURE ONLY |
| 445 | P | 11 | OTHER BLADDER PROCEDURES |
| 446 | P | 11 | URETHRAL & TRANSURETHRAL PROCEDURES |
| 447 | P | 11 | OTHER KIDNEY, URINARY TRACT & RELATED PROCEDURES |
| 460 | M | 11 | RENAL FAILURE |
| 461 | M | 11 | KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT MALIGNANCY |
| 462 | M | 11 | NEPHRITIS & NEPHROSIS |
| 463 | M | 11 | KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT INFECTIONS |
| 465 | M | 11 | URINARY STONES & ACQUIRED UPPER URINARY TRACT OBSTRUCTION |
| 466 | M | 11 | MALFUNCTION, REACTION, COMPLIC OF GENITOURINARY DEVICE OR PROC |
| 468 | M | 11 | OTHER KIDNEY & URINARY TRACT DIAGNOSES, SIGNS & SYMPTOMS |
| 480 | P | 12 | MAJOR MALE PELVIC PROCEDURES |
| 481 | P | 12 | PENIS PROCEDURES |
| 482 | P | 12 | TRANSURETHRAL PROSTATECTOMY |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|---|
| 483 | P | 12 | TESTES & SCROTAL PROCEDURES |
| 484 | P | 12 | OTHER MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM & RELATED PROCEDURES |
| 500 | M | 12 | MALIGNANCY, MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM |
| 501 | M | 12 | MALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DIAGNOSES EXCEPT MALIGNANCY |
| 510 | P | 13 | PELVIC EVISCERATION, RADICAL HYSTERECTOMY & OTHER RADICAL GYN PROCS |
| 511 | P | 13 | UTERINE & ADNEXA PROCEDURES FOR OVARIAN & ADNEXAL MALIGNANCY |
| 512 | P | 13 | UTERINE & ADNEXA PROCEDURES FOR NON-OVARIAN & NON-ADNEXAL MALIG |
| 513 | P | 13 | UTERINE & ADNEXA PROCEDURES FOR NON-MALIGNANCY EXCEPT LEIOMYOMA |
| 514 | P | 13 | FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM RECONSTRUCTIVE PROCEDURES |
| 517 | P | 13 | DILATION & CURETTAGE FOR NON-OBSTETRIC DIAGNOSES |
| 518 | P | 13 | OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM & RELATED PROCEDURES |
| 519 | P | 13 | UTERINE & ADNEXA PROCEDURES FOR LEIOMYOMA |
| 530 | M | 13 | FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM MALIGNANCY |
| 531 | M | 13 | FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM INFECTIONS |
| 532 | M | 13 | MENSTRUAL & OTHER FEMALE REPRODUCTIVE SYSTEM DISORDERS |
| 540 | P | 14 | CESAREAN DELIVERY |
| 541 | P | 14 | VAGINAL DELIVERY W STERILIZATION &/OR D&C |
| 542 | P | 14 | VAGINAL DELIVERY W COMPLICATING PROCEDURES EXC STERILIZATION &/OR D&C |
| 544 | P | 14 | D&C, ASPIRATION CURETTAGE OR HYSTEROTOMY FOR OBSTETRIC DIAGNOSES |
| 545 | P | 14 | ECTOPIC PREGNANCY PROCEDURE |
| 546 | P | 14 | OTHER O.R. PROC FOR OBSTETRIC DIAGNOSES EXCEPT DELIVERY DIAGNOSES |
| 560 | M | 14 | VAGINAL DELIVERY |
| 561 | M | 14 | POSTPARTUM & POST ABORTION DIAGNOSES W/O PROCEDURE |
| 563 | M | 14 | THREATENED ABORTION |
| 564 | M | 14 | ABORTION W/O D&C, ASPIRATION CURETTAGE OR HYSTEROTOMY |
| 565 | M | 14 | FALSE LABOR |
| 566 | M | 14 | OTHER ANTEPARTUM DIAGNOSES |
| 580 | M | 15 | NEONATE, TRANSFERRED <5 DAYS OLD, NOT BORN HERE |
| 581 | M | 15 | NEONATE, TRANSFERRED < 5 DAYS OLD, BORN HERE |
| 583 | P | 15 | NEONATE W ECMO |
| 588 | P | 15 | NEONATE BWT <1500G W MAJOR PROCEDURE |
| 589 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT <500G |
| 591 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT 500-749G W/O MAJOR PROCEDURE |
| 593 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT 750-999G W/O MAJOR PROCEDURE |
| 602 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1000-1249G W RESP DIST SYND/OTH MAJ RESP OR MAJ ANOM |
| 603 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT 1000-1249G W OR W/O OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONDITION |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 607 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1250-1499G W RESP DIST SYND/OTH MAJ RESP OR MAJ ANOM |
| 608 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1250-1499G W OR W/O OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONDITION |
| 609 | P | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1500-2499G W MAJOR PROCEDURE |
| 611 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT 1500-1999G W MAJOR ANOMALY |
| 612 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1500-1999G W RESP DIST SYND/OTH MAJ RESP COND |
| 613 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT 1500-1999G W CONGENITAL/PERINATAL INFECTION |
| 614 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 1500-1999G W OR W/O OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONDITION |
| 621 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 2000-2499G W MAJOR ANOMALY |
| 622 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 2000-2499G W RESP DIST SYND/OTH MAJ RESP COND |
| 623 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 2000-2499G W CONGENITAL/PERINATAL INFECTION |
| 625 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 2000-2499G W OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONDITION |
| 626 | M | 15 | NEONATE BWT 2000-2499G, NORMAL NEWBORN OR NEONATE W OTHER PROBLEM |
| 630 | P | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G W MAJOR CARDIOVASCULAR PROCEDURE |
| 631 | P | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G W OTHER MAJOR PROCEDURE |
| 633 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G W MAJOR ANOMALY |
| 634 | M | 15 | NEONATE, BIRTHWT >2499G W RESP DIST SYND/OTH MAJ RESP COND |
| 636 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G W CONGENITAL/PERINATAL INFECTION |
| 639 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G W OTHER SIGNIFICANT CONDITION |
| 640 | M | 15 | NEONATE BIRTHWT >2499G, NORMAL NEWBORN OR NEONATE W OTHER PROBLEM |
| 650 | P | 16 | SPLENECTOMY |
| 651 | P | 16 | OTHER PROCEDURES OF BLOOD & BLOOD-FORMING ORGANS |
| 660 | M | 16 | MAJOR HEMATOLOGIC/IMMUNOLOGIC DIAG EXC SICKLE CELL CRISIS & COAGUL |
| 661 | M | 16 | COAGULATION & PLATELET DISORDERS |
| 662 | M | 16 | SICKLE CELL ANEMIA CRISIS |
| 663 | M | 16 | OTHER ANEMIA & DISORDERS OF BLOOD & BLOOD-FORMING ORGANS |
| 680 | P | 17 | MAJOR O.R. PROCEDURES FOR LYMPHATIC/HEMATOPOIETIC/OTHER NEOPLASMS |
| 681 | P | 17 | OTHER O.R. PROCEDURES FOR LYMPHATIC/HEMATOPOIETIC/OTHER NEOPLASMS |
| 690 | M | 17 | ACUTE LEUKEMIA |
| 691 | M | 17 | LYMPHOMA, MYELOMA & NON-ACUTE LEUKEMIA |
| 692 | M | 17 | RADIOTHERAPY |
| 693 | M | 17 | CHEMOTHERAPY |
| 694 | M | 17 | LYMPHATIC & OTHER MALIGNANCIES & NEOPLASMS OF UNCERTAIN BEHAVIOR |
| 710 | P | 18 | INFECTIOUS & PARASITIC DISEASES INCLUDING HIV W O.R. PROCEDURE |
| 711 | P | 18 | POST-OP, POST-TRAUMA, OTHER DEVICE INFECTIONS W O.R. PROCEDURE |
| 720 | M | 18 | SEPTICEMIA & DISSEMINATED INFECTIONS |
| 721 | M | 18 | POST-OPERATIVE, POST-TRAUMATIC, OTHER DEVICE INFECTIONS |
| 722 | M | 18 | FEVER |
| 723 | M | 18 | VIRAL ILLNESS |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 724 | M | 18 | OTHER INFECTIOUS & PARASITIC DISEASES |
| 740 | P | 19 | MENTAL ILLNESS DIAGNOSIS W O.R. PROCEDURE |
| 750 | M | 19 | SCHIZOPHRENIA |
| 751 | M | 19 | MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDERS & OTHER/UNSPECIFIED PSYCHOSES |
| 752 | M | 19 | DISORDERS OF PERSONALITY & IMPULSE CONTROL |
| 753 | M | 19 | BIPOLAR DISORDERS |
| 754 | M | 19 | DEPRESSION EXCEPT MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDER |
| 755 | M | 19 | ADJUSTMENT DISORDERS & NEUROSES EXCEPT DEPRESSIVE DIAGNOSES |
| 756 | M | 19 | ACUTE ANXIETY & DELIRIUM STATES |
| 757 | M | 19 | ORGANIC MENTAL HEALTH DISTURBANCES |
| 758 | M | 19 | CHILDHOOD BEHAVIORAL DISORDERS |
| 759 | M | 19 | EATING DISORDERS |
| 760 | M | 19 | OTHER MENTAL HEALTH DISORDERS |
| 770 | M | 20 | DRUG & ALCOHOL ABUSE OR DEPENDENCE, LEFT AGAINST MEDICAL ADVICE |
| 772 | M | 20 | ALCOHOL & DRUG DEPENDENCE W REHAB OR REHAB/DETOX THERAPY |
| 773 | M | 20 | OPIOID ABUSE & DEPENDENCE |
| 774 | M | 20 | COCAINE ABUSE & DEPENDENCE |
| 775 | M | 20 | ALCOHOL ABUSE & DEPENDENCE |
| 776 | M | 20 | OTHER DRUG ABUSE & DEPENDENCE |
| 791 | P | 21 | O.R. PROCEDURE FOR OTHER COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT |
| 811 | M | 21 | ALLERGIC REACTIONS |
| 812 | M | 21 | POISONING OF MEDICINAL AGENTS |
| 813 | M | 21 | OTHER COMPLICATIONS OF TREATMENT |
| 815 | M | 21 | OTHER INJURY, POISONING & TOXIC EFFECT DIAGNOSES |
| 816 | M | 21 | TOXIC EFFECTS OF NON-MEDICINAL SUBSTANCES |
| 841 | P | 22 | EXTENSIVE 3RD DEGREE BURNS W SKIN GRAFT |
| 842 | P | 22 | FULL THICKNESS BURNS W SKIN GRAFT |
| 843 | M | 22 | EXTENSIVE 3RD DEGREE OR FULL THICKNESS BURNS W/O SKIN GRAFT |
| 844 | M | 22 | PARTIAL THICKNESS BURNS W OR W/O SKIN GRAFT |
| 850 | P | 23 | PROCEDURE W DIAG OF REHAB, AFTERCARE OR OTH CONTACT W HEALTH SERVICE |
| 860 | M | 23 | REHABILITATION |
| 861 | M | 23 | SIGNS, SYMPTOMS & OTHER FACTORS INFLUENCING HEALTH STATUS |
| 862 | M | 23 | OTHER AFTERCARE & CONVALESCENCE |
| 863 | M | 23 | NEONATAL AFTERCARE |
| 890 | M | 24 | HIV W MULTIPLE MAJOR HIV RELATED CONDITIONS |
| 892 | M | 24 | HIV W MAJOR HIV RELATED CONDITION |
| 893 | M | 24 | HIV W MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT HIV RELATED CONDITIONS |
| 894 | M | 24 | HIV W ONE SIGNIF HIV COND OR W/O SIGNIF RELATED COND |
| 910 | P | 25 | CRANIOTOMY FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA |
| 911 | P | 25 | EXTENSIVE ABDOMINAL/THORACIC PROCEDURES FOR MULT SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA |

APPENDIX A—LIST OF ALL PATIENT REFINED DRGS, VERSION 20.0

| DRG | MED - SURG | MDC | LONG DESCRIPTIONS |
|------------|-------------------|------------|--|
| 912 | P | 25 | MUSCULOSKELETAL & OTHER PROCEDURES FOR MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA |
| 930 | M | 25 | MULTIPLE SIGNIFICANT TRAUMA W/O O.R. PROCEDURE |
| 950 | P | | EXTENSIVE PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS |
| 951 | P | | MODERATELY EXTENSIVE PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS |
| 952 | P | | NONEXTENSIVE PROCEDURE UNRELATED TO PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS |
| 955 | M | | PRINCIPAL DIAGNOSIS INVALID AS DISCHARGE DIAGNOSIS |
| 956 | M | | UNGROUPABLE |

APR-DRG Bibliography

Studies Using the APR-DRGs in Their Methodology

1. Lindenauer PK, Chehabeddine R, Pekow P, Fitzgerald J, Benjamin EM. Quality of care for patients hospitalized with heart failure: assessing the impact of hospitalists. *Arch Intern Med.* 2002 Jun 10;162(11):1251-6
2. Chen J, Radford MJ, Wang Y, Marciniak TA, Krumholz HM. Do "America's Best Hospitals" perform better for acute myocardial infarction? *N Engl J Med.* 1999 Jan 28;340(4):286-92.
3. Hannan EL, Racz MJ, Jones RH, Gold JP, Ryan TJ, Hafner JP, Isom OW. Predictors of mortality for patients undergoing cardiac valve replacements in New York State. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2000 Oct;70(4):1212-8.
4. Meurer JR, Kuhn EM, Goerge V et al. Charges for Childhood Asthma by Hospital Characteristics. *Pediatrics* 1998; 102(6) electronic article

Studies Comparing the APR-DRGs with Other Systems

1. Iezzoni LI, Shwartz M, Ash AS, Mackiernan YD Predicting in-hospital mortality for stroke patients: results differ across severity-measurement methods. *Med Decis Making.* 1996 Oct-Dec;16(4):348-56
2. Thomas
3. Iezzoni LI, Ash AS, Shwartz M, Daley J, Hughes JS, Mackiernan YD Judging hospitals by severity-adjusted mortality rates: the influence of the severity-adjustment method. *Am J Public Health.* 1996 Oct;86(10):1379-87.
4. Hughes JS, Iezzoni LI, Daley J, Greenberg L How severity measures rate hospitalized patients. *J Gen Intern Med.* 1996 May;11(5):303-11.
5. Iezzoni LI, Shwartz M, Ash AS, Mackiernan YD Does severity explain differences in hospital length of stay for pneumonia patients? *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 1996 Apr;1(2):65-76
6. Iezzoni LI An introduction to risk adjustment. *Am J Med Qual.* 1996 Spring;11(1):S8-11
7. Iezzoni LI, Shwartz M, Ash AS, Mackiernan YD Using severity measures to predict the likelihood of death for pneumonia inpatients. *J Gen Intern Med.* 1996 Jan;11(1):23-31
8. Landon B, Iezzoni LI, Ash AS, Shwartz M, Daley J, Hughes JS, Mackiernan YD Judging hospitals by severity-adjusted mortality rates: the case of CABG surgery. *Inquiry.* 1996 Summer;33(2):155-66
9. Iezzoni LI, Shwartz M, Ash AS, Hughes JS, Daley J, Mackiernan YD Severity measurement methods and judging hospital death rates for pneumonia. *Med Care.* 1996 Jan;34(1):11-28
10. Iezzoni LI, Ash AS, Shwartz M, Daley J, Hughes JS, Mackiernan YD Predicting who dies depends on how severity is measured: implications for evaluating patient outcomes. *Ann Intern Med.* 1995 Nov 15;123(10):763-70
11. Iezzoni L Examining the validity of severity measures in today's health policy context. *J Gen Intern Med.* 1995 Jul;10(7):406-8

12. Iezzoni LI, Shwartz M, Ash AS, Hughes JS, Daley J, Mackiernan YD Using severity-adjusted stroke mortality rates to judge hospitals. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 1995 Jun;7(2):81-94.

Studies Examining the Properties of APR-DRGs

1. Averill, R. Muldoon, J. Vertrees, J. et al The Evolution of Casemix Measurement Using Diagnosis Related Groups (DRGs) in Goldfield N Physician Profiling and Risk Adjustment, Aspen 2nd edition 1998.
2. Averill RF, Goldfield NI, Muldoon J, Steinbeck BA, Grant TM A closer look at all-patient refined DRGs. *J AHIMA*. 2002 Jan;73(1):46-50.
3. Muldoon JH Structure and performance of different DRG classification systems for neonatal medicine. *Pediatrics*. 1999 Jan;103(1 Suppl E):302-18
4. Romano PS, Chan BK Risk-adjusting acute myocardial infarction mortality: are APR-DRGs the right tool? *Health Serv Res* 2000 Mar; 34(7):1469-89
5. Goldfield N, Averill R On "risk-adjusting acute myocardial infarction mortality: are APR-DRGs the right tool"? *Health Serv Res*. 2000 Mar;34(7):1491-5; discussion 1495-8
6. Averill RF The evolution of case-mix measurement using DRGs: past, present and future. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 1994;14:75-83.
7. Goldfield N. Case Mix and Outcomes Management, *Journal of Outcomes Management* 1(2), 1994.
8. Goldfield, N, Severity of Illness, Case Mix and Managed Care, *Journal of Outcomes Management*, 1996.
9. Goldfield N. Understanding Your Managed Care Practice: The Critical Role of Case Mix Systems. in Nash D (ed) *Managed Care*, Aspen, 1994.
10. Muldoon J. Pediatrics and DRG Case Mix Classification. Physician Profiling and Risk Adjustment, Edition 1. Goldfield N, M.D., Boland P, Ph.D. 252-270

Public Disclosure

1. Averill RF Public dissemination of provider performance comparisons in the United States. *Hosp Q*. 1998 Spring;1(3):39-41
2. Goldfield N, Public Disclosure of Case Mix Adjusted Clinical Information: Practical and Theoretical Challenges, in *Goldfield and Boland (eds) Physician Profile and Risk Adjustment*, Aspen, 1996.

Financial Uses of APR-DRGs

1. Averill RF Put competition into PPS. How Medicare can save money by allowing hospitals to offer DRG discounts. *Mod Healthc*. 1997 Dec 1;27(48):54
2. Averill RF, Kalison MJ, Vertrees JC, Goldfield NI Achieving short-term Medicare savings through the expansion of the prospective payment system. *Health Care Manage Rev*. 1996 Fall;21(4):18-25
3. Averill RF Kalison M. Competition and prospective payment: a new way to control health costs. *J Am Health Policy*. 1993 Mar-Apr;3(2):22-8

Case Studies Using the APR-DRGs

1. Noetscher CM, Morreale GF Length of stay reduction: two innovative hospital approaches. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 2001 Oct;16(1):1-14.
2. Franklin PD, Noetscher CM, Murphy ME, Lagoe RJ Using data to reduce hospital readmissions. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:67-85
3. Jones P A case study in APR-DRGs: the Greater Southeast Community Hospital experience. *Manag Care Q.* 1994 Summer;2(3):48-56
4. Fridlin C Using severity-adjusted data to impact clinical pathways. *Healthc Inf Manage.* 1996 Spring;10(1):23-30
5. Franklin PD, Legault JP Using data to evaluate hospital inpatient mortality. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:55-66
6. Murphy ME, Noetscher CM Reducing hospital inpatient lengths of stay. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:40-54.
7. Lagoe RJ, Arnold KA, Littau SA Analyzing hospital admission rates at the community level. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:25-39
8. Lagoe RJ, Kurtzig BS, Hohner VK Health care data and their sources. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:7-24.
9. Lagoe RJ, Noetscher CM Using health care data to improve utilization and outcomes. Introduction. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 1999 Nov;Spec No:1-6.
10. Bennett F, McKee W and Kilberg L. Case Study in Physician Profiling. *Managed Care Quarterly*, vol 2, #4 pp 60-70.

International Studies

1. Kawabuchi K Payment systems and considerations of case mix--are diagnosis-related groups applicable in Japan? *Pharmacoeconomics.* 2000;18 Suppl 1:95-110.
2. Reid B, Palmer G, Aisbett C The performance of Australian DRGs. *Aust Health Rev.* 2000;23(2):20-31
3. De Marco MF, Lorenzoni L, Addari P, Nante N Evaluation of the capacity of the APR-DRG classification system to predict hospital mortality *Epidemiol Prev.* 2002 Jul-Aug;26(4):183-90
4. Ciccone G, Lorenzoni L, Ivaldi C, Ciccarelli E, Piobbici M, Arione R. Social class, mode of admission, severity of illness and hospital mortality: an analysis with "All patient refined DRG" of discharges from the Molinette hospital in Turin. *Epidemiol Prev.* 1999 Jul-Sep;23(3):188-96.
5. Nante N, De Marco MF, Balzi D, Addari P, Buiatti E Prediction of mortality for congestive heart failure patients: results from different wards of an Italian teaching hospital. *Eur J Epidemiol.* 2000;16(11):1017-21
6. Fantini MP, Cisbani L, Manzoli L, Vertrees J, Lorenzoni L. On the use of administrative databases to support planning activities. The case of the evaluation of neonatal casemix in the Emilia-Romagna region using DRG and APR-DRG classification systems. *European Journal of Public Health*, June 2003 (in press)
7. Lorenzoni L, Cisbani L, Manzoli L, Fantini MP. The evaluation of neonatal case mix using Medicare DRG and APR-DRG classification systems. *Italian Journal of Pediatrics* 2002, 28: 225-229