

RESEARCH ARTICLE


Detection of complicated ectopic pregnancies in the hospital discharge database: A validation study

Marion Fermaut^{1,2}, Arnaud Fauconnier^{1,2}, Aurélie Brossard³, Jimmy Razafimamonjy⁴, Xavier Fritel^{3,5}, Annie Serfaty^{2,6,7}*

1 Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Intercommunal Hospital Centre of Poissy-Saint-Germain-en-Laye, Poissy, France, **2** EA 7285, Research Unit "Risk and Safety in Clinical Medicine for Women and Perinatal Health", Versailles-Saint-Quentin University (UVSQ), Montigny-le-Bretonneux, France, **3** Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital Center of Poitiers, Poitiers, France, **4** Medical Information Department, Intercommunal Hospital Centre of Poissy-Saint-Germain-en-Laye, Poissy, France, **5** INSERM CIC 1402, University Hospital Center of Poitiers, Poitiers, France, **6** Medical Information Department, Armand-Trousseau, La Roche-Guyon, Eastern Parisian University Hospital, Assistance Publique–Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Paris, France, **7** Regional Agency of Health for Paris Region, Direction of health promotion and inequality reduction, Paris, France

* These authors contributed equally to this work.

* annieserfatydr@yahoo.fr



OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Fermaut M, Fauconnier A, Brossard A, Razafimamonjy J, Fritel X, Serfaty A (2019) Detection of complicated ectopic pregnancies in the hospital discharge database: A validation study. PLoS ONE 14(6): e0217674. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217674>

Editor: Manisha Nair, University of Oxford, National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, UNITED KINGDOM

Received: April 11, 2018

Accepted: May 16, 2019

Published: June 5, 2019

Copyright: © 2019 Fermaut et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Funding: This work was supported by the Woman's Health Research Institute (France) for conducting the research.

Competing interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

Objective

Complicated ectopic pregnancies with severe bleeding (CEPSB) are life-threatening situations and should be considered maternal near-miss cases. Previous studies have found an association between severe maternal morbidity secondary to CEPSB and substandard care. Almost all women with CEPSB are hospitalized, generating administrative and medical records. The objective of this study was to propose a method to measure the validity of the hospital discharge database (HDD) to detect CEPSB among hospital stays in two gynecological units.

Methods

We included all hospital stays of women who were 18–45 years old and hospitalized for acute pelvic pain or/and metrorrhagia in the two hospitals. The HDD was compared to medical data (gold standard). Two algorithms constructed from the International Classification of Disease (ICD-10) and Common Classification of Medical Procedures (CCAM), were applied to the HDD: a “predefined algorithm” according to coding guidelines and a “pragmatic algorithm” based on coding practices. Sensitivity, specificity and positive likelihood-ratios were calculated. False negatives and positives were analyzed to describe coding practices.

Results

Among 370 hospital stays included, 52 were classified as CEPSB cases. The “predefined algorithm” gave a sensitivity of 23.1% (95% CI: 11.6–34.5) and a specificity of 99.1% (95% CI: 98.0–100.0) to identify CEPSB. The “pragmatic algorithm” gave a sensitivity of 63.5%

(95% CI: 50.4–76.5) and a specificity of 94.7% (95% CI: 92.2–97.5) to identify CEPSB. Coding errors (77.6%) were due to misuse of diagnosis codes and because complications were not coded.

Conclusion

HDD is not reliable enough to detect CEPSB due to incorrect coding practices. However, it could be an ideal tool to monitor quality of care if a culture in data quality assessment is developed to improve quality of medical information.

Introduction

Ectopic pregnancies (EPs) account for approximately 2 to 3% of pregnancies each year [1–5]. Tubal rupture occurs in 22 to 34% of cases and often results in hemoperitoneum [2]. The Eighth Report of the Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths in the United Kingdom, covering the period from 2006 to 2008, estimated a fatality rate of 16.9 (95% CI 7.6–37.6) per 100 000 EPs [6]. Furthermore, a study from the United States estimated EP to be the most common cause of mortality during the first trimester of pregnancy [7]. Thus, complicated EPs with severe bleeding (CEPSB) are life-threatening situations and should be considered maternal near-miss cases. Reducing the incidence of complications of EP is a national public health goal in France as in other countries in the world [8–10].

Some studies have suggested an association between severe maternal morbidity in EP and substandard quality of care such as misdiagnosis, and diagnostic or therapeutic delays [6, 11]. Morbidity and complication events could be more sensitive criteria to evaluate quality of care than mortality [12]. We hypothesized that analysis of CEPSB might be a useful approach to audit medical practices and manage quality of care in gynecological units.

Women with EP represent an important part of the activity of gynecological emergency units and almost all women with CEPSB are hospitalized. In France, each hospital admission generates administrative and medical records in the French Medical Information System Program (MISP), or the “Programme de Médicalisation des Systèmes d’Information” (PMSI). This system was implemented in 1991 to measure medical activity and to finance health facilities in both private and public hospitals [13]. The hospital discharge database (HDD) is a standardized national database composed of discharge data from the MISP corresponding to hospital stays.

Routine data from HDD were utilized for multiple public health purposes. Various researchers have utilized HDD in epidemiology purposes, to measure disease incidence [14–16], rates of complications in healthcare settings [17] or to estimate severe maternal morbidity [18] of the second and third trimesters of pregnancy. However, few studies have measured morbidity of the first trimester of pregnancy from HDD [19]. Also, few studies highlight the role of medical routine data collection in the monitoring of quality of care [20].

The usefulness of routine data from HDD in different purposes such as epidemiological studies, quality of care, highlights of public health policies are based on diverse algorithms, constructed with the International Classification of Diseases and Health Related Problems (ICD) and/or the Common Classification of Medical Procedures (CCAM). Specific codes are available to describe the diagnosis and complications of CEPSB. The relevant question is whether the HDD could be used to detect CEPSB to manage clinical audits and quality of care.

The objective of this study was to propose a method to measure the validity of the hospital discharge database (HDD) to detect CEPSB among hospital stays in two gynecological units.

Materials and methods

Study population

The National Data Protection Authority (Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés) approved the study on October 23, 2015 (n° 1859704). All data were fully anonymized before we accessed them.

The unit of analysis was the hospital stay, integrated an episode of hospital admission in gynecological unit. All hospital stays of women between 18 and 45 years old, admitted in two tertiary teaching gynecological units for acute pelvic pain or/and vaginal bleeding in 2012, were included. Hospital stays in a clinical context of post-partum, post-surgery or post-abortion, less than six weeks of the event, and of women with a history of chronic pelvic pain or whose pregnancy was beyond 15 weeks of amenorrhea, were excluded. During the study period, some women were hospitalized twice either for two different medical events (i.e., one CEPSB and one ovarian cyst rupture) or for the same pathology (i.e., one pelvic infection treated by antibiotics and a second hospitalization for laparoscopy). We counted each hospitalization as a hospital stays.

For our population, we recorded the specific clinical situation that justified each hospital stay. In case of several hospitalizations for the same patient, the administrative data (i.e., date of hospitalization or duration of hospitalization) helped us select the right medical record.

Data sources

Hospital discharge database (HDD). For each hospital stay, both administrative (age, sex, and type of admission) and medical (pathology and medical procedures) data are recorded in the HDD. The pathologies diagnosed during the hospital stay are coded with the 10th edition of the ICD (ICD-10), according to the coding guidelines of medical activity, updated yearly by the Technical Agency for Information on Hospital Care [<https://www.atih.sante.fr>]. In the HDD, the main diagnosis retained is related to the health problem requiring the hospitalization and confirmed at the end of the hospital stay. Other diseases, complications or health risks that are diagnosed and treated during the hospital stay are recorded as associated diagnosis [21]. All procedures performed during the hospitalization are coded according to the French Common Classification of Medical Procedures (CCAM). The HDD data were coded at the end of the hospital stay by the senior gynecologist and controlled by a technician of the Medical Information Department.

Medical data. For each patient admitted or hospitalized in a health facility, a medical record is required. We collected “medical data” from the medical records of the women included in our study, and these data were considered as the gold standard. A CEPSB was defined as an EP (confirmed by histological analysis) and at least one of the following complications: (1) tubal rupture visualized by a tubal wall breach during the laparoscopy, (2) hemoperitoneum of 500cc or more measured by aspiration, (3) the presence of active bleeding. CEPSB cases were identified with clinical, biological and radiological criteria: a positive pregnancy test, uterine vacuity and/or an image of hematosalpinx, and/or pelvic effusion found by ultrasound. Laparoscopy was mandatory to confirm diagnosis.

All other medical situations (i.e., spontaneous abortion, ovarian cyst rupture, metrorrhagia of an intra-uterine pregnancy, uncomplicated EP) were considered as non-CEPSB cases.

The medical records were filed by the residents during the hospital stay. The medical data were collected by clinic research technicians in each hospital. The data management of the medical data was realized by one clinical researcher.

Data processing and statistical analysis

Identification of CEPSB from HDD. Two algorithms were built to extract hospital stays related to CEPSB from the Medical Information Department.

The first algorithm (Table 1), called the “predefined algorithm” was constructed *a priori* from the coding guidelines of the MISD. This algorithm was composed of the following items: 1) administrative information related to inclusion criteria (sex: female; age: between 18 and 45 years; hospital stay during the year 2012 in gynecological unit); 2) diagnosed pathologies based on specific ICD-10 codes (EP for the main diagnosis and pregnancy-associated complications for the associated diagnosis); 3) specific procedures related to the EP treatment using the CCAM thesaurus (Table 1).

Table 1. Items integrated into the algorithms used to identify hospital stays for complicated ectopic pregnancy with severe bleeding (CEPSB) in the HDD.

	Algorithm operations
Predefined algorithm	<p><u>Administrative data:</u> Sexe (female), Age (between 18 and 45 years of age), period of analysis (2012), unit (gynecology unit). AND <u>Diagnosis codes:</u> O00.1 (Tubal pregnancy) or O00.0 (Abdominal pregnancy) or O00.2 (Ovarian pregnancy) or O00.8 (Other ectopic pregnancy) or O00.9 (Ectopic pregnancy, unspecified). AND O08.1 (Delayed or excessive haemorrhage following abortion and ectopic and molar pregnancy) or K66.1 (Hemoperitoneum) or Z51.3 (Blood transfusion) or O08.3 (Shock following abortion and ectopic and molar pregnancy) or O08.6 (Damage to pelvic organs and tissues following abortion and ectopic and molar pregnancy). AND <u>Procedure codes:</u> JJFA001 (salpingectomy for ectopic pregnancy by laparotomy) or JJFC001 (salpingectomy for ectopic pregnancy by laparoscopy) or JQGA001 extraction of an abdominal ectopic pregnancy >13 week of amenorrhoea by laparotomy) or JJPC001 (salpingotomy + aspiration for ectopic pregnancy by laparoscopy) or JJPA001 (salpingotomy + aspiration for ectopic pregnancy by laparotomy).</p>
Pragmatic algorithm	<p><u>Administrative data:</u> Sexe (female), Age (between 18 and 45 years of age), period of analysis (2012), unit (gynecology unit). AND <u>Diagnosis codes:</u> O00.1 (Tubal pregnancy) or O00.8 (Other ectopic pregnancy) or O00.9 (Ectopic pregnancy, unspecified) or O08.1 (Delayed or excessive haemorrhage following abortion and ectopic and molar pregnancy) or O08.3 (Shock following abortion and ectopic and molar pregnancy). AND <u>Procedure codes:</u> JJFA001 (salpingectomy for ectopic pregnancy by laparotomy) or JJFC001 (salpingectomy for ectopic pregnancy by laparoscopy) or JJPC001 (salpingotomy + aspiration for ectopic pregnancy by laparoscopy) or JJJC002 (tubal expression for tubo-abdominal evacuation of ectopic pregnancy by laparoscopy) or FELF001 (transfusion of packed red blood cells, of a volume superior of a half blood mass, under general or local-regional anaesthesia) or FELF004 (transfusion of packed red blood cells, of a volume superior of a half blood mass, by adult).</p>

EP, ectopic pregnancy; HDD, hospital discharge database

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217674.t001>

After this first data extraction, the association between the ICD-10 or CCAM codes and the data from hospital stays classified as CEPSB in the HDD was used to define the second algorithm. This “pragmatic algorithm” was constructed from codes with statistically significant associations and a positive likelihood-ratio > 4 (Table 1).

The pragmatic algorithm (Table 1) was composed of two items: 1) the diagnosed pathology, either the main or associated diagnosis with specific ICD-10 codes for EP; 2) EP-related procedures coded using the CCAM thesaurus.

Measure of the validity of the HDD to detect CEPSB. The validity of the HDD was measured by sensitivity, specificity and positive likelihood ratio values between the HDD and the medical data of each gynecological unit. Each hospital stay was considered as a specific clinical situation and was independently analyzed. The two algorithms were successively used to estimate the validity of the HDD.

True positives were defined as CEPSB cases that were accurately identified in the HDD with the algorithm. False positives were defined as non-CEPSB cases that were wrongly recorded as CEPSB in the HDD. False negatives were defined as CEPSB cases that were not recorded in the HDD as CEPSB. True negatives were all hospital stays for which CEPSB cases were listed neither in the patient’s record nor in the HDD.

The sensitivity was the probability of the HDD to correctly identify a CEPSB case. The specificity was the probability for the HDD to correctly identify a hospital stay for a non-CEPSB case. The positive likelihood-ratio was the odds ratio of the HDD to correctly identify a CEPSB case divided by (1- specificity).

We analyzed the false negative and the false positive cases according to the coding guidelines of medical activity to identify and classify coding errors.

The validity of each hospital’s HDD to identify CEPSB cases, measured by successively applying the predefined and pragmatic algorithms, were compared.

Confidence intervals were determined using an alpha risk of 5%. The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 22 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) software.

Results

A total of 385 hospital stays of patient, aged between 18 and 45 years old hospitalized for acute pelvic pain or/and metrorrhagia in 2012 were considered for inclusion. Fifteen of these (3.9%) had no medical records: nine from center A and six from center B and were excluded from analysis.

Of the remaining 370 hospital stays, 52 were defined by the medical data as CEPSB cases (28 in center A and 24 in center B) and 318 as non-CEPSB cases (Table 2).

The predefined algorithm applied to the HDD classified 12 stays as true positive cases of CEPSB, three as false positives, 40 as false negatives, and 315 as true negatives (Table 3).

The pragmatic algorithm applied to the HDD classified 33 stays as true positive cases of CEPSB, 19 as false negatives, 17 as false positives, and 301 as true negatives (Table 3).

Table 2. Characteristics of hospital stays of patient aged between 18 and 45 years old hospitalized for acute pelvic pain or/and vaginal bleeding in two gynecological units in 2012 (N = 370).

Characteristics of hospital stays	Center A	Center B	Total
Total, n (%):	230 (62.2)	140 (37.8)	370 (100.0)
For CEPSB cases, n (%)	28 (11.7)	24 (16.4)	52 (13.5)
For non-CEPSB cases, n (%)	202 (84.5)	116 (79.5)	318 (82.6)
Mean duration (days \pm 1 SD)	2.11 (\pm 1.7)	2.39 (\pm 1.6)	2.21 (\pm 1.7)
Mean age (years \pm 1SD)	32.6 (\pm 6.1)	31.0 (\pm 7.3)	32.0 (\pm 6.6)

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217674.t002>

Table 3. Validity of HDD to detect complicated ectopic pregnancies with severe bleeding (CEPSB) in two gynecological units in 2012 (N = 370).

	Positive tests, n	Sensitivity% [IC 95%]	Specificity% [IC 95%]	LR(+)[IC 95%]	False positives, n	False negatives, n
Predefined algorithm	15	23.1[11.6–34.5]	99.1[98.0–100.0]	24.5[7.2–83.8]	3	40
Pragmatic algorithm	50	63.5[50.4–76.5]	94.7[92.2–97.5]	11.9[7.2–19.7]	17	19

HDD, hospital discharge database; LR, likelihood ratio.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217674.t003>

The hospital stays classified as false positives and false negatives were due to coding errors as shown in Table 4. Coding errors were related to the misuse of ICD-10 codes in 77.6% of cases, to the misuse of CCAM codes in 14.3% of cases and to administrative errors in 4.1% of cases. A misuse of ICD-10 could be for example: a complication such as "hemoperitoneum of more than 500cc" reported in the medical record that was not coded in the HDD with the specific ICD-10 code. The misuse of a CCAM code could be for example: the use of a nonspecific CCAM code "JJFC006" (total salpingectomy by laparoscopy) instead of the specific code for EP procedure "JJFC001" (total or partial salpingectomy for EP by laparoscopy). One hospital stay was not coded at all and one hospital stay for delivery was coded as a CEPSB.

The sensitivity of the HDD to detect hospital stays for CEPSB after applying the predefined algorithm was statistically different between the two hospitals (sensitivity in center A: 35.7%, in center B: 8.3%, $p = 0.02$) but not the specificity (specificity in center A: 98.5%, in center B: 100%, $p = 0.56$). The sensitivity and specificity of the HDD to detect CEPSB by applying the pragmatic algorithm were not statistically different between the two hospitals (sensitivity in center A: 71.4%, in center B: 54.2%, $p = 0.20$; specificity in center A: 95.0%, in center B: 94.0%, $p = 0.68$).

Discussion

Main findings

The principal finding of our study is that the HDD has a poor performance to detect cases of CEPSB. Our method, which involved the successive application of two algorithms, improved

Table 4. Description of coding errors in HDD for the 43 hospital stays classified as false positives (FP) and false negatives (FN).

Coding Errors		Total	Center A	Center B	P value*
Hospital stays classified FN (n)		46	21	25	
Hospital stays classified FP (n)		3	3	0	
1 coding error for the stay (n, %)		37	18 (48.6)	19 (51.4)	0.95
2 coding errors for the stay (n, %)		6	3 (50.0)	3 (50.0)	0.95
Types of coding errors					
False negatives	Incorrect code for principal diagnosis	3	2	1	0.61
	Absence of code for associated diagnosis	19	8	11	0.43
	Absence of code for complication	11	4	7	0.34
	Incorrect code for complication	2	1	1	1.00
	Absence of code for EP specific procedure	7	5	2	0.24
	Errors for administrative data	2	0	2	0.16
	Uncoded stays	1	1	0	1.00
	Use of ICD code for delivery	1	1	0	0.48
FP	Diagnosis codes used in excess	3	3	0	0.11

HDD, hospital discharge database; FN, false negative; FP, false positive

* Chi2 test or Fisher exact test.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0217674.t004>

detection performance. Most of the errors in the two tertiary teaching gynecological units were due to incorrect coding practices, despite the presence of specific codes in ICD-10 and surgery procedures for CEPSPB.

Strengths and limitations

We present a pragmatic method to improve detection of CEPSPB with a view to evaluating quality of care. Our research took into account both coding guidelines and observed coding practices to build two algorithms applied successively as mentioned above. The first algorithm measured the gap between data from the HDD and the medical records, while the second improved the capability of the HDD to detect CEPSPB. Our results justify the use of a rational approach, evaluating the inclusion or not of diagnosis and procedures according to coding guidelines on the one hand, and according to coding practices on the other.

Similarly to our study, other studies have found that the validity of an HDD varies according to the construction of the algorithm [22] and the pathology of interest [15]. For instance, a study on the detection of breast cancer found that the inclusion of procedure codes into the algorithm improved the specificity of HDD [23]. Other studies have used several algorithms to determine the reliability and the accuracy of the HDD, but without explaining how the algorithms were built [23, 24]. Our approach, which uses coding guidelines and miscoding based on the health providers' coding practices, would appear to be relevant.

Our study optimized the validity of HDD in detecting CEPSPB among our population by applying a pragmatic algorithm. The main difference between the predefined and pragmatic algorithm is the absence of a second mandatory ICD-10 code. This could increase false negatives and fail to identify complications of EP. Furthermore, the algorithms are likely to work accurately if the coding errors were eliminated. This is a critical situation since the performance of HDD depends on coding practices, medical quality data in hospitals [25, 26, 27], or recording data practices [13]. The improved validity of HDD using the pragmatic algorithm must be confirmed with another population at a regional and national level, taking into account different types of gynecological emergencies. Nevertheless, this is the first study to examine the performance of HDD to detect CEPSPB with a view to evaluating quality of care [18, 22].

Interpretation

The difficulty in detecting complicated medical situations with routinely collected HDD data throws into question its utilization as a database to identify near-miss cases to evaluate quality of care. Other studies have also assessed the use of complication codes in HDD. To evaluate the accuracy of diagnosis-type indicators for flagging complications, Quan *et al.* [17] attempted to select hospital stays based on complications to perform a clinical audit. They reported poor validity for some complications from HDDs for 1996 and 1997. In 1994, Hartz *et al.* [9] studied complications of coronary artery bypass surgery and data sources, and concluded that assessing quality of care using an HDD might be difficult. Our study comes to the same conclusion 20 years later: EP complications were under-coded and were unable to select hospital stays of interest. Although the healthcare providers' understanding of HDD quality has improved over the last 10 years, coding practices of medical complications remains to be improved.

An analysis of coding errors may provide an understanding of miscoding practices and the reasons for misreporting medical information. As previously specified [18], data quality depends on medical information collected (diagnosis, procedures) and administrative data. In our study, coding errors were mainly due to the misuse of ICD-10 codes. Lombraile *et al* [28]

discussed the lack of reliability of HDD in the use of uncertain diagnosis codes. Clinical difficulties in establishing an accurate diagnosis could explain the misuse of ICD-10 codes. Nevertheless, the diagnosis of CEPSB is confirmed by a surgical procedure that determines the final diagnosis during the hospital stay. Some coding errors could also be due to the use of two classifications, one for the diagnosis and one for the procedure. Other errors are due to the shortening or lengthening wording as previously described [29, 30].

In a study of the validity of severe maternal morbidity in HDD, Chantry *et al.* [18] reported that false positives are mainly due to the excessive use of diagnosis codes. They observed that some professionals used ICD-10 to describe a more severe medical situation than the real one. Furthermore, false negatives were mainly due to the use of non-specific procedure codes. Our study gave similar results though the proportion of coding errors was higher than in Chantry *et al.*'s study and the false negatives were due to inaccurate use of ICD-10 and procedure codes.

Chantry *et al.* [15] describe a link between the organization of medical information production and data quality in HDD. Computerization of medical data and information control in a simultaneous intermediary step were associated with an improvement in data quality. The authors show that various organizations of medical information production create differences in sensitivity and specificity of HDD in four hospitals. In our study, a significant difference was also observed between the performances of the two hospitals HDD, which could be explained by their organization.

This study is a first step for a possible program of clinical audit of pregnancy loss, such as EP, among gynecological units, since CEPSB is associated with substandard cares. Our study highlights that further improvements in coding practices need to be implemented. The implementation of a specific thesaurus with ICD-10 and procedure codes from the CCAM could help clinicians to standardize medical information collection, even if rare and severe medical situations could still be difficult to track [18, 26]. Improving the quality of HDD requires data quality assessment, including coding procedures for various clinical cases and staff training [18, 22, 29, 31, 32]. These different actions necessitate dedicated human resources [29] to ensure accurate routine care data.

These results reinforce the need for high standards in quality health data collection to be able to use HDDs for public health purposes [31].

Conclusion

This validity study of HDDs to detect CEPSB highlights that HDD cannot currently be relied on to detect such cases. Nevertheless, the use of HDD could be a useful tool to identify near-miss cases and manage quality of care in gynecologic emergency units and services. The HDD approach to identify hospital stays for clinical audit should be adapted to take into account coding practices and data collection organization. Reliability of medical data must be improved with culture in medical information and data quality assessment among health care providers and health care systems.

Supporting information

S1 Data set.
(XLSX)

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Woman's Health Research Institute (France) for conducting the research.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: Marion Fermaut, Aurélie Brossard, Xavier Fritel.

Data curation: Aurélie Brossard, Jimmy Razafimamonjy.

Formal analysis: Marion Fermaut.

Investigation: Marion Fermaut.

Methodology: Marion Fermaut, Aurélie Brossard, Xavier Fritel.

Project administration: Arnaud Fauconnier.

Supervision: Arnaud Fauconnier, Annie Serfaty.

Validation: Arnaud Fauconnier, Xavier Fritel.

Writing – original draft: Marion Fermaut.

Writing – review & editing: Arnaud Fauconnier, Annie Serfaty.

References

1. Coste J, Bouyer J, Ughetto S, Gerbaud L, Fernandez H, Pouly JL, et al. Ectopic pregnancy is again on the increase. Recent trends in the incidence of ectopic pregnancies in France (1992–2002). *Human reproduction*. 2004 Sep; 19(9):2014–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deh399> PMID: 15256504
2. Bouyer J. [Epidemiology of ectopic pregnancy: incidence, risk factors and outcomes]. *Journal de gynécologie, obstétrique et biologie de la reproduction*. 2003 Nov; 32(7 Suppl):S8–17. PMID: 14699315
3. Wedderburn CJ, Warner P, Graham B, Duncan WC, Critchley HO, Horne AW. Economic evaluation of diagnosing and excluding ectopic pregnancy. *Human reproduction*. 2010 Feb; 25(2):328–33. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dep397> PMID: 19933287
4. Mavrelou D, Nicks H, Jamil A, Hoo W, Jauniaux E, Jurkovic D. Efficacy and safety of a clinical protocol for expectant management of selected women diagnosed with a tubal ectopic pregnancy. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. Jul; 42(1):102–7.
5. Kirk E, Papageorghiou AT, Condous G, Tan L, Bora S, Bourne T. The diagnostic effectiveness of an initial transvaginal scan in detecting ectopic pregnancy. *Hum Reprod*. 2007 Nov; 22(11):2824–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/dem283> PMID: 17855406
6. Cantwell R, Clutton-Brock T, Cooper G, Dawson A, Drife J, Garrod D, et al. Saving Mothers' Lives: Reviewing maternal deaths to make motherhood safer: 2006–2008. The Eighth Report of the Confidential Enquiries into Maternal Deaths in the United Kingdom. *BJOG: an international journal of obstetrics and gynaecology*. 2011 Mar; 118 Suppl 1:1–203.
7. Grimes DA. Estimation of pregnancy-related mortality risk by pregnancy outcome, United States, 1991 to 1999. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2006 Jan; 194(1):92–4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2005.06.070> PMID: 16389015
8. Ministry of Health. Loi n° 2004–806 du 9 août 2004 relative à la politique de santé publique. *Journal Officiel de la République française*. 2004;n° 185 du 11 août 2004:14277.
9. Diagnosis and Management of Ectopic Pregnancy: Green-top Guideline No. 21. *BJOG*. 2016 Dec; 123(13):e15–e55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14189> PMID: 27813249
10. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 193: Tubal Ectopic Pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2018 Mar; 131(3):e91–e103. <https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000002560> PMID: 29470343
11. van Mello NM, Zietse CS, Mol F, Zwart JJ, van Roosmalen J, Bloemenkamp KW, et al. Severe maternal morbidity in ectopic pregnancy is not associated with maternal factors but may be associated with quality of care. *Fertility and sterility*. 2012 Mar; 97(3):623–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fertnstert.2011.12.021> PMID: 22264999
12. Hartz AJ, Kuhn EM. Comparing hospitals that perform coronary artery bypass surgery: the effect of outcome measures and data sources. *American journal of public health*. 1994 Oct; 84(10):1609–14. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.84.10.1609> PMID: 7943479
13. Ministry of Health. Loi n°91–748 du 31 juillet 1991 portant réforme hospitalière *Journal Officiel de la République française*. 1991;n°179 du 2 août 1991.

14. Couris CM, Foret-Dodelin C, Rabilloud M, Colin C, Bobin JY, Dargent D, et al. [Sensitivity and specificity of two methods used to identify incident breast cancer in specialized units using claims databases]. *Revue d'épidémiologie et de sante publique*. 2004 Apr; 52(2):151–60. PMID: [15138394](#)
15. Haesebaert J, Termoz A, Polazzi S, Mouchoux C, Mechtouff L, Derox L, et al. Can hospital discharge databases be used to follow ischemic stroke incidence? *Stroke; a journal of cerebral circulation*. 2013 Jul; 44(7):1770–4.
16. Serfaty A, Baron S, Crenn-Hebert C, Barry Y, Tala S. [Perinatal health and medical administrative data: What uses, which stakeholders, what the issues for birth data?—Special REDSIAM]. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique*. 2017 Oct; 65 Suppl 4:S209–S19.
17. Quan H, Parsons GA, Ghali WA. Assessing accuracy of diagnosis-type indicators for flagging complications in administrative data. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2004 Apr; 57(4):366–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2003.01.002> PMID: [15135837](#)
18. Chantry AA, Deneux-Tharoux C, Cans C, Ego A, Quantin C, Bouvier-Colle MH, et al. Hospital discharge data can be used for monitoring procedures and intensive care related to severe maternal morbidity. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2011 Sep; 64(9):1014–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.11.015> PMID: [21330103](#)
19. Allanson ER, Tuncalp, Gardosi J, Pattinson RC, Francis A, Vogel JP, et al. Optimising the International Classification of Diseases to identify the maternal condition in the case of perinatal death. *BJOG*. Nov; 123(12):2037–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0528.14246> PMID: [27527550](#)
20. Bhattacharya AA, Umar N, Audu A, Felix H, Allen E, Schellenberg JRM, et al. Quality of routine facility data for monitoring priority maternal and newborn indicators in DHIS2: A case study from Gombe State, Nigeria. *PLoS One*. 2019 Jan 25; 14(1):e0211265. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211265> PMID: [30682130](#)
21. Ministry of Health. Guide Méthodologique de Production des Informations relatives à l'activité Médicale et à sa facturation. Bulletin Officiel 2012, N°2012/6bis p. 126.
22. Lambert L, Blais C, Hamel D, Brown K, Rinfret S, Cartier R, et al. Evaluation of care and surveillance of cardiovascular disease: can we trust medico-administrative hospital data? *The Canadian journal of cardiology*. 2012 Mar-Apr; 28(2):162–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cjca.2011.10.005> PMID: [22230034](#)
23. Couris CM, Polazzi S, Olive F, Remontet L, Bossard N, Gomez F, et al. Breast cancer incidence using administrative data: correction with sensitivity and specificity. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2009 Jun; 62(6):660–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2008.07.013> PMID: [19070463](#)
24. Baldi I, Vicari P, Di Cuonzo D, Zanetti R, Pagano E, Rosato R, et al. A high positive predictive value algorithm using hospital administrative data identified incident cancer cases. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2008 Apr; 61(4):373–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.05.017> PMID: [18313562](#)
25. Chantry AA, Deneux-Tharoux C, Bal G, Zeitlin J, Quantin C, Bouvier-Colle MH, et al. [French hospital discharge database: data production, validity, and origins of errors in the field of severe maternal morbidity]. *Revue d'épidémiologie et de sante publique*. 2012 Jun; 60(3):177–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respe.2011.11.003> PMID: [22576180](#)
26. Misset B, Nakache D, Vesin A, Darmon M, Garrouste-Orgeas M, Mourvillier B, et al. Reliability of diagnostic coding in intensive care patients. *Critical care*. 2008; 12(4):R95. <https://doi.org/10.1186/cc6969> PMID: [18664267](#)
27. Iezzoni LI. Assessing quality using administrative data. *Annals of internal medicine*. 1997 Oct 15; 127(8 Pt 2):666–74.
28. Lombrail P, Minvielle E, Comar L, Gottot S. [Prospective Payment Information Systems and epidemiology: a difficult link to establish]. *Revue d'épidémiologie et de sante publique*. 1994; 42(4):334–44. PMID: [8085050](#)
29. Dussaucy A, Viel JF, Mulin B, Euvrard J. [The framework Prospective Payment Information Systems: bias, sources of errors and consequences]. *Revue d'épidémiologie et de sante publique*. 1994; 42(4):345–58. PMID: [8085051](#)
30. Yasmeen S, Romano PS, Schembri ME, Keyzer JM, Gilbert WM. Accuracy of obstetric diagnoses and procedures in hospital discharge data. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 2006 Apr; 194(4):992–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2005.08.058> PMID: [16580288](#)
31. Serfaty A, Gold F, Benifla JL, Breart G. From knowledge to planning considerations: a matrix to assess health needs for the perinatal network in eastern Paris. *European journal of public health*. 2011 Aug; 21(4):504–11 <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckq101> PMID: [20675714](#)
32. Serfaty A. Stillbirth in France. *Lancet*. 2014 Nov 8; 384(9955):1672.