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4. **Rationale:**

Hospital discharge diagnosis codes are an increasingly common data source for epidemiological, health services and outcomes research. Administrative data is of particular importance for studies of cerebrovascular disease, for which timely, nationally representative incidence data are unavailable. Administrative data may also be used to understand patterns in stroke rehospitalization. However, the validity of International Classification of Disease (ICD) discharge codes for cerebrovascular disease diagnosis varies widely across populations and geographic regions. Published evidence for the modification of ICD coding accuracy by stroke subtype, hospital type, and sex is inconsistent. The validity of coding stratified by race/ethnicity has not been assessed and it is unclear whether coding accuracy is different for incident compared to recurrent strokes. With over one thousand validated stroke events accrued over 25 years of follow-up, the ARIC cohort study is well placed to assess variations in hospital discharge code validity for incident and recurrent strokes. With ARIC data it will be possible to explore modification of coding accuracy by ethnicity, gender, geographic region and over time.


5. **Main Hypothesis/Study Questions:**

The goal of the proposed study is to describe the validity of hospital discharge codes for subtype (ischemic vs. hemorrhagic) of stroke events in the ARIC cohort. Secondly, we plan to assess whether race/ethnicity, gender, time, hospital type (teaching vs. non-teaching) or geographic location modify the accuracy of hospital discharge coding. An additional secondary aim is to explore the validity of composite sets of discharge codes that have clinical relevance to community practice.

6. **Design and analysis (study design, inclusion/exclusion, outcome and other variables of interest with specific reference to the time of their collection, summary of data analysis, and any anticipated methodologic limitations or challenges if present).**

Study Design: We will compare the final stroke diagnostic classification from ARIC review with hospital discharge codes (ICD-9-CM) applying standard metrics of validity including positive predictive value and sensitivity. ARIC classification will be used as gold standard. Stratification of analyses will include stroke subtype,
race/ethnicity, gender, hospital type and geographic location. We will also explore validity of discharge code for incident compared to recurrent events and trends in validity of discharge codes over time.

Inclusion: Cohort event occurring from 1987 through 2010.

Exclusion:

Variables of interest: ARIC stroke diagnosis, ICD-9-CM discharge codes. Other variables: date of stroke, type of hospital (teaching vs. non-teaching), gender, race/ethnicity, and study center.

Limitations: small number of stroke hemorrhagic events may limit our ability to precisely quantify the accuracy of some ICD-9-CM codes. Geographic analysis is limited to the four ARIC communities from which the cohort was drawn.
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