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Background

Data Quality Notes highlight any specific known issues with the data to be considered when analysing the data. The HES Data Quality Notes are designed for HES system users and those requesting extracts.

This document accompanies Provisional Monthly Hospital Episode Statistics for Admitted Patient Care Data - April 2015 to January 2016.

Data contained in this notes are provisional and subject to changes and revisions each month. It should be treated as an estimate until the Annual HES publications are available.

HES Data Dictionary

The HES Data Dictionary is published on the HSCIC website below. Please send any data dictionary queries to enquiries@hscic.gov.uk referencing HES data dictionaries in the subject.

http://www.hscic.gov.uk/hesdatadictionary

Automatic data cleaning and derivation rules

To improve the value and quality of HES data, the HES Data Quality team cleans common and obvious data quality errors and derive additional data items. To do this, we follow a set of rules described on the Admitted Patient Care cleaning rules document.

Issues – Field Specific

Provider Spell Number (PROVSPNOPS)

This field for years 2010/11, 2011/12 and 2012/13 is using a different encryption method compared to the other years.

Due to the difference in encryption methods used for these three years the hospital Provider Spells that cross the boundaries of financial years 2009/10-2010/11 and 2012/13-2013/14 do not seem to have overlapping Provider Spells.

Impact

The impact is that these Provider Spells for multi-year analysis have been split thereby increasing the number of Provider Spells.

Resolution

The PROVSPNOPS has been re-created using the correct encryption method. This will be available from this month, Month 10 (Apr 2015 – Jan 2016), and all subsequent publications.

For further details or queries, please contact enquiries@hscic.gov.uk referencing ‘HES Provider Spell Number’ in the subject.
The following issues have been identified in the Month 10 (M10) data:

**Age at CDS Activity Date / Age on Admission**
Some incorrect values have been reported within this field. This may be due to technical issues when providers submit data. Caution is advised when using this field for some providers. However, at least 98% of values within this field have been correctly derived. At least 99% of records contain an age which is within 1 year of the correct age.

**Age fields**
Please note that due to some hospital systems using either ‘01/01/1900’ or ‘01/01/1901’ as a default date of birth, there are a high number of records that contain age fields with values of ‘114’ or ‘115’.

Impact: These field values should be interpreted with caution.

**Delivery place (delplace)**
There is a very small number of maternity episodes recorded for the field ‘delivery place type (actual)’ with a value of ‘1’ (a domestic address) when the field ‘episode type’ is ‘2’ or ‘3’ (delivery or birth). It is unclear which field has been incorrectly recorded and so we urge caution when analysing these two conditions together. This is due to issues with local systems with some providers.

This issue also applies where’ episode type’ is ‘5’ or ‘6’ (other deliveries or births) and the ‘delivery place type (actual)’ value states delivery took place within a hospital. E.g. a value of ‘0’ (In NHS hospital: delivery facilities associated with midwife ward) or ‘2’ (In NHS hospital: delivery facilities associated with consultant ward).

**Issues – Provider Specific**

The following providers have been identified in the Month 10 (M10) data for presenting issues in some fields:

**Burton Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (RJF)**

The above provider has incorrectly recorded a very small number of delivery records (Epitype 2 or 5) where there has been a caesarean procedure but no anaesthetic has been coded as administered (delprean = 8).

**Luton and Dunstable Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (RC9)**

Luton and Dunstable Hospital NHS Foundation Trust (RC9) has unusually high counts in the field ‘Gestation length’ (Gestat1) for low gestation length values. This is as a result of
this data being converted into values representing days rather weeks in the submission process. Caution is advised when using the fields from this trust.

Liverpool Community Health NHS Trust (RY1)

Liverpool Community Health NHS Trust has extremely low counts or no values for the following fields:

- Postcode of patient (HOMEADD)
- Local patient identifier (LOPATID)
- NHS number (NEWNHSNO)
- Person Birth Date (DOB)
- Neonatal level of care (NEOCARE)

This will affect all fields derived from the ones above. Caution is advised when using the fields from this provider and should be taken into account when using the fields at national or regional levels.

Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare NHS Trust (RY9)
Suffolk Community Healthcare (NHM)

Hounslow and Richmond Community Healthcare NHS Trust (RY9) and Suffolk Community Healthcare (NHM) have no values for any of the Diagnosis fields. This will affect all derived fields as well. Caution is advised when using the fields from these trusts and should be taken into account when using the fields at national or regional levels.

Coverage Issues

The following organisations present shortfalls or missing data; their data should be interpreted with caution.

Table 1: Estimated number of records missing per organisation at the specified periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation name</th>
<th>Org. code</th>
<th>Months affected</th>
<th>Approx. total no. of records missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen - Highgate Hospital</td>
<td>NYW03</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Community Healthcare NHS Trust</td>
<td>RYW</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham Women's NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>RLU</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Country Partnership NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>TAJ</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI - The Beardwood Hospital</td>
<td>NT403</td>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following organisation’s data is missing and will be available on the next HES reference data update

Table 2: Number of records missing per organisation at the specified periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation name</th>
<th>Org. code</th>
<th>Months affected</th>
<th>No. of records missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Rank House</td>
<td>ARH01</td>
<td>Oct- Jan</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other notes or findings

None

Feedback

If you would like to provide some feedback on the usefulness of this document or if you have any questions on the content of this note you can do it via the HSCIC Contact Centre: enquiries@hscic.gov.uk or 0300 303 5678.