Medical journeys of victims of exploitation and trafficking: a retrospective cohort study using a large multi-state dataset and new ICD-10 codes

Authors

Kezban Yagci Sokat (1)#, Alexander Gutfraind (2,3,4)#*, Guido Muscioni (3), Sami Alahmadi (5), Jonathan Hudlow (6), Ronald Hershow (2) Beau Norgeot (3)

#co-first authors, *corresponding author

agutfraind.research@gmail.com

(1) San Jose State University, (2) University of Illinois School of Public Health, (3) Anthem Inc., (4) Loyola University Chicago School of Medicine, (5) University of Oxford, (6) Love Justice International

Abstract

Background. Trafficking and exploitation for sex or labor affects millions of persons worldwide, but their use of the healthcare system is not characterized systematically. In 2018 new ICD-10 codes were implemented in the US for diagnosis of patients who were victims of trafficking or exploitation but todate no comprehensive study reported on their medical journeys. Our objective was to examine the extent to which newly implemented ICD-10 codes pertaining to human trafficking were being used in the healthcare system, and to characterize the care received by the victims.

Methods and Findings. Database search of a large US health insurer that contained approximately 43 million patients holding commercial or government-provided health insurance across the United States (US). For the dates 2018-09-01 to 2022-03-01, the dataset was found to contain 3,967 instances of the ICD-10 codes. In 31% of the cases, the codes were used as the principal or admitting diagnosis. Regression analysis of the codes found a 2% increase in the adoption of these codes. The codes were used by 1,532 distinct providers, the majority in non-hospital settings.

The data contained 2301 patients of which 1025 were treated for recent exploitation or trafficking, which corresponds to identification of 13 new patients each week. Of the latter patients, 90.1% were victims of sexual exploitation, and 9.9% victims of labor exploitation. The patients were predominantly female (81%), insured by Medicaid (60%) and the median age was 20 (interquartile range: 15-35). Healthcare utilization over 12 months after diagnosis of trafficking was $32,192 (standard deviation: $160,730) - much greater than average for Medicaid patients ($6,556 per year in 2019). The victims were characterized by a high prevalence of mental health conditions, high utilization of the emergency department, and these persisted after diagnosis of exploitation. Surprisingly, 57% of the victims were first diagnosed outside hospitals, primarily during office and psychiatric visits, and only 25% were first diagnosed during an emergency department visit.

Conclusions. The new ICD-10 codes provide valuable insights into the profiles and medical journeys of victims of trafficking. However, adoption of the codes is not widespread, increasing by only 2% per year and the majority of the victims are likely still not diagnosed by the new codes. Greater adoption, when consistent with patient safety, may improve care coordination and outcomes.

Introduction

The United Nations defines human trafficking (also called 'trafficking in persons') as the "recruitment, transportation, transfer, harbouring or receipt of persons, by means of the threat or use of force … for the purpose of exploitation" [1]. There are tens of millions of victims worldwide [2,3]. In the US, the National Human Trafficking Hotline reported 64,718 victims with high confidence for 2007-2020 [4], and an estimated 199,000 incidents of sexual exploitation of minors occur each year [5,6]. The vast array of physical, sexual, psychological and social problems faced by survivors of human trafficking make it an important public health concern [7,8], There has been growing recognition of the need for improvements in victim identification and service provision on the part of healthcare professionals [8–10] but also an acute need for more representative studies of this population [11].

Healthcare providers are often on the operational frontlines when interacting with victims of trafficking, especially those trafficked for sexual exploitation. However, even in clinical contexts, victims may not make their experience known for reasons that include language or cultural barriers, fear of criminal repercussions, fear of the trafficker, or distrust of the healthcare provider [12]. Thus, it is critical that providers have an understanding of the indicators of trafficking and potential obstacles to disclosure [13].

In the medical setting one emerging source of data on trafficking are a set of diagnostic ICD-10 codes introduced in late 2018. The codes are intended to be used in medical records of suspected and confirmed victims of trafficking, or identify patients with a history of victimization [14]. The codes are expected to result in better coordination of care for this vulnerable population [15,16]. While the new codes have been launched in the United States only, there have already been calls to expand their usage globally [14]. As healthcare providers are one of the major groups caring for victims of exploitation, the new codes have the potential to provide an important new source of data about exploitation resulting from trafficking [16], and improve health outcomes for this group of patients.

The literature review with Pubmed, Scopus, Web of Science and Google Scholar shows that there have been few studies based on the new ICD-10 codes. The largest study to date characterized the victims in major pediatric medical centers [17], but was on a much smaller set of cases (n=293) than here, and it was specifically children-focused, and included only major urban centers. Additionally, a small study (n=23) reported on how the codes were used to better identify sexually exploited youth and young adults in Minnesota [18]. Previously [19] interviewed providers and examined their awareness of human

trafficking, but the study was completed before the inception of the ICD-10 codes and did not quantify the characteristics of the trafficked population.

This study is therefore the first report on these ICD-10 codes to utilize a comprehensive multi-state dataset across all care settings, and contains three and a half years of tracking data. The analysis aims to establish the demographic characteristics of the patients, their medical needs and profiles of their medical providers. It also demonstrates the potential use of these codes to inform delivery of healthcare. Lastly, it evaluates trends in the adoption of the codes.

Based on previous studies, we hypothesized that the relevant population would be predominantly female and young [20]. We also expected to see a high burden of mental health conditions and sexually-transmitted infections and high utilization of hospital emergency departments [8–10,21]. These hypotheses were largely confirmed by the data, but we also found that the majority of the diagnoses were made outside of hospitals. A priori, we hypothesized a steady increase in the use of the new ICD-10 codes by providers, but found only a weak trend suggesting that there are potential barriers to further adoption.

Materials and Methods

The data for this study was managed by Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield - a Fortune 500 company. Anthem is one of the largest health benefits companies in the United States, serving approximately 43 million medical members, including 21 million under the age of 40, in all 50 states as of December 31, 2020. Membership includes 29 million in employer and other commercial policies, 9 million in Medicaid, 4 million in Medicare and federal programs, and nearly 1 million with individual (Affordable Care Act) policies. The Anthem population is generally representative of the US population in terms of age, gender and other demographic and medical characteristics. While Anthem has a presence in all 50 states, it has a particularly large enrollment in California, Georgia, Indiana, New York, Ohio and Virginia and these states are better covered in our data. We hypothesized that California and New York might have an elevated prevalence of trafficking, since they receive a larger volume of immigrants and consistently rank in the top 5 states with human trafficking reports according to the National Human Trafficking Hotline.

Our analysis is based on a search of administrative claims, that is, medical bills created by medical facilities, professionals, and pharmacies and submitted to payers. In the US, the format of claims data is standardized by law (HIPAA) and contains a listing of diagnoses, health services and medications. Taken together, claims data provide a nearly complete summary of each patient's medical journey across all types of care and providers. We queried the database for all claims for the newly-introduced ICD-10 codes, matching the base code and their extensions. After finding the claims containing the codes, we explored the medical record of the victims in the 12 months before and after the code, but not within 7 days of it, to characterize their medical histories and subsequent care, respectively. We excluded from this second stage of analysis patients who only had codes associated with exploitation in the past because they might have a systematically different profile: Y07.6 (multiple perpetrators of abuse) and Z62.813 / Z91.42 (personal history of exploitation).

We accessed an anonymized copy of the Anthem claims repository using a SQL client using Python 3.7, pandas [22] and the sqlalchemy package [23]. A poisson generalized linear model was fitted to the daily count of the ICD-10 codes using scipy version 1.5.0 [24]. For the study, the research group was provisioned with a limited view of the repository, with minimized access to clinical data. Birth dates were randomly obfuscated within a calendar year. All data was encrypted at rest and during transmission, and accessed from secured devices. The study was initiated and pursued primarily to improve care delivery to victims. Ethical review indicated that the study involves secondary analysis of existing data, and is of potential benefit to the public. Independent pre-publication review indicated that the study contains no identifiers or the potential for re-identification.

Results

We divide the results into three sections: trends in the use of the codes, demographics of the patients identified by the codes, and these patients' state of health and medical needs.

Utilization of the new codes

Between 2018-09-01 and 2022-03-01, the dataset was found to contain 3,967 administrative claims (i.e., medical bills) with the trafficking-related ICD-10 codes and 2301 patients (Table 1). The most common codes were Y07.6, Z04.81 and Z62.813. Exploitation codes were sexual, labor and unspecified in 46%, 4% and 50% of cases, respectively. Exploitation codes were labeled as confirmed by the provider in

71% of cases and merely suspected in 29% (see Table 1). In 2305 instances (31%), the codes were used for principal or admitting diagnosis.

Table 1: Frequency of use of the new exploitation and trafficking codes from 2018-09-01 through 2022-03-01. Total patients: 2301.

ICD-10 code	First event	Count	#Patients	Description
T74.51	10/11/18	369	156	Adult forced sexual exploitation, confirmed
T74.52	10/26/18	509	138	Child sexual exploitation, confirmed
T74.61	1/7/19	48	33	Adult forced labor exploitation, confirmed
T74.62	3/15/19	2	2	Child forced labor exploitation, confirmed
T76.51	10/8/18	155	103	Adult forced sexual exploitation, suspected
T76.52	11/7/18	199	128	Child sexual exploitation, suspected
T76.61	7/5/19	11	10	Adult forced labor exploitation, suspected
T76.62	10/30/18	14	9	Child forced labor exploitation, suspected
Y07.6	10/16/18	881	750	Multiple perpetrators of maltreatment and neglect
Z04.81	10/8/18	605	441	Encounter for examination and observation of victim following forced sexual exploitation
Z04.82	10/23/18	78	53	Encounter for examination and observation of victim following forced labor exploitation
Z62.813	10/12/18	575	325	Personal history of forced labor or sexual exploitation in childhood
Z91.42	10/24/18	521	295	Personal history of forced labor or sexual exploitation

We examined trends in the use of the new codes over time expecting to see gradual adoption of the codes with more providers, and contrasted it with trends in the overall database of claims. Over the period of analysis, the database saw a growth trend of 2.1% per year. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, the overall number of claims declined by a quarter in March 2020, and rapidly recovered to its previous value by November 2020. The use of the new codes also declined during this period and then recovered (Fig.1).



Fig.1: Daily count of exploitation-related ICD-10 codes from 2018-01-01 through 2022-03-01 (blue, left axis, 30-day moving average). Use of the codes increased by 2.3% per year on top of the growth of the data (2.1% per year). Superimposed trendline (orange) and overall new claims in the database (faint green, 30-day moving average).

To test for increasing adoption of the new codes, we fitted the 30-day smoothed data to a Poisson model with a linear time variable and controlled for the 30-day smoothed rate of all claims in the database. To ensure that the analysis is not affected by the quick uptake at the introduction of the ICD-10 codes in late 2018, the model was fit to data from 2019 onwards. We found a slight positive linear trend (0.00021 new codes per day, p=0.0025), corresponding to an increase of 2.3% per year.

About half (54%) of the medical claims were from doctors' offices, outpatient facilities, labs, clinics, and specialized agencies. The remaining so-called facility claims (including emergency department visits and admissions) were responsible for 46%. There were 1532 distinct providers using the codes (counting national provider identifiers, NPIs), with 44% caring for a single patient, with a maximum of 52 patients. High-volume providers tended to be large medical centers and specialty or pediatric centers. In 452 patients, the codes were used as part of an evaluation and management visit not co-occurring with an emergency or hospital visit, including 296 patients who were recently victimized. Recent victims of exploitation were most likely to be diagnosed in the following settings or by the following practitioners: general hospital emergency room (ER), community or behavioral health center, pediatric hospital, pediatrician, psychiatrist, emergency physician and family doctor (ranked from most to least likely, with many other specialties making the diagnosis as well but less frequently).

Some of the new ICD-10 codes have special usages: Z62.813 and Z91.42 are sometimes applied to patients with personal history of forced labor or sexual exploitation, including events that may have occurred many years in the past rather than recently; code Y07.6 captures maltreatment and neglect rather than specifically exploitation or trafficking. The victims with these codes were not substantially different from the remaining population described below, being predominantly female (74%) and young (median age of 21). Our analysis found that only 2.4% of the patients with these codes also received any of the codes for recent exploitation. Because we wanted to understand more precisely the medical characteristics of recent victims, these three codes were dropped from subsequent analysis.

We also studied the rate at which the codes identify new patients, rather than previously treated patients. We found that 13.0 victims are newly-identified in our dataset every week by the codes. Extrapolating from our database of 43 million to the US national population, we estimate that 101.3 victims are identified per week nationally using the new ICD-10 codes. But consistent with the nearly flat trend in

usage of the codes, there is no increasing trend in the number of victims identified per day (data not shown).

Characteristics of recent victims

Our dataset was found to contain 1025 distinct patients of recent exploitation. Their characteristics are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Demographics of the population with new diagnoses of exploitation or trafficking (n=1025 patients). IQR, Interquartile range.

	Typical value	Distribution information
Exploitation type	90.1% sexual	9.9% labor, 0.8% both types of exploitation
Age	20 years (median)	IQR: 15-35. Median sexual: 19.9, labor: 28.3
Gender	82% Female	Fraction Female for sexual: 83%, Labor: 80%
Race	60% Unknown	White: 51%, Black: 36%, Latin-American: 8.3%, American-Indian: 2%, Asian-American: 2%
Health insurance	60% Medicaid	19% large employers, 12% multi-state employers, and others (individual policies 0.3%)
	71% Primary subscriber	20% as child, 6% as spouse, 5% unknown/other*

*numbers sum to more than 100% due to rounding

Sexual and labor exploitation accounted for 90.1% and 9.9% of codes, respectively, and both exploitation types appeared in 8 patients (0.8% of the patients). The patients were predominantly female (83%) and the median age was 20 (IQR: 15-35) (Fig.2). The patients' medical insurance policy was predominantly a direct policy to them, with just 20% insured as child or dependent, and 6% as spouses.



Fig.2: Histogram of the ages of the patients identified by the new ICD-10 codes: Victims of sexual (black) and labor (grey drawn over) exploitation. Sexual exploitation victims are predominantly 10-30 old, while labor victims are mostly 15-40.

We compared the prevalence of the patients in different US states and found that six US states had 50 or more victims in our database, and these were often states with large populations or large enrollment in our plans. To determine if certain states have higher numbers of patients than expected, we determined the size of the population aged 15 to 40 in each of these states in our claims data. A chi-squared test showed that the counts of patients are statistically different from what would be expected (p=1.3e-56). We found that prevalence was elevated with respect to the peer population in Texas (186%) and Georgia (151%) and reduced in California (76%), New York state (79%), Virginia (73%) and Indiana (96%). These differences could be caused by higher prevalence of trafficking or greater use of the codes, or both.

Patient medical background and needs

To evaluate the medical needs of the patients, we retrieved all the diagnoses and the procedures they received. Three periods were considered: at the time when exploitation was established, 12 months before and 12 months after. The diagnosis codes at establishment (Table 3) were often related to sexual

exploitation, mental health but also non-specific codes such as asthma or abrasions. Over the preceding 12 months and the following 12 months it was common to see mental health diagnoses. Sexually-transmitted infections were found in 15.6% of patients, chiefly Chlamydia (5.4%), Gonococcal infections (4.2%) and Trichomoniasis (3.0%). Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) was detected in 1.0% of patients.

Table 3. Most common diagnosis codes for victims of exploitation

(A) The most common diagnoses in encounters with any diagnosis of exploitation (primarily or secondary), (B) all diagnoses over the preceding 12 months before first exploitation diagnosis code, and (C) the following 12 months. % Pts: percent of patients with the diagnosis over the given period. The 12 month period in (C) is truncated on 2022-03-01, reducing the overall bounds. Total patients: 1025.

(A) At establishment		(B) 12 months before		(C) 12 months after	
Description	**% Pts**	**Description**	**% Pts**	**Description**	**% Pts**
Encounter for examination and observation of victim following forced sexual exploitation	43	Encounter for examination and observation of victim following forced sexual exploitation	40	Encounter for immunization	30
Child sexual exploitation, suspected, initial encounter	12	Encounter for immunization	35	Anxiety disorder, unspecified	23
Adult forced sexual exploitation, confirmed, initial encounter	11	Anxiety disorder, unspecified	27	Post-traumatic stress disorder, unspecified	22
Child sexual exploitation, confirmed, initial encounter	10	Other long term (current) drug therapy	25	Other long term (current) drug therapy	21
Adult forced sexual exploitation, suspected, initial encounter	9	Major depressive disorder, single episode, unspecified	25	Major depressive disorder, single episode, unspecified	20
Post-traumatic stress disorder, unspecified	7	Encounter for screening for infections with a predominantly sexual mode of transmission	23	Contact with and (suspected) exposure to COVID-19	19
Encounter for immunization	7	Post-traumatic stress disorder, unspecified	20	Encounter for routine child health examination without abnormal findings	15
Anxiety disorder, unspecified	6	Suicidal ideations	19	Unspecified abdominal pain	15
Encounter for screening for infections with a predominantly	6	Encounter for routine child health examination	19	Encounter for screening for	15

sexual mode of transmission		without abnormal findings		infections with a predominantly sexual mode of transmission	
Suicidal ideations	5	Cough	18	Essential (primary) hypertension	15
Encounter for examination and observation of victim following forced labor exploitation	5	Unspecified abdominal pain	17	Generalized anxiety disorder	15
Major depressive disorder, single episode, unspecified	4	Nicotine dependence, cigarettes, uncomplicated	16	Contact with and (suspected) exposure to other viral communicable diseases	15
Nicotine dependence, cigarettes, uncomplicated	4	Urinary tract infection, site not specified	16	Bipolar disorder, unspecified	14
Other long term (current) drug therapy	4	Contact with and (suspected) exposure to other viral communicable diseases	16	Nicotine dependence, cigarettes, uncomplicated	14
Bipolar disorder, unspecified	4	Essential (primary) hypertension	15	Suicidal ideations	13
Essential (primary) hypertension	4	Bipolar disorder, unspecified	14	Cough	12
Child in welfare custody	3	Generalized anxiety disorder	14	Urinary tract infection, site not specified	12
High risk heterosexual behavior	3	Dietary counseling and surveillance	14	Chest pain, unspecified	11
Adult forced sexual exploitation, confirmed, subsequent encounter	3	Encounter for general adult medical examination without abnormal findings	14	Nicotine dependence, unspecified, uncomplicated	11
Personal history of self-harm	3	Nicotine dependence, unspecified, uncomplicated	13	Encounter for general adult medical examination without abnormal findings	11

Table 4 reports on the procedures and treatments of the victims. Routine encounters were seen in 79% and 76% of the patients in the 12 months before and 12 months after the diagnosis of exploitation, respectively. Serological and urological tests were common, particularly for sexually-transmitted infections. Examination of the care setting found that the first report of victimization most often

occurred outside of a hospital: 27% of the victims were first diagnosed during an office visit as established patients and 8% as new patients. Psychiatric and therapy encounters contributed 9% and 4% of the diagnostic events, respectively. Only in 25% of the cases was the victim first diagnosed in an emergency department and in a further 9% as part of any hospital visit. The remaining victims were first diagnosed by clinics, during transportation and other uncommon settings.

Table 4. Most common procedures for victims of exploitation

(A) The most common procedures* during medical visits involving an ICD-10 code of exploitation, (B) all procedures over the 12 months preceding the first exploitation diagnostic code, and (C) the following 12 months. % Pts indicates percent of patients with this procedure, as in Table 3. Total patients: 1025.

(A) At exploit. diagnosis		(B) 12 months before		(C) 12 months after	
Description	**% Pts**	**Description**	**% Pts**	**Description**	**% Pts**
Office/outpatient visit est	27	Office/outpatient visit est	79	Office/outpatient visit est	76
Emergency dept visit	25	Emergency dept visit	51	Emergency dept visit	48
Chylmd trach dna amp probe	17	Complete cbc w/auto diff wbc	46	Routine venipuncture	43
N.gonorrhoeae dna amp prob	16	Routine venipuncture	45	Complete cbc w/auto diff wbc	42
Routine venipuncture	13	Office/outpatient visit new	41	Office/outpatient visit new	38
Urine pregnancy test	12	Comprehen metabolic panel	40	Comprehen metabolic panel	37
Hiv-1 ag w/hiv-1 & hiv-2 ab	12	Urine pregnancy test	34	Urinalysis auto w/scope	30
Syphilis test non-trep qual	10	N.gonorrhoeae dna amp prob	31	Urine pregnancy test	29
Complete cbc w/auto diff wbc	9	Chylmd trach dna amp probe	31	Chylmd trach dna amp probe	27
Comprehen metabolic panel	9	Urinalysis auto w/scope	30	N.gonorrhoeae dna amp prob	27
Drug test prsmv chem anlyzr	8	Drug test prsmv chem anlyzr	24	Urine culture/colony count	21
Office/outpatient visit new	8	Lipid panel	23	Urinalysis auto w/o scope	21
Urinalysis auto w/scope	8	Urinalysis auto w/o scope	22	Subsequent hospital care	21

Hepatitis b surface ag ia	8	Assay thyroid stim hormone	21	Lipid panel	20
Trichomonas vaginalis amplif	7	Urine culture/colony count	21	Drug test prsmv chem anlyzr	20
Ther/proph/diag inj sc/im	7	Ground mileage	21	Ground mileage	19
Urine culture/colony count	6	Subsequent hospital care	20	Hospital discharge day	19
Hep b surface antibody	5	Hiv-1 ag w/hiv-1 & hiv-2 ab	19	Hiv-1 ag w/hiv-1 & hiv-2 ab	19
Hepatitis c ab test	5	Ther/proph/diag inj sc/im	19	Electrocardiogram report	18
Ceftriaxone sodium injection	5	Initial hospital care	18	Assay thyroid stim hormone	18

*est = established patient, new = new patient. Cells report all CPT/HCPCS codes with identical abbreviated descriptions. Full descriptions for the procedures could be located at www.cms.gov and other sources.

Overall, the patients who were recent victims of exploitation had elevated medical needs. Financial analysis confirmed that the patients in this group use healthcare at a rate significantly higher than their peers: the mean expenditure in the 12 months prior to diagnosis of exploitation was $37,427 (standard deviation (SD): $261,618), and in the 12 months after diagnosis was $32,192 (SD : $160,730) - much greater than average (for Medicaid, $6,556 per year in 2019 [25]).

Discussion

It has been three and a half years since the new ICD-10 codes for trafficking-related exploitation have been introduced. This research is the first study to examine the adoption of the new ICD-10 codes across all care settings since they were created. Through access to a large multi-state database of medical claims, we were also able to create a detailed picture of this population's medical needs across multiple jurisdictions and medical settings. The largest previous study [17] included only 293 patients received at pediatric tertiary centers during individual hospital encounters, while this study captured 2301 patients identified across all care settings, and included 1025 patients with a recent exploitation event who were tracked over two years.

We found that in a large number of cases (31%), the new ICD-10 codes were used as the principal or admitting diagnosis code of the victims. This suggests that the caregivers may have viewed the patient's exploitation history as the root cause of their medical condition, which underlines an unexpected use of the new codes. More than 75% of providers who used the codes, coded just one patient over the study

period, and adoption of the codes was growing only by 2% per year. The current coding rate likely greatly underestimates the true victim population: at this rate, an estimated 101 victims are newly-identified per week nationally, from a population estimated to number tens or hundreds of thousands. It is possible that medical coders do not use the new codes for administrative or privacy reasons, or because of a lack of awareness as discussed in [26]. Victims might be facing barriers when accessing care, or may be trying to avoid identification due to stigma associated with the diagnosis, fear of legal complications, and reluctance to report criminal exploitation by persons that they are economically dependent on.

We found that the population is predominantly young and female, consistent with reports in the US and some other regions [20]. The population was found to be slightly older and racially more White than reported in an earlier study [17], likely because it utilized data from urban pediatric tertiary medical centers. Generally speaking, it was surprising to see so many victims in our database, which includes just persons holding commercial or government-provided insurance, as it runs counter to the view that few victims would have insurance of any kind. The majority of the cases were for sexual exploitation (90.9%), while a very small percentage demonstrate co-occurrence of both sexual and labor exploitation (0.8%). Victims were found across all parts of the US, but elevated with respect to the peer population in Texas (186%) and Georgia (151%) and reduced in California (76%) and New York state (79%).

Surprisingly, the majority of recent victims of exploitation were not identified in hospitals or emergency departments, but rather in clinics or offices (57%). Most of these clinic and office-based cases were identified in the context of an established provider relationship and were not diagnosed during first encounters with patients. Many of the victims had procedures consistent with treatment of suspected rape victims (although the diagnostic codes or procedures do not directly indicate if the provider suspected that a rape had occurred). We also confirmed reports that victims of exploitation also had considerable mental health needs and many of the patients had severe psychiatric diagnoses. In examining the medical needs in the 12 months following a diagnosis of exploitation, we did not see a significant change, suggesting that perhaps the victims have hard-to-treat psychiatric conditions, or difficulty obtaining definitive therapy.

Despite access to comprehensive health insurance, the victims made high use of emergency departments (EDs). Use of ED might relate to acute medical needs, but we hypothesize that it might also be caused by barriers to accessing or using care such as lack of a stable relationship with a provider, inability to

pay fees, or misdiagnosis. We hypothesize that for some of the victims, access and use of healthcare are affected by precarious employment, unstable housing and substance use. Addressing these barriers might reduce the need for acute interventions and thus improve health and reduce expenditures. Taken together, the new ICD-10 codes may provide an important addition to the ability of providers to plan care at the individual and population level, as previously hypothesized by [27].

In summary, we suggest that our findings have the following specific implications towards improving healthcare operations: (1) the number of victims being reported is low compared to the expected magnitude of human trafficking and exploitation, suggesting that many of the victims are not identified; (2) victims have exceptionally high overall costs and high burden of mental health conditions, suggesting that effective care would involve a robust and coordinated package of services addressing these conditions and prevention; (3) the victims are often under 18, female and mostly using Medicaid programs, suggesting that there is a need to ensure that they can readily enroll in Medicaid programs despite their age and any challenging family situations. Mitigating these findings needs to account for the risks to the health and safety of the patients, and many authorities [28,29] advised that healthcare providers should receive targeted training in reporting of and caring for victims of human trafficking.

Overall, ICD-10 codes for trafficking-related exploitation are opening a new resource for healthcare plans, providers and epidemiologists who are combatting human trafficking, and the codes are expected to assist operationally in care for victims of human trafficking and understanding their needs. We hypothesize that interventions that increase awareness of human trafficking and training about the ICD-10 codes could increase the uptake of the codes and improve the identification of victims. Future work could identify factors that inhibit the adoption of the codes, barriers the victims face in accessing non-emergency care, and identify and validate successful approaches to heal the victims.

Limitations

The available data, though national in scale, likely under-reports the scale of human trafficking. Patients might be concerned about shame, stigma, discrimination by staff or legal ramifications [30]. Providers might lack training on the new codes or deliberately avoid their use for the fear of potential unintended consequences, patient privacy or wrongly labeling a patient. Because administrative claims data is used for billing, providers might be using more conventional codes where they are more certain of receiving payment. Additionally, patients and providers might be concerned about whether the trafficker has access to the medical records of the patient or not, which might make the providers hesitant about using

the new ICD-10 codes [17]. But we hypothesize that the lack of awareness and absence of institutional policies are the primary causes of underreporting.

Another limitation is that the data does not provide a systematic cross-section of the victim population, since it includes only victims with insurance rather than those paying for care directly or receiving charitable care. The data does include victims with all types of health coverage, including employer-provided insurance, commercially-administered Medicaid and Medicare programs and individual policies. Because the health insurer is involved with patients over time and across providers, the data provides a comprehensive and accurate description of the patients and their journeys over time. Victims without insurance likely have medical needs similar to our population, but receive a more restricted array of services.

We found some evidence of differences between US states in the prevalence of patients with diagnoses of exploitation, but the difference is not fully attributable to the difference in prevalence of exploitation. Differences in usage of the new codes might affect the number of patients being diagnosed in the different states, and future research should attempt to determine if such coding differences exist. COVID-19 and measures taken in some states might have impacted the uptake of codes in those states, particularly, California and New York, which experienced lengthy shutdowns during part of the study period.

In conclusion, this study is the largest and most comprehensive report to date on the use of new ICD-10 codes for diagnosing human trafficking-related exploitation. The codes allowed us to identify a population who were victims of trafficking, predominantly for sexual exploitation. The exploration of ICD-10 codes supports previous reports of patient profiles and their medical needs, finding a population that was predominantly young, female and affected by sexually-transmitted infections and mental health conditions. Although the victims were often treated at emergency departments, the majority were first diagnosed by providers outside hospitals. The new codes were used by hundreds of providers, in many cases as the principal diagnosis. This strengthens the case for expanding the use of these codes in the US and internationally as proposed by others [14], and studying the barriers to their utilization.

Acknowledgements

AG would like to thank Stacey Sweeney for help with the data anonymization. AG, GM and BM are employees of Anthem Inc. The funder had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

1. United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime. In: United Nations : Office on Drugs and Crime [Internet]. 15 Nov 2000 [cited 28 Feb 2022]. Available: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/organized-crime/intro/UNTOC.html

2. International Labor Organization. Statistics on forced labour, modern slavery and human trafficking (Forced labour, modern slavery and human trafficking) in 2016. 2017. Available: http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/statistics/lang--en/index.htm

3. US Department of State. Trafficking in Persons Report. 2021 Jun. Available: https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/TIPR-GPA-upload-07222021.pdf

4. 2020 National Hotline Annual Report. In: National Human Trafficking Hotline [Internet]. 3 Jan 2022 [cited 28 Feb 2022]. Available: https://humantraffickinghotline.org/resources/2020-national-hotline-annual-report

5. Estes RJ, Weiner NA. The Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children in the U.S., Canada and Mexico: Final Report (of the U.S. National Study). 2001.

6. Clawson HJ, Dutch N, Solomon A, Grace ALG. Human Trafficking Into and Within the United States: A Review of the Literature. In: ASPE [Internet]. 29 Aug 2009 [cited 28 Feb 2022]. Available: https://aspe.hhs.gov/reports/human-trafficking-within-united-states-review-literature-0

7. Gallo M, Konrad RA, Thinyane H. An Epidemiological Perspective on Labor Trafficking. Journal of Human Trafficking. 2020; 1–22.

8. Ottisova L, Hemmings S, Howard LM, Zimmerman C, Oram S. Prevalence and risk of violence and the mental, physical and sexual health problems associated with human trafficking: an updated systematic review. Epidemiol Psychiatr Sci. 2016;25: 317–341.

9. Hemmings S, Jakobowitz S, Abas M, Bick D, Howard LM, Stanley N, et al. Responding to the health needs of survivors of human trafficking: a systematic review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2016;16: 320.

10. Rothman EF, Stoklosa H, Baldwin SB, Chisolm-Straker M, Kato Price R, Atkinson HG, et al. Public Health Research Priorities to Address US Human Trafficking. Am J Public Health. 2017;107: 1045–1047.

11. Cannon AC, Arcara J, Graham LM, Macy RJ. Trafficking and Health: A Systematic Review of Research Methods. Trauma Violence Abuse. 2018;19: 159–175.

12. Greenbaum VJ. Child sex trafficking in the United States: Challenges for the healthcare provider. PLoS Med. 2017;14: e1002439.

13. Zimmerman C, Borland R. Caring for Trafficked Persons: Guidance for Health Providers. Geneva: International Organization for Migration; 2009.

14. Greenbaum J, Stoklosa H. The healthcare response to human trafficking: A need for globally harmonized ICD codes. PLoS Med. 2019;16: e1002799.

15. Macias-Konstantopoulos WL. Diagnosis Codes for Human Trafficking Can Help Assess Incidence, Risk Factors, and Comorbid Illness and Injury. AMA J Ethics. 2018;20: E1143–1151.

16. Landman A, Gibbs H. ICD codes – an important component for improving care and research for patients impacted by human trafficking. J Law Med Ethics. 2021;49: 290–292.

17. Garg A, Panda P, Malay S, Slain KN. Human trafficking ICD-10 code utilization in pediatric tertiary care centers within the United States. Front Pediatr. 2022;10. doi:10.3389/fped.2022.818043

18. Zhu L, Roesler J, Menanteau B, Kindemark M. 87 The use of hospital discharge data to count sexually exploited youth and young adults in Minnesota. Poster Presentations. BMJ Publishing Group Ltd; 2020. doi:10.1136/injuryprev-2020-savir.106

19. Katsanis SH, Huang E, Young A, Grant V, Warner E, Larson S, et al. Caring for trafficked and unidentified patients in the EHR shadows: Shining a light by sharing the data. PLoS One. 2019;14: e0213766.

20. United Nations, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2012. United Nations Publications; 2012.

21. Ottisova L, Smith P, Shetty H, Stahl D, Downs J, Oram S. Psychological consequences of child trafficking: An historical cohort study of trafficked children in contact with secondary mental health services. PLoS One. 2018;13: e0192321.

22. Reback J, McKinney W, Van den Bossche J, Augspurger T, Cloud P, Hawkins S, et al. pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas 1.3.3. Zenodo; 2021. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.3509134

23. Bayer M. SQLAlchemy. In: Brown A, Wilson G, editors. The Architecture of Open Source Applications Volume II: Structure, Scale, and a Few More Fearless Hacks. aosabook.org; 2012.

24. Virtanen P, Gommers R, Oliphant TE, Haberland M, Reddy T, Cournapeau D, et al. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. Nat Methods. 2020;17: 261–272.

25. Kaiser Family Foundation. State Health Facts - Medicaid spending per enrollee. KFF. 2019. Available: https://www.kff.org/medicaid/state-indicator/medicaid-spending-per-enrollee/

26. Greenbaum J, Garrett A, Chon K, Bishop M, Luke J, Stoklosa H. Principles for safe implementation of ICD codes for human trafficking. J Law Med Ethics. 2021;49: 285–289.

27. Koegler E, Mohl A, Preble K, Teti M. Reports and Victims of Sex and Labor Trafficking in a Major Midwest Metropolitan Area, 2008-2017. Public Health Rep. 2019;134: 432–440.

28. Shandro J, Chisolm-Straker M, Duber HC, Findlay SL, Munoz J, Schmitz G, et al. Human Trafficking: A Guide to Identification and Approach for the Emergency Physician. Ann Emerg Med. 2016;68: 501–508.e1.

29. National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. Confronting Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking of Minors in the United States: A Guide for the Health Care Sector. National Academies Press; 2014.

30. Greenbaum J, McClure RC, Stare S, Barnes W, Claire E. Castles JD, Culliton ER, et al. Documenting ICD Codes and Other Sensitive Information in Electronic Health Records. 2021. Available: https://www.mhaonline.org/docs/default-source/resources/human-trafficking/icd-codes-and-other-sensitive-information-in-ehr.pdf