THE UNDER-DIAGNOSIS AND UNDER-TREATMENT OF **OSTEOPOROSIS DUE TO INACCURATE CODING PRACTICES IN** PRIMARY CARE IN UK

Dr SK Nedungayil, Dr R Azzam, Dr S Cooper, Dr S Davis, Dr M Ninan East Lancashire and Blackburn with Darwen CCG, United Kingdom

INTRODUCTION

There are clear guidelines on the diagnosis and management of Osteoporosis (1). However evidence suggests that under-diagnosis and under-treatment of the condition is not uncommon (2). This study looks at the underlying reasons for the problem and offers solutions to improve detection rates of osteoporosis.



AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

- To study the burden of undiagnosed and untreated osteoporosis in Primary Care in the UK
- To calculate the prevalence rates
- To identify the reasons behind this under reporting

METHODS AND MATERIALS

47988 electronic patient records across 4 GP practices in North-West England (EMIS[©]) were analysed using computerised algorithms (figure 1). The software, that can be run on all electronic patient records, searched for patients with diagnosis codes for fragility fractures, osteoporosis, and clinical risk factors for osteoporosis. Patients on bone sparing therapy, their compliance rates and side effects were also ascertained. The data was used to quantify the prevalence rates, under-diagnosis and suboptimal treatment of patients.

FIGURE 1- IDENTIFICATION OF PATIENT COHORTS



- Demographics • Diagnosis
- Current or past therapies

FIGURE 4- UNDER-DIAGNOSIS AND UNDER-TREATMENT





CLINICAL SYSTEM INTERROGATION

• Low trauma fractures Clinical Risk Factors for Osteoporosis (FRAX and Non-FRAX)

PATIENT COHORTS

• Adults with a diagnosis of osteoporosis who are not currently receiving treatment with bonesparing agents

• Adults with or without a diagnosis of osteoporosis currently receiving treatment with bone-sparing agents for longer than 3 years

• Adults with fragility fracture (fitting diagnostic criteria for osteoporosis) but without diagnosis of osteoporosis or not on Bone-sparing agents (or both)

The prevalence of osteoporosis in this study population, exceeds the national and regional estimate. This is because more cases were detected as a part of this study. It therefore reinforces the belief that osteoporosis is underdiagnosed in primary care.

This study identifies inconsistent coding of index events and lack of appreciation of co-existing clinical risk factors as the prime cause for underdiagnosis. Fragility fractures are not being picked up in time leading to a delay or missed diagnosis of osteoporosis. Patients are therefore not being treated in a timely manner. Inconsistent use of diagnostic codes for fragility fractures in the hospital setting too adds to this problem. Diagnosis is missed when the patient is transferred from Secondary care to Primary care. A case-finding approach, as undertaken in this study improves identification of patients with osteoporosis in primary care. Instituting timely treatment will reduce the risk of further fractures and improve the morbidity and mortality (3). There needs to be a concerted effort to improving coding practice in primary care. Increasing awareness of fragility fractures and osteoporosis and focussing on staff training on the correct use of clinical codes are areas of improvement suggested by this study.

RESULTS

15201 (31.67%) of patients were in the risk category for osteoporosis. The

CONCLUSIONS

A Case-finding approach is an efficient and cost-effective way of detecting

prevalence of osteoporosis was 1.6% (Figure 2). 941 patients were analysed to have fragility fractures but only 336 (35.7%) patients of these patients were coded appropriately (Figure 3).

Only 331 (43.38%) patients were on the right treatment for the condition while majority of 432 (58.69%) patients were not. 304 (47.87%) patients, despite being on treatment with bone sparing agents did not have a diagnosis code for osteoporosis (Figure 4).

- undiagnosed and under-treated cases of Osteoporosis.
- The computer algorithm used in this study is robust in identifying the patients in whom the diagnosis has been missed. It is easily replicable and can be applied to all electronic patient records.
- Inconsistent coding practice in Primary care can be addressed by investing in staff training and improving coding practice to improve detection and timely secondary prevention measures.

Contact

DR SUNIL K NEDUNGAYIL **General Practitioner** The Castle Medical Group Health Centre, Railway View Road, Clitheroe Lancashire, UK, BB2 7EX Email: sunil.nedungayil@nhs.net

References

1) NOGG 2017. Clinical guideline for the prevention and treatment of osteoporosis. March 2017. Available from https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/NOGG/NOGG%20Guideline%202017.pdf [Accessed 20/1/2018]

2) Nguyen TV, Center JR, Eisman JA. Osteoporosis: underrated, underdiagnosed and undertreated. Med J <u>Aust.</u> 2004 Mar 1;180 (5 Suppl):S1822. Available online at <u>https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14984358</u> [accessed on 20/1/2018]

3) National Osteoporosis Society. Effective Secondary Prevention of Fragility Fractures: Clinical Standards for Fracture Liaison Services. Available at https://staging.nos.org.uk/media/1776/clinical-standards-report.pdf [accessed on 20/1/2018]