

The Fraser Institute

# *Hospital Report Card*

*British Columbia 2008*



by Nadeem Esmail and Maureen Hazel

10 Rankings by Municipality



The Fraser Institute

## Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008

by Nadeem Esmail and Maureen Hazel

# 10 Rankings by Municipality

### Contents

- Overview and Observations / 2
- Introduction and Background / 9
- Methodology Overview and Sample Data Table / 24
- Data Tables / 28

### Data Tables and Appendices of the Hospital Report Card

- 1 Overview and Observations
- 2 Hospital Mortality Index
- 3 Observed Rates by Hospital
- 4 Risk-adjusted Rates by Hospital
- 5 Scores by Hospital
- 6 Rankings by Hospital
- 7 Observed Rates by Municipality
- 8 Risk-adjusted Rates by Municipality
- 9 Scores by Municipality
- 10 Rankings by Municipality
- 11 Methodological Appendices
- 12 FAQs about the Hospital Report Card

### The Fraser Institute

Our vision is a free and prosperous world where individuals benefit from greater choice, competitive markets, and personal responsibility. Our mission is to measure, study, and communicate the impact of competitive markets and government interventions on the welfare of individuals.

Founded in 1974, we are an independent research and educational organization with locations throughout North America and international partners in over 70 countries. Our work is financed by tax-deductible contributions from thousands of individuals, organizations, and foundations. In order to protect its independence, the Institute does not accept grants from government or contracts for research.

For media enquiries, please contact our Communications Department via 604.714.4582 or [communications@fraserinstitute.ca](mailto:communications@fraserinstitute.ca).

Copyright© 2008 The Fraser Institute. All rights reserved.

Editing, design and typesetting: Kristin McCahon and Lindsey Thomas Martin

Cover: Bill Ray

Image for covers: © 2008 atbaei, iStockphoto

3M and APR are trademarks of 3M, used under license in Canada.

ISSN 1916-5161 The Fraser Institute Hospital Report Card. British Columbia.

Date of issue: February 2008

### Acknowledgments

The authors thank all those involved in the production and release of this study including Melissa Holoday, Kristin McCahon, Wendy Mills, and Dean Pelkey. Additionally, we want to thank Mark Mullins, Rena Menaker, and Ian Vaculik for developing and contributing to the base of knowledge that is incorporated into this publication and Mark Mullins and Rena Menaker for their work in producing the first version of the Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card* for Ontario and, indeed, Canada.

The authors, of course, take full and complete responsibility for any remaining errors or omissions. As they have worked independently, the views expressed in this study are their own and do not necessarily reflect those of the trustees, supporters, or other staff of The Fraser Institute.

### CIHI Acknowledgment and Disclaimer

Parts of this material are based on data and information provided by the Canadian Institute for Health Information. The Canadian Institute for Health Information does not endorse or support the methodology used by the Fraser Institute and, therefore, the analyses, conclusions, opinions, and statements expressed herein are those of the authors and not those of the Canadian Institute for Health Information

# Overview and Observations

## Overview

The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* is constructed to help patients choose the best hospital for their inpatient care by providing them with information on the performance of acute-care hospitals in British Columbia. All of the information in this report, which is laid out in 12 documents, is available at <[www.fraserinstitute.org](http://www.fraserinstitute.org)>.

We set out to create a hospital report card that is easy to understand and accessible by the public, where individuals are able to look up a given condition or procedure and compare death rates, volumes of procedures, rates of adverse events, and utilization rates for their hospital to those of other hospitals in British Columbia.

This is accomplished by using state-of-the-art indicators developed by the US Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) in conjunction with Stanford University that have been shown to reflect quality of care inside hospitals. These indicators are presently in use in more than a dozen US states, including several of the more populous ones, New York, Texas, Florida and California.

We are using the Canadian Institute for Health Information's (CIHI) Discharge Abstract Database (DAD) as our primary information source. This information is derived from patient records provided to CIHI by all hospitals in British Columbia. Demographic, administrative, and clinical data are extracted from the Discharge Abstract Database for inpatient hospital stays from all acute care hospitals in British Columbia.

Since more specialized hospitals may treat more high-risk patients and some patients arrive at hospitals sicker than others, it is important to risk-adjust hospital death rates, adverse events rates, and utilization rates for patients with the same condition but a different health status. The international standard for risk adjustment, 3M™ APR™ DRG Classification System, [1] is employed to risk-adjust the data.

The Fraser Institute spent two years developing the methods, databases, and computer programs required to adapt the measures to Canadian circumstances. This work has been internally and externally peer-reviewed (Mullins, Menaker, and Esmail, 2006) and is supported by an extensive body of research based on the AHRQ approach.

None of British Columbia's 95 acute-care hospitals granted us authorization to identify them by name in this report. This contrasts with the Fraser Institute's forthcoming *Hospital Report Card: Ontario 2008*, for which 29 hospitals agreed to be identified. The non-participation of British Columbia's hospitals is a setback to the empowerment of patients in British Columbia regarding the health care they receive and for the ongoing commitment of hospitals to quality improvement through accountability and transparency.

[1] 3M and APR are trademarks of 3M, used under license in Canada.

The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* consists of 39 of AHRQ's indicators of quality (such as death due to a stroke) and patient safety (such as a foreign body left inside a patient during a procedure). The indicators are shown for all acute-care hospitals in British Columbia from 2001 to 2006, comprising almost two million patient records. We have also calculated the indicators for all municipalities in British Columbia, based on patient location. This constitutes the most comprehensive and detailed publicly available measure of acute-care hospital performance and accountability in Canada at the present time.

The indicators are expressed as observed rates (such as death due to hip replacement surgery) and risk-adjusted rates (the same rate adjusted for patient health status). Each institution was given a score from 0 to 100 for each indicator based on its risk-adjusted rate, where 100 is the best. The institutions were then ranked based on their scores, where 1 is the best.

The indicators are classified into three groups: those related to medical conditions, hospital procedures, and child birth. The indicators are further classified by type: death rates, volumes of procedures, utilization rates, and adverse events.

A Hospital Mortality Index (HMI) has been constructed to examine the overall performance of a hospital or municipality across indicators that measure death rates. It consists of nine indicators including:

- deaths due to hip replacement surgery
- deaths due to heart attacks
- deaths due to heart failure
- deaths due to acute strokes
- deaths due to bleeding from the esophagus, stomach, small intestine or colon
- deaths due to hip fractures
- deaths due to pneumonia infection
- deaths among patients that are considered unlikely to die in the hospital
- deaths in patients that developed complications of care during hospitalization

The final HMI is an average of the scores of these indicators, where 100 is the best. All institutions and municipalities were ranked based on their HMI score, where 1 is the best. It is important to note that the 39 indicators and the Hospital Mortality Index are applicable only to acute-care conditions and procedures for inpatient care. The results cannot be generalized to assessing the overall performance of any given hospital.

Since this report is based on administrative data, the results have limitations related to coding variations and other factors. Hospital deaths or complications will occur even when all standards of care are followed. Deciding on treatment options and choosing a hospital are decisions that should be made in consultation with a physician. It is not recommended to choose a hospital based solely on statistics and descriptions such as those given in this report.

That said, the DAD is a major data source used to produce various CIHI reports including annual reports on the performance of hospitals and the health-care system and for seven of the health indicators adopted by the federal, provincial, and territorial governments. These data have been used extensively in previous reports on health care performance, and form the basis for many journal articles.

As the *Ontario Hospital Report*, [2] which uses the same DAD data set underlying this report card, notes, “the data are collected under consistent guidelines, by trained abstractors, in all acute care hospitals in Ontario. The data undergo extensive edit checks to improve accuracy, but all errors cannot be eliminated” (p. 6).

There are a number of publications that have addressed data-quality issues that are discussed in our report. Of note are CIHI’s reabstraction studies that go back to the original patient charts and recode the information using a different set of expert coders. [3]

Overall, according to CIHI, [4] findings from their three-year DAD reabstraction studies have confirmed the strengths of the database, while identifying limitations in certain areas resulting from inconsistencies in the coding of some data elements. In addition, the findings from the inter-rater data (that is, comparison between reabstractors) were generally similar to the findings from the main study data (that is, comparison between original coder and reabstractor). This suggests that the database is coded as well as can be expected using existing approaches in the hospital system.

In addition to the aforementioned reabstraction studies, the OECD published a report [5] that supports the AHRQ patient-safety indicator approach, noting that “this set of measures represents an exciting development and their use should be tested in a variety of countries” (p. 11). Further, a recently released report by the Manitoba Center for Health Policy that used the AHRQ Patient Safety Indicators [6] noted two important advantages to using the AHRQ approach. The first advantage is the breadth of coverage offered by the indicators in studying in-hospital patient safety. The second is that the AHRQ patient safety indicators were developed to measure complications of hospital-based care among a group of patients for whom the complications seemed preventable or highly unlikely.

## Observations

A report based on just under two million patient records, shown across 39 quality and safety indicators for 95 hospitals and 50 municipalities over five years, is not something that can be summarized in a few words. In fact, the primary purpose of this research is to provide patients with access to information on specific medical procedures and conditions and understand the variation of hospital care across the entire system. It is for that reason that we have rates, scores, and ranks for each separate indicator. All documents are available at <[www.fraserinstitute.org](http://www.fraserinstitute.org)>.

However, we have created one summary measure of mortality, based on the most important and reliable data in this study, the Hospital Mortality Index. The nine component indicators of the HMI were arrived at by a process of elimination. Starting with our complete group of 39 indicators, we eliminated indicators that had no data for several years or relatively few hospitals with data. The resulting HMI has scores and rankings for 25 hospitals and 42 municipalities in the latest year.

[2] A joint initiative of the Ontario Hospital Association and the Government of Ontario. Hospital Report 2006: Acute care. Report available at <<[http://www.oha.com/client/OHA/OHA\\_LP4W\\_LND\\_WebStation.nsf/resources/Hospital+Reports/\\$file/acute\\_report\\_2006.pdf](http://www.oha.com/client/OHA/OHA_LP4W_LND_WebStation.nsf/resources/Hospital+Reports/$file/acute_report_2006.pdf)>>.

[3] Reabstractors participating in the study were required to have several years of coding experience, experience coding in ICD-10-CA and CCI in particular, experience coding at a tertiary care centre, and attendance at specific CIHI educational workshops. They were also required to attend a one-week training session and to receive a passing score on the inter-rater test.

[4] Data Quality of the Discharge Abstract Database Following the First-year Implementation of ICD-10-CA/CCI. CIHI, 2004.

[5] Selecting Indicators for Patient Safety at the Health Systems Level in OECD Countries. John Millar, Soeren Mattke and the Members of the OECD Patient Safety Panel. Report available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/26/33878001.pdf>

[6] Bruce, S., et al., *Application of Patient Safety Indicators in Manitoba: A First Look*. Winnipeg, Manitoba Centre for Health Policy, June 2006.

Tables 1 (page 6) and 2 (page 8) show scores and rankings for the Hospital Mortality Index for the average score over the latest two years, 2004/05 and 2005/06. This is compared to the average score in the first three years of our survey from 2001/02 to 2003/04. The change column shows the improvement or deterioration in score between the two periods. Only scores and rankings for hospitals with data for all years are presented.

## Hospital Mortality Index: Hospitals

### Top-Ranked Hospitals

- The top hospital in British Columbia is Anonymous Hospital 11 with a high HMI score of 83.5 out of 100 in the latest years. It has performed consistently and was the top-ranked hospital in the previous period also.
- Anonymous Hospital 26 is the second ranked hospital. It held a similar position in the early 2000s, where it ranked fourth with a score of 83.1 as compared to 82.7 in the more recent period.
- Among the hospitals ranked in the top ten in 2004/05 and 2005/06, half saw an improvement in their scores and half saw a deterioration. All but one hospital in the top 10 for 2004/05 and 2005/06 were also in the top 15 for the period from 2001/02 to 2003/04.
- Anonymous Hospital 66, ranked seventh, has had the largest improvement in its HMI score of any hospital (up 5.6 points) since the early 2000s.

### Bottom-Ranked Hospitals

- Anonymous Hospital 28 is the lowest-ranked hospital with a score of 68.8. It also saw a deterioration of its score over time and was ranked second to last from 2001/02 to 2003/04.
- Anonymous Hospital 52 is the second lowest-ranked hospital, with a score of 72.5, but saw an improvement in its score (up 2.1 points) from 2001/02 to 2003/04. Anonymous Hospital 41 is third lowest, with a score of 72.8 and a drop of almost 5 points from the earlier period.
- The hospital with the sharpest decline is anonymous Hospital 5 with a 7.2 point fall and drop from eighth position in the period from 2001/02 to 2003/04 to 21<sup>st</sup> in the period from 2004/05 to 2005/06.

### Consistency

- There is a high level of consistency in the performance of both top-ranked and bottom-ranked hospitals.
- Five of the top ten hospitals, Anonymous Hospitals 11, 12, 26, 93 and 42, have sustained top-ten performances over the entire time period.
- All of the bottom ten hospitals ranked among the bottom ten in 2001/02–2003/04 except for Anonymous Hospitals 5, 13, and 8.

Table 1: Hospital Mortality Index—Hospitals

	2004/05–2005/06		2001/02–2003/04		Change	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Hospital 11	83.5	1	85.0	1	-1.5	14
Hospital 26	82.7	2	83.1	4	-0.4	11
Hospital 25	82.6	3	80.6	12	2.0	6
Hospital 24	82.3	4	80.7	11	1.6	8
Hospital 89	81.7	5	80.3	13	1.4	9
Hospital 22	81.5	6	79.8	14	1.7	7
Hospital 66	81.5	7	75.9	20	5.6	1
Hospital 42	81.2	8	82.7	6	-1.4	13
Hospital 12	81.1	9	83.6	3	-2.5	19
Hospital 93	80.5	10	82.9	5	-2.3	17
Hospital 67	80.4	11	78.3	16	2.1	5
Hospital 14	80.0	12	75.0	22	5.0	2
Hospital 17	79.6	13	82.0	9	-2.4	18
Hospital 39	78.6	14	83.7	2	-5.1	23
Hospital 13	77.7	15	82.4	7	-4.7	21
Hospital 38	77.0	16	78.0	17	-1.0	12
Hospital 19	76.5	17	75.9	21	0.6	10
Hospital 8	76.3	18	81.6	10	-5.3	24
Hospital 59	75.7	19	72.5	23	3.2	3
Hospital 15	75.0	20	78.8	15	-3.7	20
Hospital 5	74.9	21	82.1	8	-7.2	25
Hospital 53	74.2	22	76.3	19	-2.1	16
Hospital 41	72.8	23	77.7	18	-4.9	22
Hospital 52	72.5	24	70.4	25	2.1	4
Hospital 28	68.8	25	70.6	24	-1.8	15

## Hospital Mortality Index: Municipalities

### Top-Ranked Municipalities

- The top municipality is Nelson with a high HMI score of 78.6 out of 100. However, this municipality and second-ranked Port Moody had inadequate data to show a score in fiscal years 2001 to 2003.
- The third-ranked municipality is Penticton, which also ranked among the top 10 in the earlier years.
- Municipalities are less consistent over time than hospitals. Only three municipalities among the top 10 in 2004/05 were also among the top 10 in 2001/03. On the other hand, half of the bottom ten municipalities in 2004/05–2005/06 were also in the bottom 10 in the earlier years.

Note: The Hospital Mortality Index (HMI) is calculated for municipalities using the residence of patients treated in British Columbia's acute-care hospitals.

- Municipalities with larger populations that had high rankings are: Victoria, ranked 11<sup>th</sup>; Vancouver, ranked 12<sup>th</sup>; Surrey, ranked 13<sup>th</sup>; Kelowna, ranked 14<sup>th</sup>; and Delta, ranked 15<sup>th</sup>. It is notable that none of British Columbia's largest municipalities are ranked among the top 10.

#### **Bottom-Ranked Municipalities**

- The lowest-ranked municipality in British Columbia is Salmon Arm, with a low HMI score of 57.1 for the most recent period, which comes after a sizable decline of 10.2 points from its score during the period from 2001/02 to 2003/04.
- Most of the bottom-ranked municipalities are consistently of low rank over the two time periods, except for Burnaby, which fell from 8<sup>th</sup> to 31<sup>st</sup> with a 13.9 point decline in its HMI score, and Central Saanich, which fell from 1<sup>st</sup> place to 29<sup>th</sup> with a 17.4 point decline in its HMI score.
- Abbotsford, ranked 36<sup>th</sup>, is the lowest-ranked, larger-population municipality in British Columbia.

#### **Five Largest Municipalities**

- The five largest municipalities in British Columbia by number of inpatient stays are: Vancouver, ranked 12<sup>th</sup> on the Hospital Mortality Index with a score of 71.8; Surrey, ranked 13<sup>th</sup> with a score of 71.7; Victoria, ranked 11<sup>th</sup> with a score of 72.0; Kelowna, ranked 14<sup>th</sup> with a score of 71.3 and Abbotsford, ranked 36<sup>th</sup> with a score of 59.4.

## **Conclusion**

The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* provides a comprehensive measure of inpatient acute-care conditions in British Columbia's hospitals. This is the first edition of an annual report card for patients in British Columbia. A report for Ontario is already available and future editions of The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card* will include performance measurement of acute-care hospitals in other provinces. We welcome comments on the content and format of this report via <comments@hospitalreportcards.ca>.



Table 2: Hospital Mortality Index—Municipalities

	2004/05 & 2005/06		2001/02 - 2003/04		Change	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Nelson	78.6	1				
Port Moody	77.5	2				
Penticton	76.7	3	76.6	6	0.0	6
Trail	75.6	4	75.9	7	-0.3	8
Parksville	74.8	5	73.9	14	1.0	4
Sidney	74.3	6	73.8	16	0.5	5
Other	73.6	7	74.0	12	-0.4	9
Rural	73.4	8	73.4	18	0.0	7
Langley	73.3	9	69.5	26	3.9	1
Campbell River	72.8	10	75.1	9	-2.3	17
Victoria	72.0	11	73.1	19	-1.1	12
Vancouver	71.8	12	74.8	10	-3.0	19
Surrey	71.7	13	68.3	27	3.4	2
Kelowna	71.3	14	73.8	15	-2.5	18
Delta	71.1	15	76.8	5	-5.7	22
Qualicum	69.5	16	67.1	31	2.4	3
Coquitlam	69.0	17	78.2	2	-9.1	28
Vernon	69.0	18	78.1	3	-9.1	29
Nanaimo	68.8	19	69.6	25	-0.8	11
New Westminster	68.3	20	70.5	22	-2.3	16
Prince George	67.7	21	77.1	4	-9.4	30
Kamloops	67.0	22	74.4	11	-7.4	23
Port Coquitlam	66.5	23	73.9	13	-7.4	24
Cranbrook	66.5	24	68.2	28	-1.7	14
Port Alberni	66.4	25	67.0	32	-0.5	10
Duncan	66.0	26	70.3	24	-4.3	20
Mission	65.1	27				
Chilliwack	64.5	28	73.1	20	-8.5	26
Central Saanich	64.1	29	81.5	1	-17.4	34
Richmond	63.6	30	72.5	21	-8.9	27
Burnaby	61.5	31	75.3	8	-13.9	33
Courtenay	60.9	32	62.3	34	-1.4	13
Salt Spring	60.5	33				
Dawson	60.3	34	65.3	33	-5.1	21
White Rock	59.7	35	67.6	29	-7.9	25
Abbotsford	59.4	36	70.4	23	-11.0	32
Maple Ridge	58.8	37	60.9	35	-2.1	15
Salmon Arm	57.1	38	67.3	30	-10.2	31
Powell River			73.5	17		

# Introduction and background

The goal of the Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* is to contribute to the improvement of inpatient care in British Columbia by providing hospital-specific information about quality of service directly to patients and to the general public. This series was the first in Canada to empower patients to make informed choices about their health-care delivery options by providing comparable, hospital-specific, performance measurements on clearly identified indicators. The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* has been published to promote accountability within hospitals, thereby stimulating improved performance through an independent and objective measurement of performance.

## Introduction

In Canada, individuals have access to data identifying problem areas in an automobile from information willingly supplied by consumers, the vehicle's manufacturer, and industry experts. They can find which CD player is the best on the market for their needs. They can compare restaurants before heading out for an evening meal. Yet when it comes to health care, which many will consider more important for an individual's well being, consumers are left with remarkably little information about where the best services are available. They cannot even tell which hospitals offer the worst care or have the highest mortality rates (Esmail, 2003).

## What Are Hospital Report Cards? [1]

Hospital report cards provide a set of consistent performance measurements to rank the products in question and help inform consumer choice. In some cases, these indicators may be subjective, or based on the opinions of survey respondents. In other cases, the indicators will be objective measures of performance or outcomes.

Hospital report cards are used to measure specific practices in hospitals such as the application of a specific drug or technology to certain events; or performance with respect to access to care or consumer friendliness; or to measure the likelihood of a positive outcome provided by health facilities in a specific jurisdiction.

## The Four Primary Types of Hospital Report Cards

**1 Process Report Cards** This type of report card describes the inputs used by hospitals, health plans or individual physicians in the course of treating their patients. An example of these types of report cards can be found in those commissioned by The Leapfrog Group (Leapfrog Group, 2005). [2] The primary strength of a Process Report Card is that it can be developed from existing medical

[1] Daniel P. Kessler, Stanford University, Hoover Institution, and the National Bureau of Economic Research. provide a helpful delineation of the field in a PowerPoint® slideshow entitled "Health Care Quality Report Cards."

[2] Further information available at <<http://www.leapfroggroup.org/>>.

administrative databases with relative ease. The process report card, however, does not necessarily measure the appropriateness, the quality, or the importance of the inputs employed in ensuring good health, although these factors can be captured to some extent by the inclusion or exclusion of specific inputs.

**2 Survey Report Cards** These types of report cards are composed of patients' evaluations of their quality of care and/or customer service. An example of this type of report card is found in the Pacific Business Group on Health's (PBGH) *Healthscope* reports. Although survey-based report cards do provide valuable information on subjective areas of patient care, they cannot measure how treatment decisions by a doctor or hospital lead to objective improvements in patient care.

**3 Outcomes Report Cards** These report cards present average levels of adverse health outcomes based on mortality or complication rates experienced by patients as part of a health plan, as treated by a specific doctor, or in a specific hospital. An example of this type of report card can be found in the *Pennsylvania CABG* surgery reports (Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Council, 2006). [3] These report cards provide objective measures of differences in the quality of care but are susceptible to being "gamed" by either doctors or hospitals. For example, the doctor or hospital may avoid exceptionally sick patients (that is, patients who are qualitatively more ill with a listed condition and who will consequently drag average results down) in favour of healthy patients (to skew results upward). This unintended effect can, however, be mitigated through the appropriate application of risk-adjustment in the measures. Outcomes report cards (including The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card*) provide the most empirically sound basis for analyzing the quality of care.

[3] Further information available at <http://www.phc4.org/reports/cabg/>.

**4 Balanced Scorecards** The balanced scorecard was developed in the early 1990s by Drs. Robert Kaplan and David Norton to examine a business above and beyond the financial bottom line. Translated into the healthcare field, this results in four quadrants. In the case of the *Ontario Hospital Reports* series, a prime example of the use of a "balanced scorecard," these are [a] financial performance and conditions; [b] patient/client satisfaction; [c] clinical utilization and outcomes; and, [d] system integration and change. While this variant of report card is useful in determining the broadest view of a hospital's operations and functions, specific and relevant indicators regarding hospital performance may be overlooked.

## Why Are Hospital Report Cards Published?

The publication of hospital report cards is based on the concept that publishing outcomes data can both improve the quality of care in hospitals and inform patients' healthcare decision-making. Armed with more information based on a set of repeatable measurements about the relative performance of caregivers, both patients and physicians are able to make a more informed choice about which

facility or provider to select for a given condition. This allows for a rational discussion of relative levels of quality of service provision and eliminates measurement based on anecdotal information, which can be misleading and ultimately harmful.

## Where Are Hospital Report Cards Published?

### The United States of America

The United States was one of the first nations to begin measuring, comparing, and publishing measurements of hospital performance. Hospital report card initiatives were first undertaken by the federal government, with state governments following its lead. Private-sector information providers offering several competing reports on provider quality have refined the reporting of information.

In 1987, the first US hospital report cards were published by the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA). These reports detailed annual mortality rates that were measured from the records of hospitalized Medicare patients. However, due to extensive criticism regarding the accuracy, usefulness, and interpretability of the HCFA's mortality data, this initiative was withdrawn in 1993 (Berwick and Wald, 1990).

In the late 1980s, the state of New York began the Cardiac Surgery Reporting System (CSRS), which collected data from patients' medical histories and recorded whether they died in hospital following surgery. From these data, New York was able to report detailed physician-specific statistics. While the information contained in the CSRS was not originally intended to provide the public with information about the performance of their provider, the news media understood the public's desire for such data and saw the benefit in publishing the information. In December of 1990, the *New York Times* used this information to publish a list of local hospitals, which ranked facilities according to their mortality rates for Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery (CABG). Invoking the *Freedom of Information Act*, the *New York Newsday* sued the New York State Department of Health to obtain access to its database on bypass surgery and on cardiac surgeons. The goal was to publish physician-specific death rates for patients. The Supreme Court of New York ruled that it was in the public's best interests to have access to these mortality data in order to make informed decisions about their health care (Zinman, 1991). As a result, *New York Newsday* was able to publish the information on physician performance for citizens to assess where the best care was available. Driven by this development, the New York State Department of Health began publishing annual editions of the *Coronary Artery Bypass Surgery Report* in 1996 (New York State, Department of Health, 2005). [4]

Following the precedent set by this pioneering case, a wide variety of hospital performance reports began to be produced in the 1990s by a disparate group of authors that ranged from the news media, coalitions of large employers, consumer advocacy organizations, and state governments (Marshall et al., 2003). Many different development paths have been taken so that there is currently no "standardized" hospital report card or agreement on the indicators to measure.

[4] Links to the entire series of reports can be found at <[http://www.health.state.ny.us/nysdoh/heart/heart\\_disease.htm](http://www.health.state.ny.us/nysdoh/heart/heart_disease.htm)>.

Furthermore, these different reports range widely in terms of both quality and comprehensiveness. Indeed, as Marshall and colleagues cheekily note: “Public reporting in the United States is now much like healthcare delivery in that country: It is diverse, is primarily market-based, and lacks an overarching organizational structure or strategic plan. Public reporting systems vary in what they measure, how they measure it and how (and to whom) it is reported.” [5] Of course, for patients who are the beneficiaries of such competition between information providers, each of whom strives to deliver a product in some way superior to his competitors, this is no bad thing.

[5] Document available at <[www.medscope.com/viewarticle/452953\\_3](http://www.medscope.com/viewarticle/452953_3)>.

### Examples of American Private and Public Information Providers

- [1] America’s Best Hospitals—USNEWS & World Report <<http://www.usnews.com>>.
- [2] Healthgrades <<http://www.healthgrades.com>>
- [3] Leapfrog Group <<http://www.leapfroggroup.org>>
- [4] National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA) <<http://www.ncqa.org>>
- [5] National Quality Forum <<http://www.qualityforum.org>>
- [6] Quality Check <<http://www.jointcommission.org/PerformanceMeasurement/PerformanceMeasurement/>>
- [7] Cardiac Surgery in New Jersey <<http://www.state.nj.us/health/reportcards.htm>>
- [8] Cardiac Surgery Reports <<http://www.health.state.ny.us/nysdoh/healthinfo/index.htm>>
- [9] Pennsylvania Hospital Performance Reports <<http://www.phc4.org>>
- [10] Indicators of Inpatient Care in New York Hospitals <<http://www.myhealthfinder.com/newyork>>
- [11] Indicators of Inpatient Care in Texas Hospitals <<http://www.thcic.state.tx.us>>
- [12] Maryland Hospital Performance Evaluation Guide <<http://www.hospitalguide.mhcc.metro-data.com>>
- [13] Pacific Business Group on Health (PBGH) <<http://www.healthscope.org>>.

### The United Kingdom

The hospital reporting universe in the United Kingdom is a fraction of the US market’s size. League tables [6] of death rates for English hospitals were available from 1992 to 1996 (Leyland and Boddy, 1998) and mortality statistics for English hospitals were published by the Labour government in 1998. Although publicly released, these were intended for managerial use and had little discernible impact (Street, 2002). The first initiative designed for public consumption was the Patient’s Charter (National Health Service, 1991), [7] which focused on waiting times as opposed to clinical quality.

[6] A league table ranks the performance of a range of institutions.

[7] Further information can be found at <<http://www.pfc.org.uk/medical/pchrt-e1.htm#foreword>>.

In 1998, the National Health Service (NHS, Britain's tax-funded and universal medical insurance program) adopted a new Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) to report clinical outcomes at the hospital level (London: Department of Health, 1998). It focused on health gain, fair access, effective delivery of services, efficient delivery of services, health outcomes, and patient/career experience. This initiative received prominence in 2001 as the NHS Plan became the first government plan in the developed world to deal explicitly with report cards. Beginning in September 2001, the UK Department of Health began to publish a new rating system for all NHS non-specialist hospitals in England. The performance of hospitals included in this survey was classified into one of four categories, ranging from zero to three stars based on the hospital's performance on a range of indicators and the outcome of their clinical governance review by the Commission for Health Improvement (CHI). As an additional incentive for improvement, beyond that assumed to come with public reporting of performance, the Department of Health mandated that hospitals scoring at the high end of the scale would receive greater funding and autonomy, while those at the bottom of the scale would be subject to greater government oversight and intervention. For example, those receiving zero stars were subject to investigations and underwent changes in management where necessary.

Although the lion's share of reporting in Britain has been by and at the direction of government, an independent initiative entered the arena in the latter half of 2000 when Tim Kelsey and Jake Arnold-Forster, a pair of *Sunday Times* journalists, founded Dr. Foster to generate authoritative independent information about local health services on the web at <<http://www.drfooster.co.uk>>. The partnership is in the form of a 50:50 joint venture involving the new Health and Social Care Information Centre (a special health authority of the NHS) and Dr. Foster, a commercial provider of healthcare information. Numerous publications have emerged from this initiative including the *Good Birth Guide* and the annual *Good Hospital Guide*, which was first published in 2001 and continues to be published annually. These guides contain information about hospital-specific mortality rates; the total number of staff; wait times; numbers of complaints; as well as, uniquely, private hospital prices for services.

## Canada

Hospital reporting initiatives, like those in both the United States and the United Kingdom, have emerged in Canada only recently. In 1998, the Ontario Hospital Association produced a report card comparing the hospitals covered by its organization. Undertaken by a research group at the University of Toronto, the publication focused upon inpatient acute care and reported results at both peer group and regional levels of aggregation, but not for individual facilities. *Hospital Report '99*, published the following year, saw the first reporting of hospital-specific acute-care hospital performance indicators in Canada. In 2000, the Government of Ontario joined as a partner in the enterprise and the scope of the report was expanded to include such areas as complex continuing care, mental health, rehabilitation, and emergency department care. In addition, specific reports dealing

with women's health, the health of the population as a whole, and nursing care were also produced. These publications have since appeared annually. The Hospital Report Series appears in a "balanced scorecard" format and assesses the performance of hospitals in four quadrants including: [a] financial performance and conditions; [b] patient/client satisfaction; [c] clinical utilization and outcomes; and [d] system integration and change.

Other notable reporting initiatives in Canada include CIHI's Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio (HSMR) (discussed below), *Healthcare Performance Measurement in Canada: Who's Doing What?* (Baker et al., 1998), *Quality of Cardiac Care in Ontario* (ICES, 2004) [8] and *The State of Hospital Care in the GTA/905* (GTA/905 Healthcare Alliance, 2005). [9] Additionally, two publications that have reported on patient safety and adverse events are *The Ottawa Hospital Patient Safety Study* (Forster et al., 2004) [10] and *The Canadian Adverse Events Study* (Baker et al., 2004), though neither reported institution-specific measures. [11] Additionally, for the last 17 years, The Fraser Institute has published *Waiting Your Turn: Hospital Waiting lists in Canada*, a report that provides Canada's only national, comparable, and comprehensive measurement of waiting times for medically necessary treatment (Esmail and Walker with Bank, 2007). [12] Another Fraser Institute initiative is *How Good is Canadian Health Care? An International Comparison of Health Care Systems* (Esmail and Walker, 2007) [13], which compares Canada's health policies and healthcare performance with other nations that guarantee their citizens access to healthcare insurance.

Other avenues of hospital performance reporting and monitoring in Canada have largely been in the form of private hospital assessments of performance by a contracted third party using a proprietary performance indicator methodology. A prime example of this is the work done by the Hay Group in rating the performance of participating Ontario hospitals for a fixed fee per facility (Hay Group, 2005).

### Canadian Institute for Health Information's Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio (HSMR)

The Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) published its own measure of hospital and regional performances, the *Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio* (HSMR), in 2007. While both the CIHI's measure and the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* use data from CIHI's Discharge Abstract Database, there are several significant differences between the measure published by CIHI and those published by The Fraser Institute. These differences make comparisons between the two reports difficult and lead to the conclusion that CIHI and the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* are measuring mortality in two very different ways.

The most significant difference between the measures published by The Fraser Institute and those published by CIHI is the level of detail available. According to the CIHI's report, the *Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio* (HSMR) is a "big dot summary" measure (CIHI 2007: 4), or a measure that "tracks

[8] Report available at <[http://www.ices.on.ca/WebBuild/site/ices-internet-upload/file\\_collection/Ccort%5FFull%5FReport%2Epdf](http://www.ices.on.ca/WebBuild/site/ices-internet-upload/file_collection/Ccort%5FFull%5FReport%2Epdf)>.

[9] Further details available at <<http://www.gta905health.com/mediaroom/2005-may3.html>>. Report available at <<http://www.gta905health.com/whatsnew/gta905-hospitalreport.pdf>>.

[10] Article available at <<http://www.pubmedcentral.gov/articlerender.fcgi?tool=pubmed&pubmedid=15078845>>. Also, the Manitoba Center for Health Policy recently released an in-hospital patient safety report using the AHRQ Patient Safety Indicators (Bruce et al., 2006).

[11] Article available at <<http://www.cmaj.ca/cgi/content/full/170/11/1678>>.

[12] Report available at <[http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication\\_details.aspx?pubID=4962](http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication_details.aspx?pubID=4962)>.

[13] Report available at <[http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication\\_details.aspx?pubID=5035](http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication_details.aspx?pubID=5035)>.

progress on broad outcomes at a system level” (2007: vii). More specifically, the HSMR is a composite measure of mortality in diagnosis groups that comprise 80% of all deaths in acute-care facilities. These include:

- Acute pancreatitis
- Acute renal failure
- Adult respiratory distress syndrome
- Alcoholic liver disease
- Alzheimer’s disease
- Acute myocardial infarction
- Angina pectoris
- Aortic aneurism and dissection
- Atrial fibrillation and flutter
- Cardiac arrest
- Cerebral infarction
- Chronic ischemic heart disease
- Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease
- Chronic renal failure
- Complications of procedures, not elsewhere classified
- Convalescence
- Diabetes mellitus type 2
- Diffuse non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma
- Diverticular disease of intestine
- Fibrosis and cirrhosis of liver
- Heart failure
- Hepatic failure
- Hip fracture
- Intracerebral hemorrhage
- Intracranial injury
- Lymphoid leukemia
- Malignant neoplasm of bladder
- Malignant neoplasm of brain
- Malignant neoplasm of breast
- Malignant neoplasm of bronchus and lung
- Malignant neoplasm of colon
- Malignant neoplasm of liver and intrahepatic bile ducts
- Malignant neoplasm of pancreas
- Malignant neoplasm of prostate
- Malignant neoplasm of stomach
- Malignant neoplasm without specification of site
- Multiple myeloma and malignant plasma cell neoplasms
- Myeloid leukemia
- Other and unspecified types of non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma
- Other bacterial intestinal infections
- Other diseases of digestive system
- Other diseases of intestine
- Other disorders of brain
- Other disorders of fluid, electrolyte and acid-base balance
- Other disorders of urinary system
- Other interstitial pulmonary diseases
- Other non-traumatic intracranial hemorrhage
- Paralytic ileus and intestinal obstruction without hernia
- Peritonitis
- Pleural effusion, not elsewhere classified
- Pneumonia
- Pneumonitis due to solids and liquids
- Post-procedural respiratory disorders, not elsewhere classified
- Pulmonary embolism
- Respiratory failure
- Secondary malignant neoplasm of other sites
- Secondary malignant neoplasm of respiratory and digestive organs
- Septicemia
- Shock, not elsewhere classified
- Stroke, not specified as hemorrhage or infarction
- Subarachnoid hemorrhage
- Unspecified dementia
- Unspecified renal failure
- Vascular disorders of intestine
- Volume depletion

By comparison, the measures published in the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* allow for the examination of hospital performance in specific and detailed areas, thus providing patients with a greater level of information regarding their particular interest or diagnosis and allowing providers greater insight into the areas of care that are of particular concern in their facilities. In



the latest year of data, 39 specific and well-defined indicators of quality of care are examined in The Fraser Institute's report. The composite measure published in the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008*, the Hospital Mortality Index (HMI), is also a more specific measure of mortality in acute-care hospitals than the CIHI's composite measure and includes only the following nine measures:

- Hip replacement mortality (IQI 14)
- Acute myocardial infarction mortality (IQI 15)
- Congestive heart failure mortality (IQI 16)
- Acute stroke mortality (IQI 17)
- Gastrointestinal hemorrhage mortality (IQI 18)
- Hip fracture mortality (IQI 19)
- Pneumonia mortality (IQI 20)
- Death in low mortality Diagnosis Related Groups (PSI 2)
- Failure to rescue rates (PSI 4)

Further, the *Hospital Standardized Mortality Ratio* (HSMR) is a relative measure, giving a measure of a hospital's or region's performance relative to Canada's performance as a whole in 2004. The indicator measures the ratio of the actual number of deaths for a hospital or region given its case mix (age, sex, length of stay, diagnosis group, etc. of its patients) to the number of deaths that would be expected according to national estimates in 2004. [14] Conversely, the 39 indicators published in the *Hospital Report Card* and the Hospital Mortality Index (HMI) composite measure give an absolute measure of patient safety or inpatient quality of care.

These significant differences in the approaches used by CIHI and the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* lead to the conclusion that the two measures cannot be compared with one another directly. Further, the relative rankings of hospitals are not necessarily comparable because of differences in what is being measured in the HSMR and the various indicators of the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* or the HMI composite measure, and because of the differences between an absolute and relative measure (i.e. for a given indicator, a hospital or region performing better than the Canadian average will not necessarily score highly if the Canadian average is low). In addition to these significant differences in approach is a difference in risk-adjustment methodologies: the indicators in the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* are risk-adjusted using the publicly-available 3M/AHRQ methodology/software and are not risk adjusted in the manner developed and employed by CIHI for the HSMR.

However, while the two sets of measures cannot be directly compared, it is nevertheless true that the HSMR provides a measure of hospital mortality that can be used in conjunction with the HMI and the other measures produced in the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008*. [15] Both sets of measures are based on an internationally validated and commonly applied methodology, and both sets of measures can provide patients and providers with insight into where mortality rates are unacceptably high or exceptionally low. [16] In this sense, the authors of this report welcome the CIHI's measure and hope that greater reporting of, and attention to, provider performances on mortality leads to improved outcomes from care for Canadians.

[14] The number of deaths is computed for the 65 diagnosis groups listed above, accounting for 80% of in-patient mortality.

[15] Note that the regional results published by CIHI are based on where patients were treated, while municipal measures published in the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* are based on where patients lived.

[16] It is worth noting that CIHI began working with the HSMR measure for Canada in 2005 while The Fraser Institute's research program on the *Hospital Report Card* began in 2004. Further, The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: Ontario 2008* was the first publicly available report in Canada that allowed the comparison of mortality rates in Canadian hospitals based on a standardized measure. A significant advantage of the CIHI's report over the *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2006* is that it names all hospitals for which data is published while many hospitals in Ontario elected to remain unnamed in the report produced by The Fraser Institute.

## What Are the Measurable Impacts of Patient Safety and Hospital Report Cards?

In the United States, hospital report cards have had a number of measurable impacts on performance and the quality of patient care. The first and most notable example came from the *New York State Cardiac Surgery Report*. Hannen et al. (1994) reported an associated 41% decline in the risk-adjusted mortality rate of Coronary Artery Bypass Graft patients with the publication of these outcomes statistics and data. A similar overall trend was experienced in Pennsylvania and New Jersey following the publication of their report cards. [17]

These findings have also created controversy about the Cardiac Surgery Reporting System, the database used to create the New York State Surgery Report. Critics have raised pertinent questions regarding “up-coding” [18] and the possibility that hospitals have decided not to operate on some complex and critically ill patients and have referred such complex cases to out-of-state jurisdictions (McKee and Healy, 2000). In contrast, using data from the *Cardiac Surgery Reporting System Report* (CSRS) for the period from 1991 to 1999, researchers at the National Bureau of Economic Research found that the reporting program had an impact on the volume of cases and the future quality at hospitals identified as poor performers. Those identified as weaker hospitals lost some relatively healthy patients to competing facilities with better records. Subsequently, these “weaker” hospitals experienced a decline of 10% in the number of patients during the first 12 months after an initial report, and this decrease remained in place for three years. Consequently, patients choosing these hospitals demonstrated a decrease in their risk-adjusted mortality rate by approximately 1.2 percentage points (Cutler et al., 2004). [19]

Though subject to a number of caveats regarding the design and structure, report cards have had a beneficial impact on the quality of healthcare delivery in those regions where they are published.

### The Fraser Institute’s Hospital Report Card

The primary focus of this project was the construction of a patient-friendly hospital and patient-care report card focused on clinical outcomes. The report itself includes information about all acute-care facilities treating patients in British Columbia, none of which (out of a total of 95) are identified in the report. [20] The report is built on a recognized hospital report card methodology from the Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality (AHRQ) in the United States and is used in more than 12 US States including New York, Texas, Colorado, [21] California, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, Vermont, and parts of Wisconsin.

[17] For Pennsylvania data, see Cardiac Care: Pennsylvania’s Guide to Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery 1994–1995, <<http://www.phc4.org/reports/cabg9495/default.htm>> (April 2, 2002). For New Jersey data, see Cardiac Surgery in New Jersey: Technical Report, <[http://www.state.nj.us/health/hcsa/cabgs01/cabg\\_technical01.pdf](http://www.state.nj.us/health/hcsa/cabgs01/cabg_technical01.pdf)> (April 2, 2002). For the northern New England initiative, see G.T. O’Connor et al., “A Regional Intervention to Improve the Hospital Mortality Associated with Coronary.”

[18] “Up-coding” is a term used to describe when financial incentives cause a physician or hospital to exaggerate or falsely represent patients’ medical conditions and services provided in order to increase payment received from the government.

[19] <<http://papers.nber.org/papers/w10489>>.

[20] Facilities in British Columbia either declined or offered no response to our requests for participation/identification.

[21] New York <<http://www.myhealthfinder.com/newyork05/glancechoose.htm>>; Texas <<http://www.dshs.state.tx.us/THCIC/Publications/Hospitals/IQIReport2003/IQIReport2003.shtm>>; Colorado <<http://www.hospitalquality.org>>.

## 1 What Are the AHRQ Inpatient Quality and Patient Safety Indicators?

The first stage of the research process in producing this report was to acquire or create a methodology that was reliable, easily understood by the public and participants, and that produced an accurate measurement of provider performance. An initial period of examining performance indicator frameworks from earlier literature on hospital report cards provided a number of different examples of accepted and proven methodologies that were not otherwise proprietary information and thus could be employed by The Fraser Institute. [22] The search also turned up methodologies that, though available, would be less effective in providing a patient-friendly clinical outcomes-focused hospital report card.

Further examination of these available methodologies led to the selection of the performance indicator framework developed by AHRQ in the United States. [23] AHRQ's indicator modules were chosen because they represent a comprehensive set of indicators that are widely used, highly regarded, and applicable to any hospital inpatient administrative data. They are readily available and relatively inexpensive to use. Importantly, they comprise an ideal set of indicators to allow a patient-friendly, clinical outcomes-focused, hospital-specific patient care report card.

The AHRQ indicators date from the mid-1990s when AHRQ developed a set of quality measures, or indicators, that required only the information found in routine hospital administrative data: diagnoses and procedures codes, patient age, gender, other basic demographic and personal information, source of admission, and discharge status. These indicators, 33 in all, made up the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Quality Indicators, designed to be used by hospitals to assess their inpatient quality of care as well as by the State and community to assess access to primary care. [24] Although they could not be used to provide definitive measures of the quality of health care directly, they are used to provide indicators of healthcare quality. They serve as the basis for subsequent in-depth investigation of issues of quality and patient safety at the facility level.

In the years following the release of the HCUP, both the knowledge base regarding quality indicators increased and newer risk adjustment methods developed. Following input from then-current users, as well as advances in the specific indicators themselves, AHRQ underwrote a project to develop and further refine the original Quality Indicators. This project was undertaken by the University of California San Francisco-Stanford Evidence-based Practice Centre. The results of this research were the AHRQ Quality Indicators, which are currently used to measure hospital performance in more than 12 US States including New York, Texas, Colorado, California, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, Vermont and parts of Wisconsin.

### AHRQ indicators Are Organized in Four Modules [25]

[1] **Prevention Quality Indicators (PQIs)** [26] Consisting of ambulatory care sensitive conditions, these indicators pertain to hospital admissions that could have been prevented via high-quality outpatient care.

[22] For a clear example of how individual report card methodologies are proprietary, please refer to Healthgrades user agreement at <<http://www.healthgrades.com/aboutus/index.cfm?function=modnw&modtype=content&modact=UserAgreement>>.

[23] An agency of the US federal government's Department of Health and Human Services.

[24] Further information regarding the HCUP Quality Indicators can be found at <[http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/hcup\\_archive.htm](http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/hcup_archive.htm)>.

[25] The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* is composed of 39 indicators from the quality and safety modules of the AHRQ system (see Appendix E for a list of all indicators used in this report).

[26] The PQIs identify the quality of care for ambulatory care-sensitive conditions and are measures of the overall healthcare system. Since the *Hospital Report Card* was designed to analyze the care inside acute-care hospitals, the PQIs were omitted from this report.

**[2] Inpatient Quality Indicators (IQIs)** These indicators reflect the quality of care inside hospitals and include such items as inpatient mortality; the utilization of procedures where there are questions of misuse, overuse, or underuse; and volume of procedures from which evidence shows that a higher volume of procedures is associated with a lower rate of mortality.

**[3] Patient Safety Indicators (PSIs)** These indicators focus upon preventable instances of harm to patients such as complications arising from surgery and other iatrogenic [27] events.

**[4] Pediatric Quality Indicators (PDIs) [28]** These indicators examine the quality of pediatric inpatient care, as well as the quality of outpatient care that can be inferred from inpatient data, such as potentially preventable hospitalizations. [29]

The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card* uses the IQI and PSI indicators; it is made up of 39 of the 59 available indicators in these categories [30]. These two modules were chosen because of their widespread use and high quality record.

The AHRQ indicator modules are designed to be used with data from administrative databases in the United States, which themselves are primarily used by hospitals for billing purposes. This type of record, referred to as "administrative data" consists of diagnoses and procedures codes along with information about a patient's age, gender, and discharge status. The Canadian counterpart is the Canadian Institute for Health Information's Discharge Abstract Database (DAD), which contains demographic, personal, administrative, and clinical data for hospital discharges (inpatient acute, chronic, rehabilitation) and day surgeries.

The indicators in The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card* analyze nearly two million patient records extracted from the DAD for the period of fiscal years 2001/02 to 2005/06. The data are also risk-adjusted using the 3M™ All Patient Refined™ DRG (APR™-DRG) software, commonly recognized to be the gold-standard system for risk-adjusting hospital data [31]. The AHRQ IQIs were in fact designed to be used in conjunction with 3M™ All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Groups™ (APR™-DRG) software, which risk adjusts the IQIs for patients' clinical conditions and severity of illness or risk of mortality. Indeed, the version of the APR-DRG software built in to the AHRQ software was used for this report.

Participation in the report card project was not mandatory for hospitals in British Columbia. In the end, none of British Columbia's acute-care facilities, agreed to have their institution identified.

Since this report is based on administrative data, the results have limitations. Coding variations exist among hospitals and codes do not always provide specific details about a patient's condition at the time of admission or capture all that occurs during hospitalization. For these reasons, individual judgment often is required while reviewing the results from this report.

When reviewing mortality or other quality and patient safety measures, remember that medicine is not an exact science and death or complications will occur even when all standards of care are followed. Deciding on treatment

[27] An iatrogenic event is one that is inadvertently caused by a physician, a medical/surgical treatment, or a diagnostic procedure.

[28] The PDI module became available in February 2006 and was therefore not used in this first edition of the *Hospital Report Card* for British Columbia.

[29] For details, please see <[http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/pdi\\_download.htm](http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/pdi_download.htm)>.

[30] The 11 area indicators were not used. Out of the 48 provider indicators, 9 were dropped (see Appendix G for details).

[31] For further details, please refer to Appendix B and <[http://www.3m.com/us/healthcare/his/products/coding/refined\\_drg.jhtml](http://www.3m.com/us/healthcare/his/products/coding/refined_drg.jhtml)>.

options and choosing a hospital are decisions that should be made in consultation with a physician. It is not recommended to choose a hospital based solely on statistics and descriptions such as those given in this report.

## 2 Data Quality

CIHI's Discharge Abstract Database (DAD) contains information on hospital stays in Canada. Various CIHI publications note that the DAD is used extensively by a variety of stakeholder groups to monitor the use of acute-care health services, conduct analyses of health conditions and injuries, and increasingly to track patient outcomes. [32] The DAD is a major data source used to produce various CIHI reports, including annual reports on the performance of hospitals and the health care system and for seven of the health indicators adopted by the federal, provincial, and territorial governments. [33] These data have been used extensively in previous reports on health-care performance and form the basis for many journal articles. [34]

As the *Hospital Report 2006: Acute Care* notes, [35] using the same DAD data set underlying this report card, "the data are collected under consistent guidelines, by trained abstractors, in all acute care hospitals in Ontario. The data undergo extensive edit checks to improve accuracy, but all errors cannot be eliminated" (p. 6). However, in order to produce good information about data quality, CIHI established a comprehensive and systematic data-quality program, whose framework involves 24 characteristics relating to five data quality dimensions of accuracy, timeliness, relevance, comparability, and usability. [36]

There are a number of publications that have addressed data-quality issues, which are discussed in our report. Of note are CIHI's reabstraction studies that go back to the original patient charts and recode the information using a different set of expert coders. [37]

The reabstraction studies note the following rates of agreement between what was initially coded compared to what was coded on reabstraction:

- a) non-medical data: 96%–100%
- b) selection of intervention codes (procedure codes): 90%–95%
- c) selection of diagnosis codes: 83%–94%
- d) selection of most responsible diagnosis: 89%–92%
- e) typing of co-morbidities: pre-admit: 47%–69%; post-admit: 51%–69%
- f) diagnosis typing (which indicates the relationship of the diagnosis to the patient's stay in hospital) continues to present a problem; discrepancy rates have not diminished with adoption of ICD-10-CA.

The coding issues in points (e) and (f) do not affect our results since the most responsible diagnosis is coded with a high degree of agreement and the AHRQ indicators do not discriminate among diagnosis types. Overall, when the rates of agreement in the third year of this reabstraction study (performed on data coded

[32] DAD Data Quality Reabstraction study. Combined findings for FY 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. Dec 2002.

[33] DAD Data Quality Reabstraction study. Combined findings for FY 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. Dec 2002.

[34] A joint initiative of the Ontario Hospital Association and the Government of Ontario. *Hospital Report 2007: Acute care*. <[http://www.oha.com/Client/OHA/OHA\\_LP4W\\_LND\\_WebStation.nsf/resources/2007+Hospital+Reports/\\$file/OHA\\_Acute07\\_EN\\_final.pdf](http://www.oha.com/Client/OHA/OHA_LP4W_LND_WebStation.nsf/resources/2007+Hospital+Reports/$file/OHA_Acute07_EN_final.pdf)>.

[35] A joint initiative of the Ontario Hospital Association and the Government of Ontario. *Hospital Report 2006: Acute care*. <[http://www.oha.com/client/OHA/OHA\\_LP4W\\_LND\\_WebStation.nsf/resources/Hospital+Reports/\\$file/acute\\_report\\_2006.pdf](http://www.oha.com/client/OHA/OHA_LP4W_LND_WebStation.nsf/resources/Hospital+Reports/$file/acute_report_2006.pdf)>.

[36] The CIHI Data Quality Framework. June 2005 Revision.

[37] Reabstractors participating in the study were required to have several years of coding experience, experience coding in ICD-10-CA and CCI in particular, experience coding at a tertiary care centre, and attendance at specific CIHI educational workshops. They were also required to attend a one-week training session and to receive a passing score on the inter-rater test.

in ICD-10-CA) were compared to the rates of agreement of the previous years' data (coded in ICD-9-CCP), the rates were as good as, or better than, previous rates.

However, with regard to the coding of pneumonia, a potential data quality issue exists because some reabstraction coders selected pneumonia instead of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) as the most responsible diagnosis. [38] This could potentially create false positive results for Pneumonia mortality rate (IQI 20) since this indicator counts deaths due to pneumonia in situations where the primary diagnosis is a pneumonia diagnosis code. We have noted this proviso in our report.

With respect to specific conditions related to the health indicators examined, those that are procedure driven (i.e. Cesarean section, coronary artery bypass graft, and total knee replacement) were coded well with low discrepancy rates. The following had less than a 5% rate of discrepancy: Cesarean section, coronary artery bypass graft, hysterectomy, total knee replacement, vaginal birth after Cesarean, and total hip replacement. The following had greater than a 5% discrepancy: AMI (8.9%), hip fracture (6.0%), hospitalization due to pneumonia and influenza (6.9%), and injury hospitalization (5.3%). [39]

Discrepancy rates were noted in conditions that are diagnosis driven: acute myocardial infarction (AMI) [40], stroke, pneumonia, and COPD [41] (as described above). Only the pneumonia codes are potentially affected in our report.

Overall, according to CIHI, findings from their three-year DAD reabstraction studies "have confirmed the strengths of the database, while identifying limitations in certain areas resulting from inconsistencies in the coding of some data elements." [42] In addition, the findings from the inter-rater data (that is, comparison between reabstractors) were generally similar to the findings from the main study data (that is, comparison between original coder and reabstractor). This suggests that the database is coded as well as can be expected using existing approaches in the hospital system.

In addition to the aforementioned reabstraction studies, the OECD published a report [43] in support of the AHRQ patient safety indicator modules noting that "this set of measures represents an exciting development and their use should be tested in a variety of countries" (p. 11). Further, a recently released report by the Manitoba Center for Health Policy that used the AHRQ Patient Safety Indicators [44] noted two important advantages to using the AHRQ module. The first advantage is the breadth of coverage offered by the indicators in studying in-hospital patient safety. The second is that the AHRQ patient-safety indicators were developed to measure complications of hospital-based care among a group of patients for whom the complications seemed preventable or highly unlikely.

## References

Baker, G.R., et al. (1998-99). "Healthcare Performance Measurement in Canada: Who's Doing What?" *Hospital Quarterly* 2 (2): 22–26.

[38] Canadian Coding Standards for ICD-10-CA and CCI 2004.

[39] DAD Data Quality Reabstraction study. Combined findings for FY 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. Dec 2002.

[40] DAD Data Quality, Reabstraction Study Combined finding for Fiscal Years 1999/2000 and 2000/2001. CIHI 2002, pg 8.

[41] Data Quality of the DAD following the First year implementation of ICD-10-CA/CCI. September 2004.

[42] Data Quality of the DAD following the First year implementation of ICD10CA/CCI. September 2004: p.41.

[43] John Millar, Soeren Mattke, and the Members of the OECD Patient Safety Panel. *Selecting Indicators for Patient Safety at the Health Systems Level in OECD Countries*. <<http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/26/33878001.pdf>>.

[44] Bruce et al., 2006.

- Baker, G.R., et al. (2004). "The Canadian Adverse Events Study: The Incidence of Adverse Events among Hospital Patients in Canada." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 170 (11) (May).
- Berwick, D.M., and D.L. Wald (1990). "Hospital Leaders' Opinions of the HCFA Mortality Data." *JAMA* 263 (2): 247–49.
- Bruce, S., et al. (2006). *Application of Patient Safety Indicators in Manitoba: A First Look*. Manitoba Centre for Health Policy.
- Canadian Institute for Health Information [CIHI] (2007). *HSMR: A New Approach for Measuring Hospital Mortality Trends in Canada*. CIHI.
- Cutler, D.M., et al. (2004). "The Role of Information in Medical Markets: An Analysis of Publicly Reported Outcomes in Cardiac Surgery." Working Paper No. 10489 (May). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Esmail, Nadeem (2003). "Health Information in Hiding." *Fraser Forum* (May): 12–13.
- Esmail, Nadeem, and Michael Walker (2007). *How Good Is Canadian Health Care? 2007 Report. An International Comparison of Health Care Systems*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Esmail, Nadeem, and Michael Walker, with Margaret Bank (2007). *Waiting Your Turn: Hospital Waiting Lists in Canada, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Forster, A.J., et al. (2004). "Ottawa Hospital Patient Safety Study: Incidence and Timing of Adverse Events in Patients Admitted to a Canadian Teaching Hospital." *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 170 (8) (April).
- Hannan, E.L., et al. (1994). "Improving the Outcomes of Coronary Bypass Surgery in New York State." *JAMA* 271: 761–66.
- Hay Group (2005). *Annual Benchmarking Comparison of Canadian Hospitals*. The Hay Group and The Canadian Institute for Health Information. <<http://www.haygroup.ca/services/Benchmarking%20Health/2005/CIHI%202005%20C.pdf>>.
- Leyland, A.H., and F.A Boddy (1998). "League Tables and Acute Myocardial Infarction." *Lancet* 351 (9102): 555–58.
- London Department of Health (1998). "A First Class Service, Quality in the NHS."
- London Department of Health (1999). "The NHS Performance Assessment Framework."

Marshall, M.N., et al. (2003). "Public Reporting on Quality in the United States and the United Kingdom." *Health Affairs* (May/June): 136.

McKee, M., and J. Healy (2000). "Monitoring Hospital Performance." *Euro Observer* 2 (2): 2.

Mullins, Mark, Rena Menaker, and Nadeem Esmail (2006). *The Fraser Institute Hospital Report Card: Ontario 2006*. Revised Sept. 2007. The Fraser Institute. <[http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication\\_details.aspx?pubID=3149](http://www.fraserinstitute.org/commerce.web/publication_details.aspx?pubID=3149)>.

National Health Service (1991). "The Patient's Charter." <<http://www.pfc.org.uk/medical/pchrt-el.htm#foreword>>.

New York State Department of Health (2005). "Adult Cardiac Surgery in New State 2001–2003." October 2005. <[http://www.nyhealth.gov/nysdoh/heart/pdf/2001-2003\\_cabg.pdf](http://www.nyhealth.gov/nysdoh/heart/pdf/2001-2003_cabg.pdf)>.

Street, A. (2002). "The Resurrection of Hospital Mortality Statistics in England." *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy* 2: 104–10.

Woodward, Graham, Thérèse Stukel, Michael Schull, Nadia Gunraj, and Andreas Laupacis (2004). *Utilization of Ontario's Health System During the 2003 SARS Outbreak*. An ICES Investigative Report (May). Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences (ICES).

Zinman, D. (1991). "Heart Surgeons Rated. State Reveals Patient-mortality Records." *Newsday* (Dec): 34.



# Methodology Overview

All hospital data used in The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* are from the Discharge Abstract Database (DAD) that was purchased from the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). The DAD is an administrative database containing demographic, administrative, and clinical data for hospital discharges (inpatient acute, chronic, rehabilitation) and day surgeries. Only inpatient acute records were used in this report (see Appendix A for details on which DAD data fields were used).

CIHI is unable to release the identity of specific institutions in DAD data releases unless those institutions have explicitly granted permission to the researchers requesting the data. Unlike hospitals in Ontario, none of British Columbia's 95 acute-care hospitals granted The Fraser Institute authorization to identify their institution-specific discharge data in the DAD for the years from 2001/02 to 2005/06.

These records were then grouped into diagnosis-related groups (DRGs) using The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Grouper with Medicare Code Editor software. The program sorts patients' records into groups that are expected to have similar hospital resource use. The groupings are based on information extracted from diagnosis and procedure codes as well as the patients' age, sex, and the presence of complications or co-morbidities (see Appendix B for details). [1]


Since more specialized hospitals may treat more high-risk patients and some patients arrive at hospitals sicker than others, it is difficult to compare hospital mortality and utilization rates for patients with the same condition but a different health status. In order to compensate for this potential difference in hospital case mix, the international standard for risk adjustment, developed by 3M Corporation (for information, see <[http://www.3m.com/us/healthcare/his/products/coding/refined\\_drg.jhtml](http://www.3m.com/us/healthcare/his/products/coding/refined_drg.jhtml)>), was employed to risk-adjust the data. This was done to ensure that a hospital's final score reflected the performance grading that the hospital would have received if it had provided services to patients with the average mix of medical complications (see Appendix B for details).

The final step in the methodology was to produce separate indicators for hospital performance based on the methodology developed by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's (AHRQ) Evidence-Based Practice Center (EPC) at the University of California San Francisco-Stanford [2] (for information, see <<http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/>>; see Appendix C for details). AHRQ's indicator modules use readily available discharge data and were chosen because they have been demonstrated to be a concise and effective tool by which to inform patients' decision-making about their health care. They are currently used to measure hospital performance in more than 12 US states including New York, Texas, Colorado, California, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, Utah, Vermont and parts of Wisconsin. Figure 1 shows a graphical representation of the methodology.

[1] In order to use the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) Grouper with Medicare Code Editor as well as the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Inpatient Quality Indicators (IQI) and Patient Safety Indicators (PSI) modules, the diagnosis and procedure codes had to be translated from ICD10CA/CCI (ICD-10-CA is an enhanced version of ICD-10 developed by CIHI for morbidity classification in Canada; the companion classification to ICD-10-CA for coding procedures in Canada is CCI) to ICD-9-CM. Please see Appendix J for details.

[2] The AHRQ Quality Indicators were developed in response to the need for both multidimensional and accessible quality indicators. They include a family of measures that patients, providers, policymakers and researchers can use with easily accessible inpatient data to identify apparent variations in the quality of inpatient care.

Figure 1: Methodology Overview



The Fraser Institute's *Hospital Report Card: British Columbia 2008* comprises 39 indicators of the quality of inpatient care and patient safety (for a list of all indicators used in the report, see Appendix E).

Inpatient Quality Indicators (IQIs) reflect the quality of care inside hospitals and include mortality rates, the utilization of procedures (where there are questions of misuse, overuse, or underuse), and volume of procedures (for which evidence shows that a higher volume of procedures is associated with a lower rate of mortality).

Patient Safety Indicators (PSIs) focus on preventable complications acquired while in hospital, as well as adverse events following surgeries, procedures, and childbirth.

The indicators are expressed as observed rates (which are raw measures) and risk adjusted rates (incorporating patient severity and risk of mortality scores from the 3M™ software described above). IQI rates are expressed as rates per hundred patients while PSI rates are expressed per thousand. Each institution was also given a score from 0 to 100 for each indicator based on its risk-adjusted rate and was then ranked based on their scores (see Appendix F for details on calculating scores and ranks). [3]

A Hospital Mortality Index (HMI) was constructed to examine the overall performance of a hospital or municipality across mortality indicators. It consists of nine mortality indicators: *hip replacement mortality* (IQI 14), *acute myocardial infarction mortality* (IQI 15), *congestive heart failure mortality* (IQI 16), *acute stroke mortality* (IQI 17), *gastrointestinal hemorrhage mortality* (IQI 18), *hip fracture mortality* (IQI 19), *pneumonia mortality* (IQI 20), *low mortality DRGs* (PSI 2) and *failure to rescue rates* (PSI 4). The final HMI index score is based on an equal-weight construct of the separate indicators. For an indicator to be included in the HMI, hospitals representing at least 75% of the patient sample for that year

[3] Ranks are not used for comparisons of hospitals across indicators as they are based on a varying number of hospitals. It is advisable to rely on the scores (as in the HMI) to examine the overall performance of a hospital across indicators. The HMI also has a fairly large number of hospitals so any bias is insignificant.

had to have measured data in order to ensure an adequate number of hospitals for comparison. For example, in 2005/06 an indicator had to contain at least 291,785 records in order to be included in the HMI. [4] All institutions were ranked based on their HMI score, where the highest rank (1) corresponds to the highest score out of 100 (for details on calculating scores, ranks, the HMI, and rank of the HMI, please see Appendix F).

[4] The total number of patient records in 2005/06 was 389,047.

Throughout the *Hospital Report Card*, several measures were taken in order to protect patient confidentiality. First, patient identifiers such as patients' names and addresses were removed prior to The Fraser Institute accessing the dataset. Also, postal codes were truncated to Forward Sortation Areas (FSAs) and grouped into municipalities in order to assess and compare care received by patients from those jurisdictions (please see Appendix H for details). Furthermore, results were omitted from publication if the patient population in any given indicator was less than, or equal to, 5 in any institution and/or municipality.

## Legend for Sample Table

Use the sample table (p. 27) and the explanations below to help you understand how each indicator is displayed in the data tables of the *Hospital Report Card*.

[A] The name of the Inpatient Quality Indicator (IQI) or Patient Safety Indicator (PSI) from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). [5]

[5] Please see Appendix E for a complete list of the indicators used in the *Hospital Report Card*.

[B] All indicators were expressed as:

[a] an Observed Rate (which are raw measures)

[b] a Risk Adjusted Rate (incorporating patient severity and risk of mortality scores from 3M™ All Patient Refined Diagnosis Related Groups [APR™-DRG] Software) [6]

[6] Please see Appendix B for details.

[c] a Score [7]

[7] Please see Appendix F for details on calculating scores, ranks, HMI, and rank of the HMI.

[d] a Rank

Two additional measures were calculated to examine the overall performance of a hospital or municipality across mortality indicators: a Hospital Mortality Index (HMI) and a Rank of the Hospital Mortality Index.

[C] Indicators are stratified by Institution and by Municipality. [8]

[8] Postal Codes were truncated to Forward Sortation Areas (FSAs) before The Fraser Institute accessed the dataset. All patient FSAs were grouped into corresponding municipalities as described by Canada Post. Please see Appendix H for details.


[D] All IQIs are expressed as percent. PSIs are expressed per thousand.

[E] All data used in the *Hospital Report Card* were extracted from the Discharge Abstract Database (DAD), which was purchased from CIHI for the period from Fiscal 2001 (April 1, 2001 to March 31, 2002) to Fiscal 2005 (April 1, 2005 to March 31, 2006).

[F] “—” indicates that either no data were available for that hospital for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator is 5).

[G] Indicators were calculated for all of British Columbia’s 95 acute-care hospitals. Since none of the acute-care hospitals consented to be identified in the *Hospital Report Card*, institution numbers from all acute-care hospitals were encrypted by the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) prior to delivery. We assigned these institutions an arbitrary number from Hospital 1 to Hospital 95.

[H] The average rate (Observed or Risk Adjusted) for all the acute-care hospitals in Ontario.



“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Esophageal Resection Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	—	—	—	—	—
Burnaby	—	—	—	—	—
Campbell River	—	—	—	—	—
Castlegar	—	—	—	—	—
Central Saanich	—	—	—	—	—
Chilliwack	—	—	—	—	—
Coquitlam	—	—	—	—	—
Courtenay	—	—	—	—	—
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	—	—	—	—
Delta	—	—	—	—	—
Duncan	—	—	—	—	—
Fort St John	—	—	—	—	—
Kamloops	—	—	—	—	—
Kelowna	—	—	—	—	—
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	—
Ladysmith	—	—	—	—	—
Lake Country	—	—	—	—	—
Langley	—	—	—	—	—
Maple Ridge	—	—	—	—	—
Merritt	—	—	—	—	—
Mission	—	—	—	—	—
Nanaimo	—	—	—	—	—
Nelson	—	—	—	—	—
New Westminster	—	—	—	—	—
Parksville	—	—	—	—	—
Penticton	—	—	—	—	—
Port Alberni	—	—	—	—	—
Port Coquitlam	—	—	—	—	—
Port Moody	—	—	—	—	—
Powell River	—	—	—	—	—
Prince George	—	—	—	—	—
Prince Rupert	—	—	—	—	—
Qualicum	—	—	—	—	—
Richmond	—	—	—	—	—
Salmon Arm	—	—	—	—	—
Salt Spring	—	—	—	—	—
Sidney	—	—	—	—	—
Surrey	—	—	1	—	—
Terrace	—	—	—	—	—
Trail	—	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Esophageal Resection Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	1	2	—	1	1
Vernon	—	—	—	—	—
Victoria	—	—	3	—	—
White Rock	—	—	—	—	—
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	—	—	—	—	—
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	—	1	1	1	1
Other	—	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Pancreatic Resection Surgery Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	—	—	—	—	—
Burnaby	—	—	—	—	—
Campbell River	—	—	—	—	—
Castlegar	—	—	—	—	—
Central Saanich	—	—	—	—	—
Chilliwack	—	—	—	—	—
Coquitlam	—	—	—	—	—
Courtenay	—	—	—	—	—
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	—	—	—	—
Delta	—	—	—	—	—
Duncan	—	—	—	—	—
Fort St John	—	—	—	—	—
Kamloops	—	—	—	—	—
Kelowna	—	—	—	—	5
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	—
Ladysmith	—	—	—	—	—
Lake Country	—	—	—	—	—
Langley	—	—	—	—	—
Maple Ridge	—	—	—	—	—
Merritt	—	—	—	—	—
Mission	—	—	—	—	—
Nanaimo	—	—	—	—	—
Nelson	—	—	—	—	—
New Westminster	—	—	—	—	—
Parksville	—	—	—	—	—
Penticton	—	—	—	—	—
Port Alberni	—	—	—	—	—
Port Coquitlam	—	—	—	—	—
Port Moody	—	—	—	—	—
Powell River	—	—	—	—	—
Prince George	—	—	—	—	—
Prince Rupert	—	—	—	—	—
Qualicum	—	—	—	—	—
Richmond	—	—	—	—	—
Salmon Arm	—	—	—	—	—
Salt Spring	—	—	—	—	—
Sidney	—	—	—	—	—
Surrey	—	—	1	3	1
Terrace	—	—	—	—	—
Trail	—	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Pancreatic Resection Surgery Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	1	1	4	1	4
Vernon	—	—	—	—	—
Victoria	—	3	1	1	1
White Rock	—	—	—	—	—
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	—	—	—	—	—
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	2	2	1	4	1
Other	—	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	35	37	46	39	37
Burnaby	27	36	1	26	22
Campbell River	32	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	1	—	1	1	1
Central Saanich	41	39	1	1	1
Chilliwack	1	30	43	41	25
Coquitlam	24	29	47	1	38
Courtenay	33	1	1	1	40
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	—	1	—	—
Delta	26	33	1	29	23
Duncan	29	1	1	43	1
Fort St John	—	—	1	1	—
Kamloops	1	23	33	38	31
Kelowna	28	1	29	1	35
Kitimat	—	1	1	1	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	1	—	1
Langley	1	19	41	44	1
Maple Ridge	39	34	1	46	42
Merritt	—	—	1	1	1
Mission	1	38	1	45	1
Nanaimo	1	21	30	25	39
Nelson	1	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	34	24	44	42	44
Parksville	1	26	1	35	1
Penticton	1	1	39	1	1
Port Alberni	40	1	1	1	1
Port Coquitlam	1	35	42	34	26
Port Moody	1	1	1	1	1
Powell River	1	41	1	36	28
Prince George	1	1	1	24	33
Prince Rupert	43	—	1	1	32
Qualicum	42	1	35	1	1
Richmond	36	31	32	33	30
Salmon Arm	1	41	1	1	1
Salt Spring	1	—	1	1	—
Sidney	1	40	1	40	45
Surrey	25	27	34	32	29
Terrace	1	1	1	1	1
Trail	1	1	—	37	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	37	22	36	30	27
Vernon	1	1	38	1	41
Victoria	31	28	37	31	34
White Rock	23	20	45	1	43
Whitehorse	—	32	1	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	1	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	30	18	31	27	36
Other	38	25	40	28	24

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Craniotomy Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	1	22	21	21	21
Burnaby	15	18	20	18	19
Campbell River	1	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	—	—	—	—	1
Central Saanich	—	1	1	—	—
Chilliwack	29	25	18	20	1
Coquitlam	11	29	1	1	1
Courtenay	1	19	1	1	1
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	—	—	—	—
Delta	1	1	24	28	20
Duncan	22	1	28	33	34
Fort St John	—	—	—	—	—
Kamloops	23	27	15	22	1
Kelowna	16	17	17	34	27
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	1
Ladysmith	—	—	—	—	—
Lake Country	—	—	1	—	—
Langley	1	1	30	30	1
Maple Ridge	1	14	23	1	26
Merritt	—	—	1	—	—
Mission	25	1	1	1	1
Nanaimo	12	12	1	1	33
Nelson	—	—	—	—	—
New Westminster	28	24	27	19	32
Parksville	—	—	26	23	1
Penticton	17	13	1	1	1
Port Alberni	26	—	1	1	1
Port Coquitlam	20	1	33	24	1
Port Moody	1	—	—	1	—
Powell River	24	31	—	1	—
Prince George	1	26	32	1	1
Prince Rupert	—	—	—	—	—
Qualicum	—	—	—	1	—
Richmond	27	1	19	29	1
Salmon Arm	—	1	—	—	1
Salt Spring	—	28	1	—	—
Sidney	30	30	31	1	24
Surrey	18	20	14	1	22
Terrace	—	—	—	1	1
Trail	—	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Craniotomy Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	14	16	25	25	25
Vernon	1	1	1	1	23
Victoria	21	23	29	32	31
White Rock	1	11	13	26	29
Whitehorse	—	—	—	1	1
Williams Lake	—	—	—	—	—
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	19	21	22	27	28
Other	13	15	16	31	30

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Hip Replacement Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	1	1	1	1	1
Burnaby	1	1	1	45	1
Campbell River	1	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	—	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	45
Chilliwack	1	1	1	1	1
Coquitlam	1	1	1	1	1
Courtenay	1	1	47	47	1
Cranbrook	1	1	1	1	1
Dawson	1	1	1	1	1
Delta	1	1	1	1	1
Duncan	1	1	1	1	1
Fort St John	—	—	1	—	1
Kamloops	1	1	1	44	1
Kelowna	43	1	1	1	47
Kitimat	—	—	1	—	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	—	—	1	46	1
Langley	1	1	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	44	1	48	1	48
Merritt	1	—	1	1	—
Mission	1	1	1	1	1
Nanaimo	1	41	1	1	1
Nelson	1	—	1	1	1
New Westminster	1	1	1	1	1
Parksville	1	1	1	1	1
Penticton	1	1	1	1	1
Port Alberni	1	1	46	1	1
Port Coquitlam	1	1	45	1	1
Port Moody	1	1	1	1	1
Powell River	1	1	1	1	1
Prince George	1	1	1	42	1
Prince Rupert	1	—	1	1	1
Qualicum	1	1	1	1	1
Richmond	1	1	1	1	44
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	1	1
Salt Spring	1	1	1	1	1
Sidney	1	1	1	1	1
Surrey	42	42	1	1	1
Terrace	—	—	—	1	1
Trail	1	1	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Hip Replacement Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	40	38	1	43	1
Vernon	1	1	1	1	1
Victoria	1	39	1	1	1
White Rock	1	1	1	1	1
Whitehorse	1	1	1	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	1	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	41	40	44	41	1
Other	1	1	1	1	46

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	35	38	46	43	40
Burnaby	32	24	22	29	28
Campbell River	45	46	2	15	6
Castlegar	48	48	15	28	9
Central Saanich	28	31	6	32	5
Chilliwack	39	34	16	39	26
Coquitlam	13	11	25	45	24
Courtenay	36	9	13	25	17
Cranbrook	22	44	14	14	44
Dawson	47	37	40	1	18
Delta	7	27	33	44	4
Duncan	14	20	3	8	20
Fort St John	33	8	10	1	34
Kamloops	25	10	7	31	35
Kelowna	11	19	28	12	22
Kitimat	44	47	48	48	37
Ladysmith	6	36	19	33	1
Lake Country	38	6	17	1	48
Langley	27	23	38	47	42
Maple Ridge	40	45	47	38	41
Merritt	5	43	8	1	43
Mission	49	30	41	7	46
Nanaimo	30	14	18	9	12
Nelson	24	40	44	34	14
New Westminster	18	25	45	16	21
Parksville	20	13	11	36	7
Penticton	34	35	37	10	19
Port Alberni	4	42	35	35	31
Port Coquitlam	16	12	39	41	8
Port Moody	31	1	1	19	1
Powell River	10	5	23	40	30
Prince George	1	4	9	6	13
Prince Rupert	43	18	42	18	39
Qualicum	12	7	4	22	10
Richmond	15	17	34	30	32
Salmon Arm	46	33	43	5	45
Salt Spring	2	26	5	46	47
Sidney	21	39	20	20	27
Surrey	9	15	32	26	25
Terrace	3	32	12	37	36
Trail	42	1	21	42	3

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	17	16	26	23	23
Vernon	19	41	27	11	29
Victoria	29	22	29	17	15
White Rock	23	21	31	27	38
Whitehorse	8	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	41	1	30	21	11
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	37	28	24	13	33
Other	26	29	36	24	16

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Congestive Heart Failure (CHF) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	31	27	18	35	31
Burnaby	23	11	24	18	34
Campbell River	35	9	39	30	38
Castlegar	5	42	43	3	33
Central Saanich	20	16	7	7	42
Chilliwack	43	13	11	43	40
Coquitlam	40	4	26	28	19
Courtenay	46	47	42	39	36
Cranbrook	6	15	34	8	41
Dawson	36	48	45	45	10
Delta	29	5	33	23	21
Duncan	37	35	30	46	14
Fort St John	1	34	35	1	6
Kamloops	34	36	20	34	27
Kelowna	13	18	6	20	30
Kitimat	22	39	40	32	44
Ladysmith	47	21	48	19	47
Lake Country	28	1	46	33	48
Langley	19	6	22	6	18
Maple Ridge	41	37	5	29	37
Merritt	44	38	9	16	3
Mission	32	40	36	41	29
Nanaimo	17	30	14	38	35
Nelson	7	3	3	31	4
New Westminster	16	29	37	26	17
Parksville	15	10	25	12	28
Penticton	3	26	8	9	5
Port Alberni	14	24	32	42	15
Port Coquitlam	21	14	41	40	13
Port Moody	48	46	1	4	45
Powell River	26	17	29	15	9
Prince George	10	7	15	11	8
Prince Rupert	42	45	17	17	2
Qualicum	4	22	47	14	11
Richmond	27	12	38	47	32
Salmon Arm	45	43	28	44	7
Salt Spring	1	23	2	37	1
Sidney	38	1	12	5	22
Surrey	12	28	23	22	26
Terrace	39	20	44	48	46
Trail	25	44	27	21	39

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Congestive Heart Failure (CHF) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	11	19	10	13	12
Vernon	24	32	4	25	20
Victoria	18	31	16	10	25
White Rock	8	41	31	27	23
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	33	8	19	2	43
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	30	33	21	24	24
Other	9	25	13	36	16

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Stroke Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	4	33	38	9	38
Burnaby	5	4	19	7	8
Campbell River	22	43	18	39	23
Castlegar	45	39	43	37	—
Central Saanich	38	13	1	28	27
Chilliwack	35	22	28	31	10
Coquitlam	25	23	7	8	17
Courtenay	40	35	39	44	35
Cranbrook	46	2	44	41	41
Dawson	23	5	16	42	39
Delta	6	14	23	12	12
Duncan	41	31	36	30	28
Fort St John	—	—	47	—	—
Kamloops	26	12	12	33	13
Kelowna	34	26	37	32	40
Kitimat	3	46	2	10	1
Ladysmith	21	—	48	40	7
Lake Country	42	45	41	3	37
Langley	24	29	40	35	3
Maple Ridge	12	15	26	22	18
Merritt	43	44	11	—	—
Mission	37	9	42	17	4
Nanaimo	32	28	25	34	20
Nelson	30	6	3	36	32
New Westminster	15	10	15	6	33
Parksville	39	3	32	4	24
Penticton	14	11	30	18	11
Port Alberni	47	34	46	45	6
Port Coquitlam	10	21	29	20	26
Port Moody	1	27	6	1	41
Powell River	27	38	10	2	—
Prince George	28	8	14	5	14
Prince Rupert	36	42	4	38	1
Qualicum	11	19	24	26	34
Richmond	17	18	13	23	21
Salmon Arm	20	40	20	19	22
Salt Spring	44	1	5	43	41
Sidney	13	36	9	15	29
Surrey	16	17	21	13	19
Terrace	31	41	8	16	5
Trail	33	37	45	25	16

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Stroke Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	9	7	17	11	9
Vernon	7	30	27	27	15
Victoria	19	25	35	21	36
White Rock	18	24	31	24	31
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	1	20	34	—	—
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	29	32	33	29	25
Other	8	16	22	14	30

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Gastrointestinal Hemorrhage Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	34	14	23	36	31
Burnaby	27	16	12	28	48
Campbell River	1	17	37	43	17
Castlegar	45	47	1	37	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	47
Chilliwack	35	28	10	14	22
Coquitlam	16	18	38	30	40
Courtenay	13	26	22	23	16
Cranbrook	40	39	34	31	1
Dawson	46	1	43	1	1
Delta	31	35	24	22	19
Duncan	42	23	19	42	15
Fort St John	1	1	1	1	32
Kamloops	10	34	39	21	37
Kelowna	11	31	36	15	23
Kitimat	24	1	45	1	1
Ladysmith	43	46	47	32	46
Lake Country	48	48	42	1	20
Langley	30	36	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	19	44	11	33	33
Merritt	1	1	32	48	1
Mission	44	22	1	45	43
Nanaimo	29	13	28	16	35
Nelson	32	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	38	41	40	19	36
Parksville	21	40	14	40	34
Penticton	41	38	30	20	13
Port Alberni	23	37	16	41	24
Port Coquitlam	18	11	1	1	42
Port Moody	1	1	48	1	1
Powell River	20	33	18	1	1
Prince George	28	20	35	46	18
Prince Rupert	1	1	25	47	21
Qualicum	14	30	44	44	28
Richmond	22	12	33	35	41
Salmon Arm	25	45	46	1	45
Salt Spring	47	1	41	38	1
Sidney	1	43	20	17	1
Surrey	36	15	17	27	27
Terrace	39	1	1	1	39
Trail	1	29	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Gastrointestinal Hemorrhage Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	33	25	31	34	29
Vernon	26	32	26	29	44
Victoria	15	24	21	18	25
White Rock	37	27	29	26	30
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	1	42	27	39	38
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	17	19	13	24	26
Other	12	21	15	25	14

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Hip Fracture Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	35	34	22	41	40
Burnaby	27	16	16	24	35
Campbell River	17	8	17	28	1
Castlegar	33	44	1	1	1
Central Saanich	1	31	29	34	1
Chilliwack	21	27	10	39	24
Coquitlam	24	17	13	9	36
Courtenay	1	25	41	40	25
Cranbrook	41	20	30	6	46
Dawson	44	9	1	35	47
Delta	10	10	26	11	23
Duncan	43	35	31	7	28
Fort St John	45	1	—	1	1
Kamloops	11	23	20	23	37
Kelowna	20	21	18	21	16
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	—
Ladysmith	1	—	40	—	18
Lake Country	—	1	1	1	1
Langley	39	38	45	36	31
Maple Ridge	23	13	39	38	29
Merritt	12	—	1	—	21
Mission	1	1	23	1	17
Nanaimo	34	36	36	33	26
Nelson	30	1	1	30	1
New Westminster	31	32	12	26	43
Parksville	18	12	42	15	13
Penticton	8	28	11	27	33
Port Alberni	1	7	37	32	1
Port Coquitlam	9	24	35	31	45
Port Moody	13	1	43	1	1
Powell River	28	39	9	17	1
Prince George	19	15	19	37	39
Prince Rupert	1	42	—	—	1
Qualicum	42	41	44	8	41
Richmond	38	29	33	18	20
Salmon Arm	14	37	1	14	38
Salt Spring	22	1	15	12	14
Sidney	36	40	28	13	34
Surrey	32	33	24	20	30
Terrace	1	43	27	—	1
Trail	16	11	1	42	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Hip Fracture Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	26	22	34	22	27
Vernon	25	30	21	29	22
Victoria	29	26	25	19	32
White Rock	37	18	38	25	44
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	—	—	1	—	42
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	15	19	14	10	15
Other	40	14	32	16	19

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Pneumonia Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	31	25	39	22	32
Burnaby	39	34	32	39	7
Campbell River	4	43	3	5	5
Castlegar	10	6	25	15	37
Central Saanich	28	1	45	19	25
Chilliwack	40	32	42	36	35
Coquitlam	17	7	9	44	30
Courtenay	25	45	43	8	17
Cranbrook	12	44	8	3	40
Dawson	9	24	48	12	47
Delta	8	21	5	35	14
Duncan	44	40	17	40	34
Fort St John	29	19	13	29	3
Kamloops	23	17	11	9	9
Kelowna	14	26	19	30	28
Kitimat	1	1	47	13	36
Ladysmith	22	5	4	37	44
Lake Country	6	39	1	—	29
Langley	27	47	46	42	6
Maple Ridge	42	30	33	24	20
Merritt	34	15	22	26	4
Mission	33	4	41	43	42
Nanaimo	20	18	12	17	27
Nelson	30	8	30	4	45
New Westminster	18	31	29	38	38
Parksville	35	37	10	32	41
Penticton	5	12	6	2	18
Port Alberni	47	14	35	46	24
Port Coquitlam	37	36	23	25	39
Port Moody	3	48	21	6	46
Powell River	46	38	18	18	26
Prince George	43	3	28	16	23
Prince Rupert	41	23	14	11	1
Qualicum	38	35	34	1	31
Richmond	21	13	40	41	33
Salmon Arm	45	42	37	45	43
Salt Spring	7	41	2	34	48
Sidney	2	28	31	14	15
Surrey	36	20	36	31	21
Terrace	48	46	44	47	11
Trail	11	11	38	10	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Pneumonia Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	26	22	24	23	12
Vernon	15	10	7	20	8
Victoria	24	29	20	7	19
White Rock	16	33	26	33	13
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	13	9	16	27	22
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	19	27	27	21	16
Other	32	16	15	28	10

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty (PTCA) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	29	38	1	47	1
Burnaby	1	31	39	32	41
Campbell River	36	41	1	1	34
Castlegar	1	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	37	1
Chilliwack	1	33	1	43	47
Coquitlam	1	39	37	36	32
Courtenay	1	1	1	1	31
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	1	1	31	1
Delta	27	48	45	40	1
Duncan	1	34	41	48	1
Fort St John	—	1	1	1	46
Kamloops	32	1	36	1	1
Kelowna	1	26	1	29	1
Kitimat	1	1	1	1	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	1	1	1
Langley	1	28	1	42	1
Maple Ridge	31	30	1	35	43
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	45	29	44	1	48
Nanaimo	30	32	42	34	28
Nelson	1	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	33	42	43	33	35
Parksville	1	27	32	46	40
Penticton	44	1	1	1	1
Port Alberni	1	44	1	45	1
Port Coquitlam	39	46	46	44	36
Port Moody	46	1	1	41	1
Powell River	1	45	1	1	1
Prince George	1	1	1	27	29
Prince Rupert	1	1	1	1	44
Qualicum	1	1	1	1	1
Richmond	37	47	40	1	45
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	1	1
Salt Spring	43	1	1	1	1
Sidney	34	40	1	26	30
Surrey	1	24	38	38	27
Terrace	1	1	1	1	1
Trail	1	1	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Percutaneous Transluminal Coronary Angioplasty (PTCA) Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	35	36	33	30	38
Vernon	1	1	35	1	33
Victoria	38	37	34	25	37
White Rock	42	43	1	39	42
Whitehorse	41	1	48	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	47	1	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	28	25	30	24	26
Other	40	35	31	28	39

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Carotid Endarterectomy Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2004–2005
Abbotsford	1	1	29	1	1
Burnaby	1	25	1	1	1
Campbell River	1	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	—	—	—	1	—
Central Saanich	1	1	1	—	1
Chilliwack	1	1	1	1	1
Coquitlam	1	27	31	1	1
Courtenay	1	1	1	1	1
Cranbrook	—	—	—	—	—
Dawson	—	—	—	—	—
Delta	31	1	1	1	32
Duncan	1	1	—	—	1
Fort St John	—	—	—	—	—
Kamloops	1	1	1	1	1
Kelowna	1	29	1	34	1
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	—
Ladysmith	—	—	—	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	1	1	—
Langley	1	—	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	1	1	1	1	1
Merritt	—	—	—	—	—
Mission	1	1	1	1	1
Nanaimo	1	1	1	1	1
Nelson	—	—	—	—	—
New Westminster	1	21	1	1	31
Parksville	1	1	1	1	1
Penticton	1	1	1	1	1
Port Alberni	1	—	—	1	1
Port Coquitlam	32	1	1	1	1
Port Moody	—	1	—	1	—
Powell River	—	—	—	1	—
Prince George	1	—	1	1	1
Prince Rupert	—	—	—	—	—
Qualicum	1	—	1	1	1
Richmond	1	28	1	1	1
Salmon Arm	—	—	—	—	—
Salt Spring	—	—	—	—	—
Sidney	30	1	1	1	1
Surrey	28	1	1	33	1
Terrace	—	—	—	—	—
Trail	1	—	—	—	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Carotid Endarterectomy Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2004–2005
Vancouver	29	26	28	1	1
Vernon	1	1	1	1	1
Victoria	26	24	1	31	1
White Rock	1	23	1	1	1
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	—	—	30	—	—
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	27	22	1	32	30
Other	33	1	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI), without Transfer Cases Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	34	36	45	38	40
Burnaby	30	23	23	32	25
Campbell River	40	41	3	33	6
Castlegar	47	40	17	25	10
Central Saanich	27	31	7	29	5
Chilliwack	37	33	16	35	30
Coquitlam	11	12	27	44	26
Courtenay	32	7	14	23	18
Cranbrook	19	44	15	18	42
Dawson	46	48	41	1	15
Delta	9	29	36	40	7
Duncan	12	15	4	6	17
Fort St John	33	19	10	1	36
Kamloops	21	11	8	28	34
Kelowna	7	18	24	13	16
Kitimat	45	24	48	47	47
Ladysmith	6	37	30	34	1
Lake Country	35	6	18	1	46
Langley	28	21	38	45	41
Maple Ridge	42	47	47	36	38
Merritt	15	46	1	—	—
Mission	48	25	44	10	45
Nanaimo	26	13	12	8	8
Nelson	24	42	39	46	27
New Westminster	18	28	43	16	11
Parksville	16	9	11	30	4
Penticton	31	30	37	9	19
Port Alberni	5	38	34	31	28
Port Coquitlam	25	10	40	37	20
Port Moody	38	1	1	1	1
Powell River	13	5	19	39	31
Prince George	1	4	9	7	21
Prince Rupert	41	43	46	17	37
Qualicum	10	8	5	12	9
Richmond	14	14	35	26	33
Salmon Arm	43	32	42	5	43
Salt Spring	2	34	6	43	44
Sidney	4	39	20	19	22
Surrey	8	17	33	24	29
Terrace	3	27	13	41	39
Trail	39	1	21	42	3

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI), without Transfer Cases Mortality: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	17	16	25	22	23
Vernon	20	45	22	11	24
Victoria	22	20	29	15	13
White Rock	23	22	31	27	35
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	44	1	28	20	12
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	36	35	26	14	32
Other	29	26	32	21	14

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Cesarean Section Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	14	23	17	25	23
Burnaby	9	1	13	13	6
Campbell River	45	22	45	46	45
Castlegar	3	19	6	24	42
Central Saanich	20	38	23	33	10
Chilliwack	37	37	25	37	21
Coquitlam	17	5	22	17	25
Courtenay	4	12	15	12	7
Cranbrook	1	28	38	47	35
Dawson	18	26	4	9	15
Delta	13	21	27	31	20
Duncan	22	6	14	2	4
Fort St John	42	44	39	39	32
Kamloops	40	34	40	36	47
Kelowna	11	16	21	35	33
Kitimat	48	48	48	48	43
Ladysmith	32	40	36	10	34
Lake Country	36	2	31	22	3
Langley	15	13	5	16	29
Maple Ridge	34	3	29	29	22
Merritt	6	33	41	42	48
Mission	16	10	11	21	13
Nanaimo	31	31	30	30	40
Nelson	10	18	19	1	2
New Westminster	7	14	9	8	9
Parksville	24	47	44	23	46
Penticton	2	35	3	14	5
Port Alberni	39	8	32	38	39
Port Coquitlam	21	15	10	18	17
Port Moody	12	24	34	6	12
Powell River	46	41	46	43	44
Prince George	38	30	28	20	27
Prince Rupert	5	20	2	11	28
Qualicum	33	43	12	41	11
Richmond	23	7	18	4	18
Salmon Arm	44	46	43	45	37
Salt Spring	27	11	8	5	41
Sidney	41	9	33	3	14
Surrey	19	17	24	26	24
Terrace	43	42	42	15	26
Trail	35	39	1	19	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Cesarean Section Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	8	4	7	7	8
Vernon	25	36	37	27	38
Victoria	30	32	35	40	36
White Rock	29	27	16	34	31
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	47	45	47	44	16
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	28	29	26	32	30
Other	26	25	20	28	19

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Vaginal Birth after Cesarean Section (VBAC) Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	22	37	26	20	22
Burnaby	21	19	36	34	34
Campbell river	7	31	39	3	19
Castlegar	42	41	13	13	1
Central Saanich	8	45	7	43	35
Chilliwack	29	9	45	21	38
Coquitlam	20	5	4	19	11
Courtenay	43	35	27	8	45
Cranbrook	30	18	3	39	6
Dawson	39	6	6	31	36
Delta	25	39	23	36	12
Duncan	46	11	32	23	28
Fort St John	4	25	40	11	24
Kamloops	40	38	28	26	21
Kelowna	36	36	41	28	39
Kitimat	31	43	38	30	1
Ladysmith	14	1	1	5	1
Lake Country	41	44	44	48	47
Langley	27	16	12	27	46
Maple Ridge	10	10	9	12	10
Merritt	19	23	17	1	41
Mission	6	28	33	41	23
Nanaimo	37	24	14	37	20
Nelson	15	42	1	4	31
New Westminster	24	20	19	15	33
Parksville	1	15	46	47	15
Penticton	38	17	22	22	43
Port Alberni	13	30	5	1	17
Port Coquitlam	16	12	10	10	13
Port Moody	9	32	11	7	14
Powell River	32	46	8	6	40
Prince George	34	40	25	24	30
Prince Rupert	5	13	34	14	8
Qualicum	1	48	47	25	1
Richmond	12	14	21	33	26
Salmon Arm	47	1	43	44	7
Salt Spring	35	1	31	45	1
Sidney	11	29	37	32	9
Surrey	18	8	16	17	25
Terrace	23	7	15	38	18
Trail	1	1	24	42	29

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Vaginal Birth after Cesarean Section (VBAC) Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	26	22	18	18	32
Vernon	44	26	48	9	44
Victoria	17	21	20	16	16
White Rock	28	27	35	40	42
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	48	47	42	46	37
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	33	33	30	29	27
Other	45	34	29	35	48

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	30	40	41	44	41
Burnaby	23	15	8	10	6
Campbell River	45	48	45	22	13
Castlegar	4	38	18	26	47
Central Saanich	7	4	13	19	7
Chilliwack	16	35	35	41	33
Coquitlam	32	27	31	34	29
Courtenay	3	25	21	11	23
Cranbrook	27	23	16	25	21
Dawson	47	37	46	31	40
Delta	11	14	36	28	9
Duncan	5	36	17	13	8
Fort St John	19	7	33	46	44
Kamloops	36	18	23	16	20
Kelowna	10	29	25	21	32
Kitimat	41	44	14	35	11
Ladysmith	25	3	1	8	12
Lake Country	17	8	38	20	42
Langley	42	10	42	45	35
Maple Ridge	26	26	24	29	26
Merritt	12	43	20	43	—
Mission	14	41	48	40	43
Nanaimo	6	6	7	7	4
Nelson	2	9	2	39	39
New Westminster	40	34	22	18	38
Parksville	1	5	5	5	1
Penticton	18	19	19	3	27
Port Alberni	20	22	3	30	24
Port Coquitlam	35	24	26	14	5
Port Moody	43	11	34	15	22
Powell River	8	16	6	2	3
Prince George	46	46	47	42	45
Prince Rupert	48	47	44	47	25
Qualicum	9	2	4	1	1
Richmond	31	17	9	9	14
Salmon Arm	13	45	39	37	30
Salt Spring	22	12	29	—	46
Sidney	38	20	15	17	10
Surrey	37	30	37	38	28
Terrace	24	42	40	6	37
Trail	29	1	32	36	18

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Laparoscopic Cholecystectomy: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	39	31	27	24	19
Vernon	44	32	43	23	17
Victoria	28	21	12	12	15
White Rock	21	13	10	32	34
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	15	39	11	4	16
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	33	33	28	27	31
Other	34	28	30	33	36

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Primary Cesarean Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	12	22	19	32	23
Burnaby	16	9	14	18	11
Campbell River	44	16	45	46	42
Castlegar	4	8	6	11	45
Central Saanich	17	45	22	34	31
Chilliwack	37	35	15	40	9
Coquitlam	26	11	21	19	33
Courtenay	2	10	28	9	8
Cranbrook	1	32	35	47	25
Dawson	8	7	4	2	22
Delta	19	20	26	28	16
Duncan	15	13	7	8	5
Fort St John	41	44	37	37	19
Kamloops	29	38	42	42	47
Kelowna	10	6	18	39	39
Kitimat	48	48	48	48	21
Ladysmith	27	28	32	6	13
Lake Country	33	1	25	29	2
Langley	7	17	5	24	36
Maple Ridge	34	15	33	36	32
Merritt	13	2	41	41	41
Mission	5	12	8	21	12
Nanaimo	35	31	17	25	37
Nelson	6	33	29	7	7
New Westminster	22	25	16	20	17
Parksville	11	47	44	16	28
Penticton	3	42	3	27	6
Port Alberni	25	5	34	35	26
Port Coquitlam	14	19	9	23	29
Port Moody	32	36	40	15	24
Powell River	46	24	46	14	44
Prince George	40	27	20	17	34
Prince Rupert	9	3	1	13	38
Qualicum	43	41	27	33	4
Richmond	31	14	13	12	15
Salmon Arm	45	34	43	43	35
Salt Spring	28	26	12	1	48
Sidney	39	4	39	3	20
Surrey	20	21	24	31	27
Terrace	42	39	30	5	3
Trail	23	43	2	4	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Primary Cesarean Delivery: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	18	18	11	22	18
Vernon	21	37	36	10	40
Victoria	38	40	38	45	46
White Rock	30	30	10	38	43
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	47	46	47	44	10
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	24	29	23	30	30
Other	36	23	31	26	14

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Vaginal Birth after Cesarean Section (VBAC), All: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	6	16	11	5	15
Burnaby	32	10	32	31	13
Campbell River	41	41	36	37	31
Castlegar	4	28	1	25	33
Central Saanich	20	23	27	42	2
Chilliwack	26	20	15	12	25
Coquitlam	25	17	17	17	12
Courtenay	10	27	4	13	7
Cranbrook	34	15	21	42	20
Dawson	13	45	6	34	43
Delta	9	30	25	22	32
Duncan	42	19	13	32	9
Fort St John	23	13	37	15	39
Kamloops	36	21	28	11	34
Kelowna	21	35	33	36	35
Kitimat	46	18	46	40	41
Ladysmith	33	39	39	16	42
Lake Country	29	40	43	42	19
Langley	30	24	14	3	14
Maple Ridge	35	12	26	14	6
Merritt	3	46	41	42	43
Mission	19	22	20	6	10
Nanaimo	39	37	40	30	40
Nelson	12	1	35	1	1
New Westminster	16	8	8	7	4
Parksville	37	14	44	38	43
Penticton	2	5	18	2	28
Port Alberni	31	3	12	26	36
Port Coquitlam	38	31	23	29	18
Port Moody	7	33	30	28	8
Powell River	45	38	45	39	43
Prince George	22	29	29	20	5
Prince Rupert	1	4	3	23	38
Qualicum	—	46	—	42	30
Richmond	14	25	42	33	26
Salmon Arm	5	42	9	42	37
Salt Spring	40	—	—	27	—
Sidney	44	43	7	41	27
Surrey	11	6	19	19	21
Terrace	43	44	38	9	16
Trail	46	2	2	42	—

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Vaginal Birth after Cesarean Section (VBAC), All: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	17	9	10	8	11
Vernon	15	32	31	35	29
Victoria	8	26	22	21	22
White Rock	28	34	16	24	17
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	27	7	34	4	3
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	24	11	24	18	24
Other	18	36	5	10	23

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Death in Low-Mortality DRGs: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	32	26	23	41	34
Burnaby	38	24	28	47	38
Campbell River	1	30	18	36	1
Castlegar	1	1	37	49	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	48
Chilliwack	22	28	17	30	44
Coquitlam	1	23	21	1	17
Courtenay	48	49	44	1	46
Cranbrook	36	1	26	1	31
Dawson	46	1	1	50	1
Delta	21	44	43	40	30
Duncan	43	27	30	42	40
Fort St John	1	1	1	1	1
Kamloops	33	37	20	28	22
Kelowna	29	32	24	23	16
Kitimat	1	1	42	46	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	41
Lake Country	1	1	41	1	1
Langley	28	1	13	33	23
Maple Ridge	47	21	35	37	37
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	27	1	40	45	26
Nanaimo	37	33	36	39	36
Nelson	1	1	34	1	1
New Westminster	30	35	38	19	32
Parksville	1	50	32	1	35
Penticton	42	29	15	44	25
Port Alberni	35	36	22	1	1
Port Coquitlam	25	40	25	20	20
Port Moody	1	39	1	29	29
Powell River	41	1	33	38	1
Prince George	34	34	39	22	21
Prince Rupert	1	1	45	1	1
Qualicum	1	48	47	43	43
Richmond	45	41	16	24	24
Salmon Arm	1	47	1	34	49
Salt Spring	1	1	48	1	45
Sidney	44	45	1	34	33
Surrey	26	31	27	26	19
Terrace	1	1	1	1	1

Note: This indicator is not risk-adjusted

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Death in Low-Mortality DRGs: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Trail	1	1	1	1	39
Vancouver	39	38	14	31	27
Vernon	23	25	1	27	28
Victoria	24	46	31	32	42
White Rock	49	42	46	48	47
Whitehorse	1	1	49	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	29	1	1
Yellowknife	—	1	—	1	—
Rural	31	22	19	25	15
Other	40	43	12	21	18

Note: This indicator is not risk-adjusted

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Decubitus Ulcer: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	14	26	28	26	47
Burnaby	34	31	37	27	35
Campbell River	11	13	1	41	14
Castlegar	25	1	23	32	1
Central Saanich	1	28	15	16	1
Chilliwack	16	25	16	7	12
Coquitlam	19	49	20	6	19
Courtenay	24	16	46	28	41
Cranbrook	1	48	40	21	22
Dawson	29	29	26	18	25
Delta	32	36	12	33	38
Duncan	12	1	34	11	39
Fort St John	46	47	49	49	1
Kamloops	33	39	19	43	33
Kelowna	15	18	9	8	15
Kitimat	1	41	48	38	1
Ladysmith	1	44	1	13	20
Lake Country	1	1	1	24	1
Langley	40	43	25	44	44
Maple Ridge	41	34	29	30	36
Merritt	1	46	1	40	45
Mission	1	20	14	10	43
Nanaimo	31	12	35	14	32
Nelson	22	27	1	1	49
New Westminster	30	42	27	36	37
Parksville	44	1	8	46	31
Penticton	38	38	47	47	48
Port Alberni	13	15	31	25	1
Port Coquitlam	45	17	17	20	21
Port Moody	1	1	1	45	40
Powell River	18	45	42	48	46
Prince George	37	32	13	42	28
Prince Rupert	47	1	36	1	42
Qualicum	23	19	44	31	1
Richmond	10	24	30	23	23
Salmon Arm	20	1	11	1	34
Salt Spring	1	1	45	1	24
Sidney	48	37	39	39	10
Surrey	42	22	41	34	18
Terrace	27	40	18	12	17
Trail	17	1	38	9	29

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Decubitus Ulcer: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	39	30	33	22	26
Vernon	28	14	21	17	16
Victoria	26	23	10	29	13
White Rock	36	35	22	35	11
Whitehorse	49	1	1	1	1
Williams Lake	43	1	43	37	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	21	21	32	19	27
Other	35	33	24	15	30

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Failure to Rescue: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	33	38	19	43	40
Burnaby	23	35	13	22	38
Campbell River	11	9	46	17	30
Castlegar	1	—	23	27	2
Central Saanich	39	4	27	11	49
Chilliwack	34	32	29	15	37
Coquitlam	43	21	28	18	13
Courtenay	35	22	10	23	20
Cranbrook	47	44	12	39	7
Dawson	44	3	9	42	21
Delta	28	15	37	40	42
Duncan	38	8	15	44	23
Fort St John	6	27	48	32	25
Kamloops	25	40	45	19	36
Kelowna	20	19	24	8	11
Kitimat	—	43	22	48	31
Ladysmith	22	25	43	34	16
Lake Country	24	28	1	1	3
Langley	8	7	7	26	10
Maple Ridge	45	24	33	14	45
Merritt	5	2	44	47	41
Mission	36	1	25	3	9
Nanaimo	12	39	42	9	18
Nelson	4	42	49	7	8
New Westminster	32	37	40	33	34
Parksville	7	12	14	12	5
Penticton	15	13	31	30	17
Port Alberni	13	45	6	5	26
Port Coquitlam	27	20	26	38	22
Port Moody	42	10	1	10	4
Powell River	16	31	32	45	43
Prince George	37	30	41	46	44
Prince Rupert	46	46	5	13	6
Qualicum	10	33	34	2	33
Richmond	19	18	36	29	35
Salmon Arm	2	11	4	35	28
Salt Spring	3	—	30	6	46
Sidney	40	36	8	37	39
Surrey	29	34	38	31	29
Terrace	41	29	47	41	47
Trail	26	41	35	4	15

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Failure to Rescue: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	21	17	17	21	14
Vernon	14	6	11	36	32
Victoria	18	23	18	28	12
White Rock	31	16	39	25	48
Whitehorse	—	—	1	—	1
Williams Lake	9	14	21	24	27
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	17	5	16	20	19
Other	30	26	20	16	24

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Foreign Body Left During Procedure: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	1	44	1	45	40
Burnaby	43	38	42	43	46
Campbell River	41	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	1	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	1
Chilliwack	1	1	46	1	44
Coquitlam	1	1	43	44	1
Courtenay	1	1	1	1	45
Cranbrook	1	47	1	1	1
Dawson	1	1	1	1	1
Delta	36	42	1	41	1
Duncan	1	46	1	1	47
Fort St John	46	1	49	1	1
Kamloops	40	1	38	38	43
Kelowna	29	1	1	1	1
Kitimat	1	1	1	1	1
Ladysmith	48	1	1	49	1
Lake Country	49	1	1	1	1
Langley	44	1	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	45	40	1	1	1
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	1	1	1	1	1
Nanaimo	32	1	1	36	1
Nelson	1	1	1	1	48
New Westminster	1	1	45	1	41
Parksville	1	1	1	1	1
Penticton	39	45	1	1	1
Port Alberni	1	1	1	47	1
Port Coquitlam	35	39	39	39	1
Port Moody	1	1	50	1	1
Powell River	1	1	1	1	1
Prince George	37	1	48	40	1
Prince Rupert	1	1	1	1	1
Qualicum	1	50	1	1	1
Richmond	1	1	1	35	1
Salmon Arm	1	49	1	1	1
Salt Spring	50	1	1	1	1
Sidney	1	1	1	48	1
Surrey	31	37	37	1	38
Terrace	1	48	1	1	1
Trail	47	1	1	1	49

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Foreign Body Left During Procedure: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	33	35	1	33	1
Vernon	38	1	47	46	50
Victoria	42	43	40	37	37
White Rock	34	40	41	1	1
Whitehorse	1	1	1	50	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	1	1
Yellowknife	1	1	1	1	1
Rural	28	36	36	34	42
Other	30	1	44	41	39

Note: This indicator is not risk-adjusted

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Postoperative Physiologic and Metabolic Derangement: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	1	44	45	43	44
Burnaby	47	1	43	1	1
Campbell River	1	1	1	1	1
Castlegar	1	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	1
Chilliwack	1	1	1	44	1
Coquitlam	1	1	1	47	1
Courtenay	1	1	1	1	1
Cranbrook	1	1	1	1	1
Dawson	1	1	1	1	1
Delta	48	1	1	45	43
Duncan	1	1	1	1	1
Fort St John	1	1	1	1	1
Kamloops	1	1	41	1	45
Kelowna	1	1	1	1	41
Kitimat	1	1	1	48	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	1	1	1
Langley	1	47	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	1	1	1	1	47
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	1	1	48	1	1
Nanaimo	1	1	1	42	1
Nelson	1	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	1	1	40	1	42
Parksville	1	49	1	1	1
Penticton	49	1	1	1	1
Port Alberni	1	1	46	1	1
Port Coquitlam	1	1	42	1	1
Port Moody	1	1	1	1	1
Powell River	1	48	1	1	48
Prince George	1	1	1	1	46
Prince Rupert	1	1	1	49	1
Qualicum	1	1	1	1	1
Richmond	1	1	1	1	1
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	1	1
Salt Spring	1	1	1	1	1
Sidney	1	1	1	1	1
Surrey	43	46	1	40	39
Terrace	1	1	49	1	1
Trail	1	1	47	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Postoperative Physiologic and Metabolic Derangement: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	45	42	1	41	40
Vernon	1	1	1	46	1
Victoria	1	43	39	1	38
White Rock	1	1	44	1	1
Whitehorse	1	1	1	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	1	49
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	44	1	38	39	37
Other	46	45	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Postoperative Respiratory Failure: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	46	1	41	31	29
Burnaby	47	42	47	41	28
Campbell River	1	1	44	44	1
Castlegar	1	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	49	1	1	1	1
Chilliwack	1	46	1	39	32
Coquitlam	1	40	1	1	1
Courtenay	1	1	42	1	1
Cranbrook	1	1	1	43	46
Dawson	1	1	1	49	1
Delta	1	1	45	28	45
Duncan	1	45	1	45	1
Fort St John	1	1	1	1	1
Kamloops	1	1	48	26	33
Kelowna	1	35	1	33	26
Kitimat	1	1	1	1	1
Ladysmith	1	48	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	1	1	1
Langley	1	1	1	36	37
Maple Ridge	1	1	37	1	42
Merritt	1	49	1	1	1
Mission	1	1	1	40	1
Nanaimo	1	37	43	1	1
Nelson	1	1	1	47	1
New Westminster	42	44	34	34	40
Parksville	1	1	1	1	1
Penticton	1	1	1	32	36
Port Alberni	1	1	49	1	1
Port Coquitlam	1	43	36	37	31
Port Moody	1	1	1	1	1
Powell River	1	1	1	46	48
Prince George	1	38	1	38	30
Prince Rupert	1	1	1	1	1
Qualicum	1	1	1	1	44
Richmond	1	47	40	42	39
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	48	47
Salt Spring	1	1	1	1	49
Sidney	1	1	1	1	1
Surrey	41	41	46	29	43
Terrace	48	1	1	1	1
Trail	1	1	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Postoperative Respiratory Failure: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	45	36	38	30	38
Vernon	1	1	1	1	35
Victoria	40	39	33	27	27
White Rock	44	1	35	25	1
Whitehorse	1	1	1	1	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	1	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	39	34	39	24	34
Other	43	1	1	35	41

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Postoperative Sepsis: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	42	36	43	42	31
Burnaby	37	32	1	39	39
Campbell River	1	1	1	1	42
Castlegar	49	49	1	45	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	44	1
Chilliwack	1	31	40	38	34
Coquitlam	41	1	1	1	1
Courtenay	1	1	36	41	36
Cranbrook	1	1	48	1	48
Dawson	1	1	1	49	1
Delta	45	1	1	1	40
Duncan	48	1	1	1	1
Fort St John	1	1	1	1	1
Kamloops	1	34	31	1	1
Kelowna	32	37	1	28	1
Kitimat	1	1	49	47	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	48	1	46	1
Langley	1	1	1	1	1
Maple Ridge	1	41	35	30	45
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	1	45	1	1	1
Nanaimo	36	30	1	33	1
Nelson	1	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	44	1	45	35	43
Parksville	1	1	42	43	1
Penticton	43	38	41	37	47
Port Alberni	1	1	39	1	1
Port Coquitlam	39	43	47	1	1
Port Moody	1	1	1	1	1
Powell River	1	47	46	1	46
Prince George	35	40	1	1	32
Prince Rupert	1	1	1	1	1
Qualicum	1	1	1	1	1
Richmond	40	39	1	1	44
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	1	1
Salt Spring	1	1	1	1	1
Sidney	46	1	1	1	1
Surrey	30	35	32	40	35
Terrace	47	1	44	48	49
Trail	1	1	1	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

### Postoperative Sepsis: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	38	42	34	36	41
Vernon	1	1	1	34	37
Victoria	31	28	30	27	30
White Rock	1	33	37	31	1
Whitehorse	1	1	1	1	1
Williams Lake	1	46	1	1	1
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	33	29	33	32	38
Other	34	44	38	29	33

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)



## Birth Trauma, Injury to Neonate: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	14	21	17	26	32
Burnaby	23	40	29	21	31
Campbell River	22	28	36	28	40
Castlegar	1	47	45	47	1
Central Saanich	1	1	1	1	1
Chilliwack	1	26	18	1	19
Coquitlam	21	32	31	20	20
Courtenay	26	1	30	1	1
Cranbrook	25	39	1	34	1
Dawson	1	43	44	1	1
Delta	13	33	24	24	24
Duncan	39	1	1	1	1
Fort St John	28	1	1	27	39
Kamloops	35	44	47	43	42
Kelowna	20	20	22	22	33
Kitimat	1	1	1	42	1
Ladysmith	40	1	1	1	43
Lake Country	45	1	1	46	1
Langley	19	24	1	1	22
Maple Ridge	30	38	25	31	26
Merritt	48	1	42	40	46
Mission	1	25	27	1	1
Nanaimo	38	45	28	30	38
Nelson	37	1	1	1	1
New Westminster	33	27	35	35	25
Parksville	1	1	39	44	44
Penticton	34	30	38	1	29
Port Alberni	36	1	33	1	34
Port Coquitlam	24	34	23	36	28
Port Moody	32	36	1	37	27
Powell River	44	48	48	39	49
Prince George	41	41	41	41	37
Prince Rupert	46	46	43	45	47
Qualicum	42	1	1	48	1
Richmond	16	23	20	18	18
Salmon Arm	1	1	37	38	45
Salt Spring	47	1	1	1	1
Sidney	1	1	1	1	1
Surrey	15	29	21	17	21
Terrace	1	1	1	1	1
Trail	43	1	46	1	1

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Birth Trauma, Injury to Neonate: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	31	42	40	25	29
Vernon	17	1	32	29	23
Victoria	12	22	19	19	17
White Rock	18	31	1	23	36
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	1
Williams Lake	1	1	1	33	48
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	27	35	34	32	41
Other	29	37	26	1	35

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Vaginal with Instrument: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2004–2005
Abbotsford	28	15	27	8	29
Burnaby	27	11	21	3	34
Campbell River	8	1	28	7	10
Castlegar	1	—	—	20	—
Central Saanich	30	—	1	—	1
Chilliwack	32	26	33	41	42
Coquitlam	9	19	3	11	7
Courtenay	36	38	37	32	41
Cranbrook	10	8	9	17	1
Dawson	21	39	20	1	22
Delta	16	18	8	6	15
Duncan	5	29	41	9	39
Fort St John	12	25	4	36	1
Kamloops	40	32	40	42	36
Kelowna	39	37	35	33	37
Kitimat	—	—	—	—	40
Ladysmith	34	—	19	—	18
Lake Country	43	36	39	5	43
Langley	35	33	34	35	13
Maple Ridge	20	12	7	14	28
Merritt	—	—	—	40	—
Mission	15	3	32	10	33
Nanaimo	14	34	24	29	16
Nelson	1	1	1	31	1
New Westminster	24	21	16	21	27
Parksville	29	13	—	34	1
Penticton	37	24	18	39	11
Port Alberni	1	4	14	2	8
Port Coquitlam	19	5	6	13	14
Port Moody	25	6	11	16	32
Powell River	44	40	43	38	44
Prince George	38	35	29	23	20
Prince Rupert	6	7	5	27	30
Qualicum	—	—	25	—	25
Richmond	13	20	12	22	21
Salmon Arm	42	28	38	4	12
Salt Spring	—	—	—	—	—
Sidney	1	23	26	—	1
Surrey	7	9	10	15	19
Terrace	33	17	17	28	9
Trail	18	—	15	26	26

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Vaginal with Instrument: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2004–2005
Vancouver	23	30	22	24	31
Vernon	31	16	31	19	45
Victoria	11	14	13	12	17
White Rock	22	27	36	30	35
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	41	10	42	18	38
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	17	22	23	25	23
Other	26	31	30	37	24

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Vaginal without Instrument: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	22	37	26	20	22
Burnaby	21	19	36	34	34
Campbell River	7	31	39	3	19
Castlegar	42	41	13	13	1
Central Saanich	8	45	7	43	35
Chilliwack	29	9	45	21	38
Coquitlam	20	5	4	19	11
Courtenay	43	35	27	8	45
Cranbrook	30	18	3	39	6
Dawson	39	6	6	31	36
Delta	25	39	23	36	12
Duncan	46	11	32	23	28
Fort St John	4	25	40	11	24
Kamloops	40	38	28	26	21
Kelowna	36	36	41	28	39
Kitimat	31	43	38	30	1
Ladysmith	14	1	1	5	1
Lake Country	41	44	44	48	47
Langley	27	16	12	27	46
Maple Ridge	10	10	9	12	10
Merritt	19	23	17	1	41
Mission	6	28	33	41	23
Nanaimo	37	24	14	37	20
Nelson	15	42	1	4	31
New Westminster	24	20	19	15	33
Parksville	1	15	46	47	15
Penticton	38	17	22	22	43
Port Alberni	13	30	5	1	17
Port Coquitlam	16	12	10	10	13
Port Moody	9	32	11	7	14
Powell River	32	46	8	6	40
Prince George	34	40	25	24	30
Prince Rupert	5	13	34	14	8
Qualicum	1	48	47	25	1
Richmond	12	14	21	33	26
Salmon Arm	47	1	43	44	7
Salt Spring	35	1	31	45	1
Sidney	11	29	37	32	9
Surrey	18	8	16	17	25
Terrace	23	7	15	38	18
Trail	1	1	24	42	29

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Vaginal without Instrument: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Vancouver	26	22	18	18	32
Vernon	44	26	48	9	44
Victoria	17	21	20	16	16
White Rock	28	27	35	40	42
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	48	47	42	46	37
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	33	33	30	29	27
Other	45	34	29	35	48

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Cesarean Section: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Abbotsford	43	25	24	21	27
Burnaby	1	41	46	38	31
Campbell River	46	1	1	40	33
Castlegar	1	1	1	1	1
Central Saanich	47	44	1	1	44
Chilliwack	28	1	1	1	22
Coquitlam	1	38	25	27	34
Courtenay	1	48	34	32	1
Cranbrook	1	37	37	1	1
Dawson	1	1	1	1	1
Delta	26	31	44	29	36
Duncan	39	1	36	42	1
Fort St John	37	1	31	1	45
Kamloops	1	1	27	30	1
Kelowna	34	28	29	22	23
Kitimat	44	1	1	1	1
Ladysmith	1	1	1	1	1
Lake Country	1	1	45	1	1
Langley	35	1	1	1	25
Maple Ridge	1	32	22	23	1
Merritt	1	1	1	1	1
Mission	1	34	32	31	32
Nanaimo	1	1	28	25	29
Nelson	1	1	1	1	47
New Westminster	36	43	42	33	37
Parksville	45	1	41	1	40
Penticton	41	1	1	46	1
Port Alberni	1	44	1	1	1
Port Coquitlam	32	36	30	28	43
Port Moody	1	39	1	44	1
Powell River	1	1	47	1	1
Prince George	30	26	33	24	28
Prince Rupert	1	40	1	42	1
Qualicum	1	1	1	45	48
Richmond	38	35	39	39	24
Salmon Arm	1	1	1	1	38
Salt Spring	48	1	1	1	1
Sidney	1	1	1	1	1
Surrey	25	29	26	26	30
Terrace	1	1	1	1	1

Note: This indicator is not risk-adjusted

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)

## Obstetric Trauma, Cesarean Section: Rank by Municipality

Municipality	2001–2002	2002–2003	2003–2004	2004–2005	2005–2006
Trail	1	1	1	48	1
Vancouver	40	46	48	41	39
Vernon	1	30	1	37	1
Victoria	42	42	40	36	42
White Rock	29	27	38	1	26
Whitehorse	—	—	—	—	—
Williams Lake	33	47	43	47	45
Yellowknife	—	—	—	—	—
Rural	31	33	35	34	35
Other	27	1	23	35	41

Note: This indicator is not risk-adjusted

“—” indicates either no data were available for that facility for that year, that the institution did not exist in that year, or that the data were censored to protect patient confidentiality (when the denominator for a given indicator < 5)