

# **Implementation Report: Representing Codes in CDA**

Grahame Grieve

Health Intersections

# Representing Codes in CDA

- Work is based on current CDA implementation experience
- Based on document “Representing Coding in CDA Documents” issued by NEHTA
  - Practical advice with regard to coding
  - Developed in collaboration with GP Desktop vendor panel
  - url:
- Note: This presentation describes how to use CDA with current coding practices
  - Current coding practices need improvement

# Codes in CDA

- Problems & Diagnoses
- Medicine Identification (& Immunizations)
- Allergies & Adverse Reactions
- Diagnostic Codes
  - Requests / Orders
  - Report & Atomic item Identification
  - Anatomical Locations
  - Observations & process information
- Procedures and Services
- Internal/Workflow/Structural Status codes
- Lots of minor classifications (Occupations, Clinical services, Institution types, Demographics)

# CD Data Type

- CD = “Concept” Descriptor
- Most difficult type in HL7 data types
- “Concept” is not the same as a code
- One Concept – one unit of clinical meaning
- Can have zero or more codes that represent the concept variably well

# CD Data Type

Group	Attributes	Meaning
<b>Code</b>	code : string codeSystem : string codeSystemVersion : string	Identifies the code system and code defined by it
<b>Display</b>	displayName : string	One defined display representation for the code
<b>Text</b>	originalText : ST (element)	Provides the text that the user said/typed/chose when picking the code or in place of the code
<b>Translations</b>	Translation (element)	Recursive reference to more of the same type.

# CD Data Type

```
<x nullFlavor=" [NF] "  
  code=" [code] " codeSystem=" [oid] "  
  displayName=" [display] " />  
<originalText> [text] </originalText>  
<translation nullFlavor=" [NF] "  
  code=" [code] " codeSystem=" [oid] "  
  displayName=" [display] " />  
</x>
```

# NullFlavor

code	name	definition
<b>NI</b>	No Information	The value is missing for some unknown reason Note that <code>&lt;x nullFlavor="NI"/&gt;</code> is exactly the same as not including <code>&lt;x&gt;</code> at all.
<b>UNK</b>	unknown	The value is not known.
<b>ASKU</b>	asked but unknown	Information was sought but not found (e.g., patient was asked but didn't know)
<b>NAV</b>	temporarily unavailable	Information is not available at this time but it is expected that it will be available later.
<b>NASK</b>	not asked	This information has not been sought (e.g., patient was not asked)
<b>OTH</b>	Other	The concept is known, but it's not a valid code

# Overlapping codes & nullflavor

Code	displayName
1	Aboriginal but not Torres Strait Islander origin
2	Torres Strait Islander but not Aboriginal origin
3	Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin
4	Neither Aboriginal nor Torres Strait Islander origin
9	Not stated/inadequately described

Rule of thumb: use the code



# Code System

- Code system – definitional framework that defines the meaning of the codes
- Identified by OID or UUID (GUID)  
2.16.840.1.113883.6.96  
441D40AF-0A07-426C-96AA-00E9D4C4A713
- Code systems must be registered with the HL7 OID registry
- Codes must never have more than one meaning in the space of the identified code system
- If the definition of the code system is known, the code can be used for logic
- Code systems can have versions – should be filled out when possible

# OIDs for common systems

Coding System	OID	Notes
<b>SNOMED CT</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	Includes SNOMED CT-AU
<b>AMT</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.96	codeSystemVersion =
<b>Loinc</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.1	
<b>ICD-10</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.3	
<b>ICD-10-AM</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.135	
<b>MIMS</b>	1.2.36.1.2001.1005.11.1	(MIMS Integrated Data Solution)
<b>ICPC 2+</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.6.140.1	
<b>DOCLE</b>	1.2.36.1.2001.1005.13	
<b>PBS Code</b>	1.2.36.1.2001.1005.22	
<b>PBS Manufacturer Code</b>	1.2.36.1.2001.1005.23	
<b>MBS Code</b>	1.2.36.1.2001.1005.21	
<b>HL7 table N</b>	2.16.840.1.113883.12.N	

# Code System Version

- Should provide a codeSystemVersion
  - All coding systems have to redefine codes (even LOINC)
- Value is that specified by code system
  - Except that code systems are very inconsistent about this
- Snomed-CT has a complicated syntax under preparation:  
“urn:” “ihtsdo” “:”
  - [ “&c=”<componentId | UUID> ]
  - [ “&m=”<moduleId> ]
  - [ “&v=”<effectiveTime> ]
- For example, 20110731 SNOMED CT International release  
urn:ihtsdo:m=900000000000207008&v=20110731
- and the 20110531 SNOMED CT-AU release  
urn:ihtsdo:m=32506021000036107&v=20110531

# displayName

- Used by systems that don't know the code system to display the code (if no originalText)

Code System	Source of displayName
<b>SNOMED CT-AU</b>	Preferred name in the Australian English Language reference set
<b>AMT</b>	Preferred Name (or, for v3, Preferred name in the Australian English Language reference set)
<b>HL7 code systems and v2 tables</b>	The Print name for the code
<b>ICD-10-AM</b>	Preferred Name
<b>ICPC2+</b>	The ICPC2+ term for the code
<b>MIMS</b>	The display term provided by MIMS

# Value Set

- Almost always, the choice of codes is limited to a set of pre-approved codes
- These are called “the value set”
- Usually a subset of one code system – can cover more
- Binding might be “With Exceptions” or “No exceptions”
  - “With exceptions” means that if the concept doesn’t match the defined codes, any other code can be supplied
- NEHTA specifying value sets from Snomed-CT and AMT
  - No one is actually using these in practice (much)

# Original Text

- Human processible representation of the concept
- The most correct representation of the concept  
“The text as seen and/or selected by the user who entered the data which represents the intended meaning of the user”
- Often the original text is just the defined description for the code (displayName)
- It can be hard to determine the originalText
- In CDA, the original text is what is used to represent the concept in that narrative

# Original Text

Scenario	Original Text
User picks a code from a list of codes, displayed as the codes themselves (usually this only works with small lists of well known terms, particularly where the codes are meaningful)	None
User picks a code from a list of codes, displayed as text	Display text
User typed some text which was processed in the background	Text user typed
User typed some text which started a code look up	The text description of the code they picked
User typed some text which was processed into a suggested list of codes, and then the user typed more text to further narrow the suggested list	The choice of “original text” becomes a little arbitrary; in the case where the original text stands as part of a report (see image below), the first original text applies.
User chose a code from a list and typed more text to clarify further	The display name for the code, with the clarifying text appended.

# Original Text

CLINICAL NOTES:¶

¶

Osteopaenia. · Prednisone. · ? · Vertebral body fracture. ¶

¶

FINDINGS:¶

¶

There is minor (estimated at about 15%) wedge appearance to one of the mid thoracic vertebral bodies, estimated at T6.

¶

No significant (20% or greater) vertebral body compression is seen. · No spondylolisthesis is evident. · The disc spaces and endplate appearances are unremarkable. ¶

¶

Thank you for referring this patient. · ¶

¶

19888007: Wedging of vertebra



# Original Text

Scenario	Original Text
User picks a code from a list of codes, displayed as the codes themselves (usually this only works with small lists of well known terms, particularly where the codes are meaningful)	None
User picks a code from a list of codes, displayed as text	Display text
User typed some text which was processed in the background	Text user typed
User typed some text which started a code look up	The text description of the code they picked
User typed some text which was processed into a suggested list of codes, and then the user typed more text to further narrow the suggested list	The choice of “original text” becomes a little arbitrary; in the case where the original text stands as part of a report (see image below), the first original text applies.
User chose a code from a list and typed more text to clarify further	The display name for the code, with the clarifying text appended.

# Original Text

Filter			
Filter Current List <input type="text" value="aneu"/>			
<div>Aneurysm;abdominal aortic Aneurysm;aortic Aneurysm;arterial Aneurysm;artery;cerebral Aneurysm;artery;coronary Aneurysm;cardiac Aneurysm;dissecting Aneurysm&gt;false Aneurysm;intrathoracic Aneurysm;leaking Aneurysm;mycotic Aneurysm;popliteal</div> <div>Aneurysm;ruptured Aneurysm;traumatic Clipping;aneurysm;intracranial Fracture;calcaneus Repair;aneurysm;abdom aortic Treat;fract/disloc;calcaneum</div>			
Problem	Extra Text	ICPC Code: K91 007	
<input type="text" value="Aneurysm;artery;cerebral"/>	<input type="text" value="minimum deficit"/>		
Problem Details for - Aneurysm;artery;cerebral - Minimum Deficit (Existing Problem)			
Onset Date <input type="text"/>	Accurate To: <input type="text"/>	Criticality	<input type="text" value="Not Set"/>
Comments and Management Plan			

# Translations

- Allow in place mappings between different code systems
- Translations are often not exact
- Allow for transition from one coding system to another
- No original text on translations
- No need for translations in CDA if root code comes from Snomed-CT, AMT, or LOINC.

# Expressions

## Snomed:

```
<value code="128045006:{363698007=56459004}"  
  codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.42">  
  <originalText>Cellulitis of the foot</originalText>  
</value>
```

## ICD-10:

```
<value code="J21.8 B95.6"  
  codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.260">  
  <originalText>Staph aureus bronchiolitis</originalText>  
</value>
```

- Requirement arises intrinsically
- All aspects of implementation are difficult
- Let's walk before we go high-diving

# Scenarios

Coded Text (No extensions) - code is known or not

Codeable Text (With extensions):

1. The Concept is not known at all
2. User picks code directly from the value set
3. User enters text
4. User picks a code provided by some other code system (e.g. MIMS, ICPC2+, ICD-10, DOCLE, etc).
5. User picks a code from another code system and then provides additional clarifying text
6. User chooses a code they have defined themselves
7. The CDA document is being prepared on an interface engine from a v2 CWE type, and it is not known which of processes #4 - #8 applied.

# Codes (No exceptions)

## Known:

```
<x code="01" codeSystem="1.2.36.1.2001.1001.101.104.16299"  
  displayName="None known"/>
```

```
<x code="01" codeSystem="1.2.36.1.2001.1001.101.104.16299"  
  displayName="None known">  
  <originalText>There are no known medications</originalText>  
</x>
```

---

## Unknown:

```
<x nullFlavor="UNK" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.3.879"/>
```

```
<x nullFlavor="UNK" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.3.879">  
  <originalText>Chinese Malay / Aboriginal</originalText>  
</x>
```

# The concept is unknown

Didn't even ask the patient:

```
<x nullFlavor="NASK"/>
```

Don't know why it's unknown:

```
<x nullFlavor="NI"/>
```

- Can't provide a nullFlavor and an originalText (that'd mean it wasn't unknown)

# User picks correct code directly

User picks Snomed-CT code from drop-down:

```
<x code="263063009" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.96"  
  displayName=" Fracture dislocation of joint">  
  <originalText>Fracture dislocation of joint</originalText>  
</x>
```

User picks from code list:

```
<x code="M" codeSystem="oid for gender"  
  displayName="Male"/>
```



# User enters Text

User enters text:

```
<x>  
  <originalText>Fracture/dislocation</originalText>  
</x>
```

Text is coded later (by a person or a machine):

```
<x>  
  <originalText>Fracture/dislocation</originalText>  
  <translation code="263063009" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.96"  
    displayName=" Fracture dislocation of joint"/>  
</x>
```

# User picks other code

## Code:

```
<x code="L76013" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.140.1"
  displayName="Fracture: other">
  <originalText>Fracture: other</originalText>
</x>
```

## Translated to Snomed-CT:

```
<x code="L76013" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.140.1"
  displayName="Fracture: other">
  <originalText>Fracture: other</originalText>
  <translation code="263063009" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.96"
    displayName=" Fracture dislocation of joint"/>
</x>
```

- Note: this case implies extra knowledge from elsewhere in order to provide a more specific Snomed-CT code.

# Special Case: MIMS

```
<code code="83510101" codeSystem="1.2.36.1.2001.1005.11.1"
  codeSystemName="MIMS Standard Code set" codeSystemVersion="20110900"
  displayName="Ganfort 0.3/5 Eye drops ...">
  <originalText><!--insert originalText here--></originalText>
  <translation code="78835011000036104" codeSystem="1.2.36.1.2001.1004.100"
    codeSystemName="Australian Medicines Terminology (AMT)"
    codeSystemVersion="2.25"
    displayName="GANFORT 0.03% / 0.5% eye drops: solution, 3 mL"/>
</code>
```

- Original Text is required (should be MIMS displayName)
- Original Text goes in the narrative
- Display and maintain the originalText

# User provides additional text

## Code:

```
<x code="K90001" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.140.1"
  displayName="Aneurysm;artery;cerebral">
  <originalText> Aneurysm;artery;cerebral - minimum deficit</originalText>
  <translation code="128608001" codeSystem="2.16.840.1.113883.6.96"
    displayName="Cerebral arterial aneurysm"/>
</x>
```

- Could use more specific snomed code in translation
  - Including post-coordinated code if tooling exists

# User self defined code

## Code:

```
<x code="AA1001"  
  codeSystem="441D40AF-0A07-426C-96AA-00E9D4C4A713"  
  displayName="Cerebral arterial aneurysm with minimum deficit">  
  <originalText>Minimal deficit Cerebral arterial  
    aneurysm</originalText>  
</x>
```

- Code system ID can be autogenerated (CoCreateGuid etc)
- Code system still needs to be registered in HL7 OID Registry
  - Automated registration coming

# V2 → CDA on Interface Engine

CWE Component	CD attribute	Notes
<b>1: identifier</b>	x.code	
<b>2: text</b>	x.displayName	
<b>3: coding system</b>	x.codeSystem	Conversion from Name to OID required
<b>4: Alternate Identifier</b>	x.translation.code	
<b>5: Alternate Text</b>	x.translation.displayName	
<b>6: Alternate Coding System</b>	x.translation.codeSystem	Conversion from Name to OID required
<b>7: coding system version</b>	x.codeSystemVersion	
<b>8: alternate coding system version</b>	x.translation.codeSystemVersion	
<b>9: original text</b>	x.originalText	

# V2 → CDA on Interface Engine

- If “No exceptions” applies, a nullFlavor is required if no component 1 (or 4).
  - If there is a third or sixth component nullFlavor is “OTH” else “UNK”
- If there is no component 1, and a component 2, then component 2 is originalText not displayName
- Mapping is in error if both components 2 and 5 are populated and components 1 and 4 are not populated.
  - It is also an error if component 9 is populated and either components 2 or 5 are populated without a matching identifier. (not illegal in v2, but nonsensical)
- Components 7 and 8 map directly to codeSystemVersion
- Generally components 1-3 map to the root code, and components 4-6 map to a translation
  - But check examples and the v2 implementation guides carefully
- No length limits in CDA – but often ignored in v2 anyway

# Advice for Receivers

- Displaying the concept to the user
  - If you get an originalText, display this to the user
  - Otherwise, if you get one, the displayName
  - Otherwise, if you can, look up the code
  - Otherwise, the code, if you get one
  - Otherwise the nullFlavor description in brackets
  - If you don't get anything then (“blank” or “—”) or equivalent
  - It is sometimes useful to display the code in brackets if assigned (alerts the user that the concept is coded, if the work flow depends on the code)



# Advice for Receivers

- Storing the concept
  - Codes, displayName, and originalText may be arbitrarily long. (>255 chars is possible)
  - They should never be truncated
  - Some unlimited type storage is appropriate.
    - most implementations choose some variation of storing the entire document as a blob, indexing the parts of the document that are used for searching/matching, and marking in those indexes where content has been truncated.
- Making decisions based on the code
  - Check the root and the translations for the preferred code
  - It may not matter whether the code is an expression or not (need to consult documentation on terminology service/library)

# Conclusion

- Coding in CDA requires more attention to details
  - it has to be done properly
- Doing coding well improves prospects for interoperability
- CDA is not really suitable for local exchange
- Experience is starting to build through the country
- Hopefully this will gradually improve coding in v2 as well