

## The Top 100 US Hospitals for Orthopaedic Surgery Fall Short in Price Transparency Reporting for Combined Anterior-Posterior Spinal Fusion

Patrick Nian<sup>1</sup>, Neil V Shah, Timothy Cooke, Girish Jayant, Elver Shei-Wah Ho, Harriet Grace Prior, Bana Hadid, Oscar Krol<sup>2</sup>, David H Mai, Olivia Merola, Peter Gust Passias<sup>3</sup>, Jad Bou Monsef, Bassel Diebo<sup>4</sup>, Carl B Paulino

<sup>1</sup>Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, SUNY Downstate, <sup>2</sup>NYU Langone Orthopedic Hospital, <sup>3</sup>NY Spine Institute / NYU Medical Center-Hjd, <sup>4</sup>Brown University

**INTRODUCTION:** The Medicare Severity-Diagnosis Related Group (MS-DRG) is a useful classification system for the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) to reimburse hospitals while also giving patients an estimate on their holistic hospital charges. Although MS-DRG data has become accessible in hospitals' Chargemaster data since the institution of the 2019 IPPS Hospital Price Transparency Final Rule, hospitals can also choose to report their standard charges using different coding systems such as Current Procedural Terminology (CPT), Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (HCPCS), or the hospital's own internal indicator. This heterogeneity in reporting can be confusing to patients. In this study, we examined how many hospitals use MS-DRG codes and if these codes reflect gross standard, only-insurance, or variable charges for combined anterior-posterior spinal fusion (except cervical) procedures. This data can help amend future hospital price transparency policies to facilitate patient understanding of healthcare costs.

### **METHODS:**

*U.S. News & World Report* 2021-2022 hospital rankings identified the top 100 orthopaedic departments/hospitals. MS-DRG codes included: 453 (combined anterior and posterior spinal fusion with major complication or comorbidity [MCC]), 454 (combined anterior and posterior spinal fusion with complication or comorbidity [CC]), and 455 (combined anterior and posterior spinal fusion without CC/MCC). Chargemasters were obtained and analyzed for presence of MS-DRG and charges. Data were further categorized as gross standard (GSC), insurance-only (IC), and variable (VC) charges.

**RESULTS:** Among 100 hospitals evaluated, 98 (98%) hospitals had available Chargemasters. Of those, 47 (48%) utilized MS-DRG. Twenty-nine (61.7%) hospitals had data for MS-DRG 453 with mean GSC \$348,841.16 [\$68,778.82 to \$827,533.00]. Thirty-one (66%) hospitals had data for MS-DRG 454 with mean GSC \$224,017.98 [\$32,234.99 to \$621,290.00]. Thirty-four (72.3%) hospitals had data for MS-DRG 455 with mean GSC \$174,634.05 [\$28,635.43 to \$610,002.05]. Hospitals in the Southeast and Northeast regions had lower levels of overall MS-DRG compliance while also differing in intra-regional GSC, IC, and VC data [Figure 1].

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:** The <50% hospitals that utilized the MS-DRG standard had inconsistencies in reported charge types. The lack of standard reporting procedures not only causes confusion, but also makes difficult the task of comparing costs between hospitals. Further studies into charge-reporting standards are necessary to improve care transparency.