

NTDB Symposium Data Validation

Case Validation Project for National Sample Project

Melanie Neal and Sandra Goble

American College of Surgeons, NTDB
633 N. Saint Clair
Chicago, IL 60611

www.ntdb.org

(312) 202 5255

Case Validation Project for NSP

National Sample Project:

- NSP is supported by the NCIPC, CDC and ACS COT
- Stratified sample of 100 trauma centers (NTDB data)

Case Validation study:

- Part of the NSP
- Externally validate selected key elements in NTDB by comparing data in NTDB to data reabstracted by trained coders.
- Study used data with ED admission year 2005

Case Validation Project

- Ten randomly chosen hospitals from NSP
 - Same strata as NSP:
 - Region
 - Trauma Level
 - NTDB status
- 50 randomized incidents / hospital
 - Stratified by Discharge Status (Dead/Alive)

Methodology

- Data dictionary
 - Data definition (Same as NTDB)
 - Where in chart to abstract the variable
- Data collection tool
- Hospitals' consent (potential IRB approval)

Methodology

- Abstractors
 - Training and testing (June 2007, University of Utah)
- Site visits
 - Inter-rater reliability & reliability
- Data analysis in-house at NTDB

Analysis

- Percent observed agreement
- Kappa score
 - how much the 2 observers agree beyond the level of agreement that could be expected by chance
 - $\text{Kappa} = (p_o - p_e) / (1 - p_e)$

Variables abstracted

- Date of Birth
- Gender
- Date of admission
- Arrival time to ED
- ICD9 code of injury
- Ecode
- Lowest GCS eye in ED
- Lowest GCS verbal in ED
- Lowest GCS motor in ED
- GCS assessment qualifier in ED
- GCS total in ED
- Complications
- Comorbidities
- ICU length of stay
- Ventilator support days
- First systolic blood pressure
- First respiratory rate in ED
- Discharge status
- Discharge disposition
- Discharge date

Considerations

- Directly attainable variables
 - Dates (birth, admission, discharge)
 - Gender
- Indirectly attainable/subjective variables
 - GCS score (notes from Dr)
 - Discharge disposition
 - Revise categories

Considerations

- Multiple observations per variable
 - Diagnosis codes (multiple injuries)
 - Only trauma diagnoses using Barrell Matrix
 - Match on at least one
 - Complications & comorbidityes
 - None/unknown in NTDB
 - Match on at least one complication
 - No complications vs. submitted complications

Results

- Inter-rater reliability
 - 50 cases abstracted by both abstracters at the first hospital visited
 - Interim analyses done to assure consistency in method of abstracting

Results

Inter-Rater Reliability

- Observed Agreement: 82% – 100%
- Kappa: 0.776 – 1.000
- All variables excellent agreement
 - Kappa > 0.75

Results: Inter-Rater Reliability

Variable	% Agree	Kappa (95% CI)
Date of birth	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
Gender	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
Date of ED admission	47/50 94.0%	0.938 (0.871, 1.000)
Lowest ED GCS Eye	49/50 98.0%	0.963 (0.892, 1.000)
Lowest ED GCS Verbal	49/50 98.0%	0.962 (0.892, 1.000)
Lowest ED GCS motor	49/50 98.0%	0.964 (0.895, 1.000)
Lowest ED GCS total	49/50 98.0%	0.963 (0.894, 1.000)
GCS assessment qualifier	48/50 96.0%	0.927 (0.834, 1.000)
ICU length of stay	48/50 96.0%	0.904 (0.772, 1.000)
Ventilator support days	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
First systolic BP in ED	44/50 88.0%	0.876 (0.783, 0.969)
First respiratory rate in ED	41/50 82.0 %	0.776 (0.646, 0.906)
Discharge status	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
Discharge disposition	43/50 86.0%	0.804 (0.673, 0.935)
Discharge date	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
ICD 9-CM mechanism of injury	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)
Complications	46/50 92.0%	0.805 (0.624, 0.987)
Comorbidities	49/50 98.0%	0.971 (0.916, 1.000)
ICD 9-CM diagnosis	50/50 100%	1.000 (1.000, 1.000)

Results:

Abstracted Data vs. NTDB

- ***See Handout***

Percent agree and Kappa scores:

- pooled data
- pooled data from Level I trauma centers
- pooled data from Level II trauma centers
- pooled data from all incidents with Discharge Status of alive
- pooled data for Discharge Status of dead

Results:

Abstracted Data vs. NTDB

Pooled data (n=503):

- Excellent for directly attainable variables (Kappa: 0.57- 0.99).
- Low Kappa score (range: 0.05-0.40)
 - GCS Assessment Qualifier
 - ICU Days, Ventilator Days,
 - Complications, Comorbidities, and Diagnosis Code
- Review of variables with low kappa
 - Variability among centers
 - Data mapping (i.e translation of submitted data into NTDB)
 - Field definitions were responsible

Results:

Abstracted Data vs. NTDB

Trauma Level I (n=300) vs II (n=203)

- 95% CI overlapping for most of variables
- Lower for Level I
 - Date of Birth
 - GCS scores (Eye, Verbal, Total)
- Lower for Level II
 - First sys BP
 - First RR

Results:

Abstracted Data vs. NTDB

Discharge Alive (n=453) vs Dead (n=50)

- 95% CI overlapping for most of variables
- Percent agreement lower for all variables but diagnosis code
- Lower for alive
 - GCS Assessment Qualifier
- Lower for dead
 - First RR

Comments

Who is the 'Gold Standard'?

- The abstractor
- NTDB data (Registrar at site)

Comments

Multiple levels of concordance:

1. Abstracted vs. NTDB
2. Abstracted vs. “raw data” into NTDB

Comments

This study revealed some significant flaws in the process by which data were loaded into the NTDB database in 2005.

Recommendations

- Standardized data definitions for NTDB data should be adopted.
- A comprehensive quality assurance plan should be developed.
- Training of trauma registrars is needed.
- Periodic data validation projects should be conducted.

Next Steps

- No mapping with data submitted in 2008 (NTDS)
- Follow-up study
 - Data based on NTDS
 - Case definition