Osteoarthritis Diagnoses are Under-recorded in Primary Care Electronic Health Records in New Zealand

Ross Wilson*[1], Rory McMahon Chistopherson[1,2], Yana Pryymachenko[1], Richelle Caya[1], Lívia Gaspar Fernandes[3,1], Yen Wei Lim[1], Moody Gayed[1], Andrés Pierobon[4,1], Tony Dowell[4], Ben Darlow[4], Jayden MacRae[5], J. Haxby Abbott[1]

21 November 2025

Abstract

Background
Effective planning of healthcare services for osteoarthritis requires accurate estimates of its prevalence in primary care. There is growing evidence to suggest that osteoarthritis prevalence estimates in primary care are inaccurate owing to under-recording of codified diagnoses within electronic health records.

Aim
To quantify the gap in recording of osteoarthritis diagnoses in primary care in New Zealand.

Methods
We linked data from the electronic health records of a cohort of 72,861 patients enrolled with primary care providers in the lower North Island of New Zealand with public hospital discharge records to identify all patients in the cohort with a total hip or knee replacement surgery for osteoarthritis between 2013-2018. We then calculated the proportion of patients who had at least one matching osteoarthritis diagnosis code in the primary care records prior to joint replacement surgery. We conducted subgroup analyses stratifying the cohort by joint, year of surgery, age, sex, ethnicity, socioeconomic deprivation, primary care practice, and frequency of contact with the practice.

Results
Among the 591 patients with hip replacement and 609 with knee replacement, 48.2% and 49.8% respectively had an osteoarthritis diagnosis code in the primary care records prior to the time of surgery. There was little difference between the rates of osteoarthritis diagnosis coding for demographic subgroups, but wide variations were observed amongst practices.

Conclusions
There is substantial under-recording of osteoarthritis diagnoses in primary care in New Zealand due to delayed or absent coding within electronic health records. Efforts should be made to improve recording of osteoarthritis diagnoses to aid in future policy decision-making and research.

[1] Centre for Musculoskeletal Outcomes Research, Department of Surgery and Critical Care, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
[2] Centre for Health and Social Practice, Waikato Institute of Technology, Hamilton, New Zealand
[3] Rehabilitation Teaching and Research Unit, Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand
[4] Department of Primary Health Care, University of Otago, Wellington, New Zealand
[5] Datacraft Analytics, Wellington, New Zealand

*Corresponding author.
Email: ross.wilson@otago.ac.nz

Introduction

Osteoarthritis (OA) is a leading global cause of disability associated with an array of personal costs, such as pain, impaired mobility, and reduced quality of life, along with various societal costs including increased healthcare spending and reduced labour force productivity[1–3]. Moreover, the burden of OA is projected to rise, casting further pressure upon healthcare systems to keep up with growing demand[1,4–6].

Service delivery efforts to manage the growing burden of OA require astute planning, resource allocation decision-making, and health economic evaluation[7], all of which rely on sound estimates of the prevalence of OA. As OA is generally diagnosed and managed in primary care[8], reliable estimates of the prevalence and management of OA in primary care settings are crucial for effective service delivery planning. However, there is growing evidence to suggest existing data on the prevalence of OA in primary care are inaccurate[9–11].

Diagnosis of OA is typically made on clinical grounds, without requiring confirmation by imaging[12–14], and there are no pharmacological treatments specific to OA, so identification of patients in electronic health records (EHRs) relies on accurate diagnostic coding. International evidence has shown the coding of OA diagnoses within primary care EHRs to be inconsistent[9–11,15], and there is preliminary evidence of under-recording of OA diagnoses in New Zealand (NZ) primary care settings[16].

The aim of the present study is to quantify the extent to which OA diagnoses are under-recorded within primary care in NZ, by comparison with public hospital discharge records of patients who had a total hip or knee replacement surgery.

Methods

Data sources

This retrospective descriptive study used data held in the NZ Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI). The IDI is a linked research database maintained by Stats NZ, NZ's national statistics agency, containing individual-level data from government administrative datasets, Stats NZ surveys and data collections, and non-governmental organisations[17].

The IDI contains, *inter alia*, extensive data from secondary care services (including public hospital discharge records), but primary care data are lacking. For this study, primary care EHRs pertaining to OA diagnosis were extracted from data held by Tū Ora Compass Health, a Primary Healthcare Organisation (PHO) in the lower North Island of NZ, and were integrated with the IDI (via record linkage at the individual patient level).

The cohort used in this study consisted of all patients who had total joint replacement (TJR) surgery of the hip or knee with a primary diagnosis of OA between January 2013 and December 2018, whose data were available in the extracted PHO data, and who were enrolled with any General Practitioner (GP) practice within Tū Ora Compass Health continuously for at least 10 years up to the date of surgery. Hip and knee replacement surgeries were treated as separate events, so an individual with both a hip and a knee replaced during the study period would contribute two independent observations. If a patient had more than one of the same procedure (e.g., both knees replaced in separate procedures), only the first eligible surgery was included.

Variables

TJR surgeries were identified from hospital discharge records using the Australian Refined-Diagnosis Related Groups classification (AR-DRG, versions 6.0-7.0; codes I03A/B [hip replacement], I04A/B [knee replacement]), and associated OA diagnoses using the International Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, Australian Modification (ICD-10-AM; codes M16 [hip OA], M17 [knee OA]).

The outcome of interest was a coded diagnosis of OA of the same joint in the primary care EHR at any time prior to surgery. While all included patients were required to have at least 10 years of continuous PHO enrolment, the primary care data also included historical OA diagnosis codes recorded by a practice within the PHO at any time. OA diagnoses in primary care records were identified using Read codes (hip OA: 7K30*, 7K31*, 7K32*, 7K37*, 7K39*, N05z5.11, N05zJ.00; knee OA: 7K22*, N05zL.00, N05z6.11), supplemented as necessary with free-text annotations to differentiate hip and knee OA from OA in other body locations[18].

Data availability and ethics statement

The anonymised data used in this study were made available to the research team by Stats NZ under strict data access requirements and are not publicly available. The aggregated data and code used to produce the results reported in the article are available at https://osf.io/nfy5v/. For more information regarding access to the underlying raw data in the IDI, see https://www.stats.govt.nz/integrated-data/. To align with the confidentiality

provisions for IDI data access, all reported counts of individuals are randomly rounded (up or down) to the nearest multiple of three.

The study was approved by the University of Otago Human Research Ethics Committee (Health) (reference HD18/077).

Analyses

We calculated the proportion of OA TJR patients who had at least one matching prior OA diagnosis code in the primary care records. For additional exploratory analyses, we also calculated the time between first recorded diagnosis and the date of surgery, including for OA diagnoses occurring after surgery.

Subgroup analyses were conducted by stratifying the cohort by year of surgery, OA joint, age, sex, ethnicity (Māori, Pacific Islander, Asian), GP practice, socioeconomic deprivation (measured at the 'meshblock' level, representing small neighbourhoods of approximately 100-200 people), and frequency of contact with the GP practice.

All analyses were conducted using R version 4.4.0[19].

Results

The PHO cohort consisted of 72 861 patients, of whom 1593 had undergone TJR between 2013 and 2018. After excluding patients who were not enrolled with the PHO continuously for at least 10 years prior to surgery, the analysis cohort consisted of 1170 patients, with a total of 1200 TJRs (591 hip replacements and 609 knee replacements). The mean (SD) age of the cohort was 69.5 (9.5) years and slightly more than half (57.5%) were female (Table 1).

Of the 1200 recorded procedures, 48.8% had a matching OA diagnosis code in the primary care EHR prior to the date of surgery. The rate was similar between hip (48.2%) and knee (49.8%) replacement surgeries. The

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the cohort

Variable	Value
N	1200
Joint	
Hip	591 (49.2%)
Knee	609 (50.7%)
Age, mean (SD)	69.5 (9.5)
Under 60	192 (16.0%)
60 to 64	147 (12.2%)
65 to 69	237 (19.8%)
70 to 74	234 (19.5%)
75 to 79	213 (17.8%)
80 and over	174 (14.5%)
Female	690 (57.5%)
Ethnicity	
Māori	93 (7.8%)
Pacific Islander	36 (3.0%)
Asian	24 (2.0%)
NZ Deprivation Index, mean (SD)	4.9 (2.6)
Decile 1	123 (10.2%)
Decile 2	147 (12.2%)
Decile 3	153 (12.8%)
Decile 4	150 (12.5%)
Decile 5	141 (11.8%)
Decile 6	114 (9.5%)
Decile 7	141 (11.8%)
Decile 8	117 (9.8%)
Decile 9	87 (7.2%)
Decile 10	27 (2.2%)

Values are count (%) unless otherwise specified. All variables measured at the time of surgery.
Abbreviations: NZ=New Zealand; SD=Standard deviation.



Figure 1: Proportion with prior OA diagnosis in primary care among patients with primary hip or knee replacement surgery
Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

rate of prior OA diagnosis coding was slightly higher for surgeries occurring before 2016, although the overall trend between 2013 and 2018 was minimal (Figure 1).

There was little difference in the rates of under-recording of OA diagnoses between hip and knee OA or between subgroups based on any observed patient characteristics. However, there was considerably more variation between GP practices (Figure 2 and Table A1).

The time of first recorded OA diagnosis of hip and knee OA, relative to the time of surgery, is shown in Figure 3. Among those with an OA diagnosis recorded prior to surgery, the first recorded diagnosis occurred less than one year before surgery in 27.7% of hip replacements and 16.8% of knee replacements and within 2 years of surgery for 41.5% of hip replacements and 29.7% of knee replacements. The first recorded diagnosis of OA in the primary care EHR occurred during the month *following* surgery for 16.8% of hip replacement surgeries and 20.2% of knee replacement surgeries.

Discussion

This study investigated the extent to which OA diagnoses are under-recorded in NZ primary care, by comparison to a definitive reference standard: public hospital discharge records of patients who had total hip or knee replacement surgery for OA. We found substantial under-recording: an OA diagnosis code was missing in more than half (51.2%) of this cohort's EHRs prior to surgery. There were no major differences observed between subgroups based on patient characteristics or OA joint, however coding behaviours varied considerably among GP practices with coding rates ranging from 26% to as high as 83% in some practices.

Strengths of this study include the use of a gold-standard reference population of patients having undergone TJR for a primary diagnosis of OA, which minimizes the risk of false positive (i.e., non-OA) cases in the reference population. Reference population challenges have been reported as a limitation within past research investigating under-recording[11]. Furthermore, by requiring all patients in our cohort to have been enrolled with the same PHO for at least 10 years prior to TJR (and including historical primary care diagnosis information for these patients as well), we ensured that any coded OA diagnoses would be captured within our data. The primary limitation of our study is that the reference population identifies only end-stage OA requiring and receiving TJR; generalizability of these results to early- and mid-stage OA is speculative. Further, the study relied on data from



Figure 2: Proportion with prior OA diagnosis in primary care among patients with primary hip or knee replacement surgery, by subgroups

Vertical red line indicates the overall sample proportion. Tabular data used to create the figure are available in Table A1.
Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.
Abbreviations: GP=General practice; NZDep=New Zealand Index of Socioeconomic Deprivation.



Figure 3: Proportion with OA diagnosis in primary care among patients with primary hip or knee replacement surgery, by time relative to surgery

a single PHO covering one region of NZ, which resulted in a smaller sample than previous international studies and may limit the generalizability of our results.

Previous studies in other countries have used differing methods and reference populations, but have found similar levels of under-recording (i.e., around 50%) of OA diagnoses[9,10,15]. The methodology of the present study was most comparable with that of Yu et al.[11]. That study also used TJR as a reference population, and investigated the coding gap within EHR data retrieved from a large tranche of GP practices representing approximately 7% of the United Kingdom's population. The coding gaps reported ranged from 47% (hip) and 56% (knee) for any OA diagnosis, to as high as 72% (hip) and 75% (knee) for joint-specific OA coding.

A novel contribution of this study was the analysis of the time between the first recorded coding of OA diagnosis and the provision of TJR. OA is a chronic condition that is ideally managed in primary care for some years before eventual need, in some cases, for TJR[4,5]. Despite this, we found that the first recorded OA diagnosis code occurred within the 2 years prior to TJR in around one-in-three cases. Orthopaedic referral within the public healthcare system in NZ is aided by prior OA diagnosis, which may explain this higher rate of OA coding shortly before TJR. In line with previous studies showing a discrepancy between narrative and coded OA diagnoses[9,10], it is likely that in some cases OA diagnoses may have been made earlier, but not coded in EHRs at the time of diagnosis. Unlike in secondary care, primary care remuneration does not depend on accurate coding of OA diagnoses, so there is little incentive for coding unless considered necessary for effective case management.

Some GPs have reported assigning lower priority to OA, especially in situations where patients present with multiple medical needs or when faced with multi-level challenges such as time pressure and system barriers[8,20,21]. A self-reported lack of confidence in making a clinical diagnosis and a reliance on imaging to confirm diagnosis are other factors that may also impede GPs' ability to make an accurate early OA diagnosis[8,21,22]. In other cases, GPs have described playing down or avoiding making an OA diagnosis in primary care due to the negative connotations associated with the OA label, often in an attempt to manage patient fear and disappointment[8]. Given long wait times for surgery and a lack of funded non-operative care, GPs may see little benefit in giving patients a formal OA diagnosis. Taken together, these factors may influence GPs' decisions to defer to radiologists and orthopaedic surgeons for definitive diagnosis[22], which may have contributed towards the observed coding behaviours; in particular, the share of patients with OA diagnosis recorded only *after* TJR. Further research is warranted to explore what may drive under-coding of OA in the NZ and international primary care context.

Care planning and resource allocation should be informed by accurate understanding of the prevalence, distribution, and management of health conditions. Our findings suggest OA is much more prevalent in primary care than implied by diagnostic coding alone, especially when considering that those who undergo TJR (one-sixth of the NZ population[23]) represent a minority of the hip and knee OA population, and presumably are those more likely to get diagnosed and coded. Our estimates of under-coding are therefore conservative, thus we strongly advise against relying on diagnostic coding as a basis for estimating OA burden in primary care.

Beyond recommending that prompt coding of OA diagnosis be prioritised in primary care settings, the observed differences in coding behaviours between GP practices involved within this study may provide material pathways for future research. By examining the knowledge, systems and processes that may underpin the coding behaviours of higher-performing GP practices, identification of the factors that influence under-recording may lead to strategies for redress.

Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate that there is substantial under-recording of OA diagnoses in NZ primary care. Efforts to improve the consistency and timeliness of coding of hip and knee OA diagnoses are warranted.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the CMOR CREW (Collaborative Research Writing) process and writing retreat in the enabling the research and production of the manuscript.

Contributions

Ross Wilson: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Formal analysis, Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Visualization.
Rory McMahon Christopherson: Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Conceptualization.
Yana Pryymachenko: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft.

Richelle Caya: Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.
Lívia Gaspar Fernandes: Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.
Yen Wei Lim: Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.
Moody Gayed: Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.
Andrés Pierobon: Writing – review & editing, Conceptualization.
Tony Dowell: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Writing – Review and Editing.
Ben Darlow: Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Writing – Review and Editing.
Jayden MacRae: Conceptualisation, Investigation, Methodology, Funding acquisition, Writing – Review and Editing, Data Curation.
J. Haxby Abbott: Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Project administration, Methodology, Conceptualization, Investigation, Funding acquisition.

Funding

This study was funded by a Project grant from the Health Research Council of New Zealand (#18/442). The funder had no role in study design, data collection, analysis, or writing of the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Steinmetz JD, Culbreth GT, Haile LM, Rafferty Q, Lo J, Fukutaki KG, et al. Global, regional, and national burden of osteoarthritis, 1990-2020 and projections to 2050: A systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. Lancet Rheumatology. 2023;5(9):e508–22.
2. Leifer V, Katz J, Losina E. The burden of OA-health services and economics. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2022;30(1):10–6.
3. He Y, Jiang W, Wang W. Global burden of osteoarthritis in adults aged 30 to 44 years, 1990 to 2019: Results from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2024;25(1):303.
4. Hunter DJ, Bierma-Zeinstra S. Osteoarthritis. Lancet. 2019;393(10182):1745–59.
5. Bannuru RR, Osani MC, Vaysbrot EE, Arden NK, Bennell K, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, et al. OARSI guidelines for the non-surgical management of knee, hip, and polyarticular osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2019;27(11):1578–89.
6. Wilson R, Abbott JH. The projected burden of knee osteoarthritis in New Zealand: Healthcare expenditure and total joint replacement provision. NZ Med J. 2019;132(1503):53–65.
7. Hiligsmann M, Cooper C, Arden N, Boers M, Branco JC, Luisa Brandi M, et al. Health economics in the field of osteoarthritis: An Expert's consensus paper from the European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis and Osteoarthritis (ESCEO). Sem Arthritis Rheum. 2013;43(3):303–13.
8. Egerton T, Nelligan RK, Setchell J, Atkins L, Bennell KL. General practitioners' views on managing knee osteoarthritis: A thematic analysis of factors influencing clinical practice guideline implementation in primary care. BMC Rheumatol. 2018;2(1):30.
9. Arslan IG, Damen J, Wilde M de, Driest JJ van den, Bindels PJE, Lei J van der, et al. Incidence and prevalence of knee osteoarthritis using codified and narrative data from electronic health records: A population-based study. Arthritis Care Res. 2022;74(6):937–44.
10. Arslan I, Damen J, De Wilde M, Van Den Driest J, Bindels P, Van Der Lei J, et al. Estimating incidence and prevalence of hip osteoarthritis using electronic health records: a population-based cohort study. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2022;30(6):843–51.
11. Yu D, Jordan K, Peat G. Underrecording of osteoarthritis in United Kingdom primary care electronic health record data. Clin Epidemiol. 2018;10:1195–201.
12. Altman R, Asch E, Bloch D, Bole G, Borenstein D, Brandt K, et al. Development of criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis: Classification of osteoarthritis of the knee. Arthritis Rheum. 1986;29(8):1039–49.
13. Altman R, Alarcón G, Appelrouth D, Bloch D, Borenstein D, Brandt K, et al. The American College of Rheumatology criteria for the classification and reporting of osteoarthritis of the hip. Arthritis Rheum. 1991;34(5):505–14.

14. Runhaar J, Kloppenburg M, Boers M, Bijlsma JWJ, Bierma-Zeinstra SMA, the CREDO expert group. Towards developing diagnostic criteria for early knee osteoarthritis: data from the CHECK study. Rheumatology. 2021;60(5):2448–55.
15. Yu D, Jordan KP, Bedson J, Englund M, Blyth F, Turkiewicz A, et al. Population trends in the incidence and initial management of osteoarthritis: Age-period-cohort analysis of the Clinical Practice Research Datalink, 1992–2013. Rheumatology. 2017;56(11):1902–17.
16. Abbott JH, Dowell T, MacRae J, Wilson R, Stephenson C, Oscroft N, et al. The primary care diagnosis and management of osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2024;32:S529.
17. Milne BJ, Atkinson J, Blakely T, Day H, Douwes J, Gibb S, et al. Data resource profile: The New Zealand Integrated Data Infrastructure (IDI). Int J Epidemiol. 2019;48(3):677–677e.
18. MacRae J, Darlow B, Dowell T, Stephenson C, Oscroft N, Wilson R, et al. Predictive models for identifying hip and knee osteoarthritis in primary care electronic records: A natural language processing text classifier approach. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2024;32:S73.
19. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. 2024. Available from: https://www.r-project.org/
20. Christiansen MB, White DK, Christian J, Waugh E, Gakhal N, King L, et al. "It … doesn't always make it [to] the top of the list": Primary care physicians' experiences with prescribing exercise for knee osteoarthritis. Can Fam Physician. 2020;66(1):e14.
21. Gibbs AJ, Barton CJ, Taylor NF, Kemp JL, Wallis JA, Manski-Nankervis JA, et al. General practitioners experience multi-level barriers to implementing recommended care for hip and knee osteoarthritis: A qualitative study. BMC Prim Care. 2024;25(1):423.
22. Evers BJ, Schers HJ, Van Den Ende CHM, Thurlings RM, Koëter S. Diagnosing knee osteoarthritis in patients, differences between general practitioners and orthopedic surgeons: A retrospective cohort study. BMC Prim Care. 2023;24(1):155.
23. Henzell IS, Zhou L, Frampton C, Hooper G, Ackerman I, Young SW. Lifetime risk of primary total knee replacement surgery in New Zealand from 2000 to 2015. NZ Med J. 2019;132(1489):48–56.

Appendix A: Supplementary Material

Table A1: Proportion with prior osteoarthritis diagnosis in primary care among patients with primary hip or knee replacement surgery, by subgroups

Group	Proportion (95% CI)
Joint	
Hip	48.2% (44.1 to 52.3)
Knee	49.8% (45.7 to 53.8)
Age	
Under 60	51.6% (44.3 to 58.8)
60-64	44.9% (36.8 to 53.3)
65-69	49.4% (42.9 to 55.9)
70-74	45.6% (39.1 to 52.1)
75-79	50.0% (43.2 to 56.8)
80 and over	50.0% (42.4 to 57.6)
Sex	
Female	49.6% (45.8 to 53.4)
Male	48.2% (43.8 to 52.7)
Māori	
Māori	48.4% (38.0 to 58.9)
non-Māori	48.5% (45.5 to 51.5)
Pacific Islander	
Pacific	45.5% (28.5 to 63.4)
non-Pacific	49.0% (46.1 to 51.9)
Asian	
Asian	50.0% (29.6 to 70.4)
non-Asian	49.0% (46.1 to 51.9)
NZ Deprivation index	
Decile 1	60.0% (50.6 to 68.7)
Decile 2	51.0% (42.7 to 59.3)
Decile 3	48.1% (40.1 to 56.2)
Decile 4	44.0% (36.0 to 52.3)
Decile 5	50.0% (41.6 to 58.4)
Decile 6	42.1% (33.0 to 51.7)
Decile 7	44.7% (36.4 to 53.3)
Decile 8	46.2% (37.0 to 55.6)
Decile 9	55.2% (44.2 to 65.7)
Decile 10	55.6% (35.6 to 74.0)

Group	Proportion (95% CI)
GP interactions	
Fewer than 64	46.5% (40.7 to 52.3)
64–93	47.5% (41.7 to 53.3)
94–137	45.5% (39.9 to 51.3)
138 or more	54.5% (48.7 to 60.1)
*Practice**	
100	50.0% (31.7 to 68.3)
116	27.3% (13.9 to 45.8)
117	61.9% (48.8 to 73.6)
120	55.6% (41.5 to 68.8)
127	50.7% (43.7 to 57.7)
129	50.0% (31.7 to 68.3)
130	60.0% (44.4 to 73.9)
132	58.3% (46.1 to 69.6)
52	31.6% (20.3 to 45.4)
53	40.0% (23.2 to 59.2)
54	33.3% (23.5 to 44.8)
56	31.2% (19.1 to 46.4)
70	82.8% (72.8 to 89.7)
71	26.3% (15.9 to 39.9)
77	70.0% (56.6 to 80.8)
81	70.6% (56.0 to 82.1)
82	40.0% (17.5 to 67.1)
84	50.0% (26.8 to 73.2)
89	50.0% (29.6 to 70.4)
92	33.3% (17.2 to 54.0)
Year of surgery	
2013	50.0% (41.2 to 58.8)
2014	60.0% (52.1 to 67.5)
2015	50.6% (44.0 to 57.2)
2016	43.3% (36.4 to 50.4)
2017	44.6% (38.3 to 51.0)
2018	43.2% (36.7 to 50.0)

* Practice labels are anonymized practice IDs; only practices with at least 6 cases are reported due to IDI confidentiality provisions
Abbreviations: CI=Confidence interval; NZ=New Zealand.