Challenges of missing specific disease codes – Estimating incidence and prevalence of primary EPH52 immunoglobulin A nephropathy (IgAN) using health insurance claims data

Timotheus Stremel¹, Matthias Roll², Dr. Amadeus Gladbach², Isabella Selinger², Dr. Thomas Hardt², Helena Himmelhaus¹, Dr. Christian Jacob¹, Julia Theil¹, Prof. Dr. med. Jürgen Floege³ ¹Xcenda GmbH, part of Cencora Inc., Hannover, Germany; ²CSL Vifor, Munich, Germany; ³Universitätsklinikum Aachen, Aachen, Germany

Background

- Claims data from Statutory Health Insurers (SHI) are a valuable resource: they provide extensive and diverse information on patient demographics, diagnoses, treatments and healthcare utilization, making them indispensable for public health research. Hence, they are commonly used to estimate disease epidemiology.
- Accurate diseases identification in claims data relies on the use of diagnostic, pharmaceutical and procedural codes, which are standardized to ensure consistency and reliability in documenting patient health information.
- However, coding practices can be inconsistent and specific diagnosis codes are not always available in health insurance datasets. As a result, physicians may rely on alternative or related codes which pose a challenge for the estimation of accurate epidemiological measures as it can lead to under- or overestimation.
- German SHI datasets include the ICD-10-GM catalogue. However, the catalogue is not always sufficiently detailed when it comes to coding rare disease or the severity of diseases. Consequently, identifying rare medical conditions such as immunoglobulin A nephropathy (IgAN) is challenging.
- IgAN, a rare kidney disease characterized by persistent hematuria, proteinuria, and arterial hypertension, has an unpredictable progression – ranging from mild, long-term symptoms to rapid kidney failure, ultimately leading to terminal renal disease.^{1,2}

Objectives

• This study presents an approach how to overcome these challenges to generate epidemiological data for IgAN in Germany.

Results (Continued)



Figure 3: Mean age (in years) in 2022

Figure 4: Distribution of age groups in 2022



Methods

Study design

- A large German claims database was used to estimate the 2022 incidence and prevalence of IgAN using two coding algorithms.
- A subset of the Institute for Applied Health Research Berlin (InGef) database, the InGef research database, was used for the analysis.
- The overall database contains anonymized claims data from over 50 health insurance funds, covering around 9 million people.
- The research subset of around 4 million people represents ~ 5% of the German population and ~ 6% of the SHI population as of 2022.
- It accurately reflects the age, gender, geographic representation, morbidity, mortality and drug use of the German population.

Study population

- The described study population was identified in a period from 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2022.
- Two coding algorithms were defined as lower bound (LB) and upper bound (UB), which can be considered as ranges (see Figure 1).
- The LB included specific ICD-10-GM codes (N00.3, N02.3, N06.3) used to confirm IgAN via biopsy.
- In contrast, the UB expanded to codes potentially used to record IgAN or related symptoms identified in a market research study preceding this work (N00.3, N02.3, N02.5, N02.7, N02.8, N02.9, N06.3, N06.8).
- Patients with codes for diseases different from IgAN and comorbidities of secondary IgAN were excluded.
- Incident patients required a documented kidney biopsy around the time of diagnosis.

Figure 1: Patient selection and respective patient counts

Individuals continuously observable in the InGef research database between 01.01.2020 to 31.12.2022

Diagnostic codes

Prevalence

- More than 90% of cases identified in both the LB and UB received their IgAN codes during outpatient care (see Figure 5).
- In the UB, a high proportion of codes were nonspecific, with N02.8 and N02.9 accounting for 38% and 49% of cases, respectively. Of the three codes included in the LB, code N02.3 was the most frequently used (78%) (see Figure 6).

Incidence

- In the UB, around 74% (39%+35%) of cases received inpatient codes, and 48% received outpatient codes.
- The most frequently used ICD-10-GM codes in the UB were N02.8 (61%) and N02.3 (30%) and the only used ICD-10-GM codes in the LB was N02.3.

Figure 5: Distribution of documented diagnostic codes for prevalent and incident IgAN patients in 2022 by healthcare setting





between 01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022.

	Incide	Incidence Prevalence				
	LB: n=300	UB: n=2,386	LB: n=300	UB: n=2,386		
0 0000	Patients without ICD- (inpatient and/or of in the pre-observation per from 01.01.2020	10-GM code for IgAN outpatient sector) iod of two years spanning) to 31.12.2021.				
	Incidence					
	LB: n=33	UB: n=467				
Patients without exclusion ICD-10-GM code for diseases different from IgAN in the inpatient sector between 01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022.						
,	Incidence		Prevalence			
	LB: n=30	UB: n=450	LB: n=282	UB: n=2,302		
ľ		7		7		
0 0 ¹ 0.0	Patients without exclusion ICD-10-GM code for comorbidities of secondary IgAN in the inpatient sector and/c outpatient sector between 01.01.2022 to 31.12.2022.					
)	Incidence		Prevalence			
	LB: n=14	UB: n=241	LB: n=173	UB: n=1,379		
,						
	Patients who underwent	kianey biopsy within the				

primary Dx	secondary Dx	Dx	primary Dx	secondary Dx	Dx
	∭LB ■UB			LB UB	

*Due to data protection regulations patients counts ≤4 and corresponding percentages cannot be reported.

Figure 6: Distribution of documented diagnostic codes for prevalent and incident IgAN patients in 2022 by 4-digit ICD-10-GM code



*Due to data protection regulations patients counts ≤4 and corresponding percentages cannot be reported.

Conclusions

- Estimating a range of incidence and prevalence helps address the challenges posed by missing specific diagnostic codes and variability in coding practices.
- While the demographic profile of patients identified via the LB algorithm may align with existing literature, the prevalence estimates are lower than expected. Conversely, the prevalence estimates from existing literature align more closely with the patient counts identified using the UB algorithm, although the demographic profile of these patients does not match existing literature.^{3,4} Neither of the current approaches provides a fully accurate picture, and the true values likely lie somewhere in between.

Step

tep

S

tep

S	prior to the index quarter up to three quarters after the index quarter.					
	Incidence					
	LB:	UB:				
	n=7	n=23				

timeframe of four quarters

Results

Patient population

Prevalence

- Per 100,000 individuals in Germany, the study identified a prevalent population of IgAN-patients ranging from 4.8 (LB) to 38.2 (UB).
- Approximately 73% of the LB were male (see Figure 2), with an average age of 53 years (see Figure 3).
- In the UB, around 57% were male and average age was 59 years.
- In the age distribution of the LB, the largest group consists of individuals aged 50-59 years (see Figure 4).
- The age distribution in the UB does not reveal any particularly large group. The three largest age groups, which are about the same size, are people aged 50-59, 60-69 and 70-79, each with about 20% (see Figure 4).
 Incidence
- Incidence rates in 2022 varied from 0.2 to 0.6 per 100,000 individuals.
- About 86% (LB) and 83% (UB) were male and mean age was 36 (LB) and 44 (UB) years.

- More precise coding would significantly enhance the accuracy of epidemiological studies and assist physicians in making informed treatment decisions.
- Raising awareness and educating physicians about IgAN is crucial to ensuring accurate diagnosis and coding. Future efforts should focus on developing specific diagnostic codes, which would reduce uncertainty improve patient euteemes, and provide more reliable epidemiological data.

uncertainty, improve patient outcomes, and provide more reliable epidemiological data.

References

¹Kwon CS, Daniele P, Forsythe A, Ngai C. A Systematic Literature Review of the Epidemiology, Health-Related Quality of Life Impact, and Economic Burden of Immunoglobulin A Nephropathy. Journal of health economics and outcomes research. 2021;8(2):36-45.

²Wyatt RJ, Julian BA. IgA nephropathy. The New England journal of medicine. 2013;368(25):2402-14.

³Willey CJ, Coppo R, Schaefer F, Mizerska-Wasiak M, Mathur M, Schultz MJ. The incidence and prevalence of IgA nephropathy in Europe. Nephrology, dialysis, transplantation : official publication of the European Dialysis and Transplant Association - European Renal Association. 2023;38(10):2340-9.

⁴Pitcher D, Braddon F, Hendry B, Mercer A, Osmaston K, Saleem MA, et al. Long-Term Outcomes in IgA Nephropathy. Clinical journal of the American Society of Nephrology : CJASN. 2023;18(6):727-38.

Disclosures

This study was funded by CSL Vifor. Jürgen Floege received consulting fees from CSL Vifor. Matthias Roll, Amadeus Gladbach, Isabella Selinger and Thomas Hardt are full-time employees of CSL Vifor. Helena Himmelhaus, Christian Jacob, Timotheus Stremel and Julia Theil are a full-time employees of Xcenda GmbH, part of Cencora Inc., acting as contractors of CSL Vifor for the execution of this study.

Acknowledgement

The data analysis was performed in cooperation with Wolfgang Greiner and the Institute for Applied Health Research Berlin (InGef).