



Improving the Quality of Cause of Death Information on Texas Death Certificates

As Required by

**2018-2019 General Appropriations
Act, Senate Bill 1, 85th Legislature,
Regular Session, 2017 (Article II,
Department of State Health
Services, Rider 36)**

October 2018



TEXAS
**Health and Human
Services**

**Texas Department of
State Health Services**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
1. Introduction	2
2. Background	3
3. Collecting Cause of Death Information	5
Death Registration Requirements in Texas.....	5
Reporting the Cause of Death	6
2017 Death Certificate Data Analysis	7
4. Assessments and Findings.....	8
Assessments.....	8
Findings	9
5. Recommendations to Improve Data Quality	13
6. Conclusion.....	16
List of Acronyms	18
Appendix A. Death Certificate Cause of Death Section	A-1
Appendix B. CDC Excerpt on Death Certificate Completion.....	B-1
Appendix C. Focus Group Questions	C-1
Appendix D. Panelist List	D-1

Executive Summary

The [2018-2019 General Appropriations Act, Senate Bill 1, 85th Legislature, Regular Session, 2017 \(Article II, Department of State Health Services, Rider 36\)](#) directs the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) to study the quality of cause of death (COD) information on death certificates, the current process of collecting COD information, and any challenges relating to the quality of that information.

By October 1, 2018, DSHS is to include the findings and recommendations from this study in a report to the Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, Legislative Budget Board, and permanent standing committees in the House and Senate with jurisdiction over health and human services.

This report outlines the current process of collecting COD information and discusses the findings and recommendations identified from three assessments on the issue.

Findings from these assessments include the following.

- Errors often occur in attempting to identify the underlying cause of death.
- Some providers do not understand the role of death certificates in public health.
- Lack of training is a barrier to quality reporting on death certificates.
- Logistical inefficiencies within the death registration process lower data quality.
- Some medical certifiers need more resources to support them in their role in the death registration process.

Recommendations made in the report include the following.

- Improve death certificate quality through medical certifier training and support.
- Facilitate communication among stakeholders to reduce role confusion in completing individual death certificates.
- Enhance DSHS capacity and expertise to support continued evaluation and improvement in cause of death reporting.
- Foster stakeholder input to identify opportunities and challenges to improve quality of death registration data.

1. Introduction

Death certificates serve public health, administrative, and legal purposes. Death certificates contain medical information such as cause of death (COD), manner of death, pregnancy status, whether an autopsy was performed, whether tobacco use contributed to death, and injury information for deaths where the manner is not natural. The death certificate is as important to public health as the medical record is to patient care. It is therefore vital to ensure that the information in death certificates is of high enough quality to support state efforts to provide reliable mortality statistics and public health programming.

The 2018-2019 General Appropriations Act, Senate Bill 1, 85th Legislature, Regular Session, 2017 (Article II, Department of State Health Services, Rider 36) directs the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) to study the quality of COD information on death certificates, the current process of collecting COD information, and any challenges relating to the quality of that information. These challenges may relate to

- the accuracy and completeness of COD information on death certificates;
- roles and perceptions of medical certifiers; and
- structural, procedural, and technological issues.

DSHS is to examine national standards and may convene a panel of experts in the process of this assessment.

By October 1, 2018, DSHS is to include findings and recommendations from this study in a report to the Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the House, Legislative Budget Board and permanent standing committees in the House and Senate with jurisdiction over health and human services.

In the following report, DSHS will

- outline the process of reporting cause of death;
- describe findings on challenges to quality cause of death information; and
- provide recommendations on how information quality can be improved.

2. Background

Vital events, including births, deaths, fetal deaths, and marriages, that take place in Texas must be reported to the Department of State Health Services (DSHS) Vital Statistics Section (VSS). There are approximately 900,000 vital events registered each year. DSHS VSS works with medical facilities, funeral homes, and local government offices to ensure events are reported timely and accurately. Once vital events are reported from statutorily authorized data providers, such as physicians, medical examiners, Justices of the Peace, birth clerks, and midwives, the reports are reviewed and registered as official vital records.

The resulting vital records serve public health, administrative, and legal purposes. The medical information captured on birth, death, and fetal death records underlie public health research and surveillance into areas such as maternal mortality, birth defects, and leading causes of death. DSHS VSS staff must work with data providers to ensure that the information provided accurately reflects medical and health records. Certified copies of birth and death records are issued to qualified applicants for various administrative and legal purposes, such as school enrollment, passport applications, and settling estates. DSHS VSS staff must examine customer applications to minimize identity theft and prevent fraud.

DSHS VSS collects, registers, amends, issues, and preserves vital records for legal and administrative purposes, and uses vital statistics for public health activities to improve the health and well-being of Texans. Public health interventions, based on mortality statistics, seek to prevent deaths by intervening as early as possible in the sequence of events that lead to death. Incomplete, inaccurate, or nonspecific reporting on death certificates can lead to under- or over-counting of causes of deaths, which can affect public health programs, policy, and funding as well as responses to disasters, outbreaks, and emergencies.

However, collecting high quality data through death certificates can be difficult, and current processes need to be examined in order to understand local context and challenges to quality data reporting.

Between 1903 and 2007, death registration in Texas was a paper-based process. [House Bill 1739, 80th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2007](#), was enacted requiring electronic death reporting for funeral homes and medical certifiers. To

comply with this requirement, DSHS implemented mandatory electronic death reporting using the Texas Electronic Registrar (TER) system.

The conversion from paper-based reporting to electronic reporting improved the timeliness of death registration, promoted standardized death certificate reporting, and made mortality data more readily available as a surveillance tool for measuring health. Electronic reporting is considered a national standard and best practice in vital statistics, with automated checks and functionality to enhance data quality, timeliness, and security that do not exist in paper-based reporting.

Though DSHS VSS has adopted electronic reporting and registration, there is still a business need for paper records. Electronic storage is not considered an acceptable permanent media storage option in part because disks have a more limited life-span (less than 30 years) compared to the long-term options of specialized paper and microform (50-100 years). The software required to store and retrieve electronic records also changes over time adding additional barriers to long-term storage and retrieval. Currently, DSHS VSS works with the Texas State Library to transfer records to microfilm to maintain the quality and integrity of vital records.

Texas has reviewed the quality and security of the statewide system of vital registration over the last several years. In 2012, DSHS, in conjunction with a birth-record security workgroup established as a provision of the [2012-2013 General Appropriations Act, House Bill 1, 82nd Texas Legislature, Regular Session, 2011 \(Article II, Texas Department of State Health Services, Rider 72\)](#), developed a set of recommendations that addressed the security and effectiveness of the state's birth record information system. Recommendations to improve the security of vital event data included the replacement of the existing Texas Electronic Registrar (TER) system. The Texas Electronic Vital Events Registrar (TxEVER) Project will result in the implementation of a new system, TxEVER, starting on January 1, 2019.

3. Collecting Cause of Death Information

Collecting cause of death (COD) information, regarding the circumstances under which an individual died, is required for filing a death certificate for registration.

Death Registration Requirements in Texas

The process of registering a death begins with the funeral director, or person acting as such, filing a Report of Death with the local registrar (for the registration district where the person died) within 24 hours of taking custody of a body. It is the responsibility of the funeral director to complete and file the Certificate of Death within ten days of the date of death ([Texas Health and Safety Code, Section 193.002 and 193.003](#)). Completion of the death certificate requires collaboration among the funeral director, the person responsible for medically certifying the death, and others as necessary to complete the certificate.

The Texas death certificate follows the United States standard death certificate set by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) at the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and includes items such as name, date of birth, date of death, cause and manner of death, and burial or disposition information.¹ The reporting process is electronic, and the death certificate must be electronically signed by the funeral director and the medical certifier prior to becoming registered by the state as an official vital record.

The medical certifier must be a physician, medical examiner, or Justice of the Peace (JP) with exceptions allowed only as specifically outlined in statute ([Texas Health and Safety Code, Section 193.005](#); [Code of Criminal Procedure, Section 49.04 and 49.25](#)). In most circumstances, a physician will be the most appropriate individual to medically certify a death certificate. If the manner of death is anything other than natural and/or the death meets any of the circumstances outlined within statute, the JP or medical examiner should be called immediately for investigation or inquest as to the cause and manner of death and will be the one to medically certify the death certificate. Additionally, in accordance with [Code of Criminal Procedure, Section 49.04](#), the medical examiner or JP should be notified of the

¹ www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/revisions-of-the-us-standard-certificates-and-reports.htm

deaths of children under the age of six, upon which an inquest is done to determine whether the death was unexpected or the result of abuse or neglect.

Once the death certificate is completed and signed, it must be filed electronically with the local registrar and DSHS VSS within ten days of the date of death by the funeral director or the person acting as such.² Once the death certificate is registered as an official vital record by the state, it may only be updated or corrected through an amendment process.

Reporting the Cause of Death

Texas is one of 57 vital records jurisdictions that is independently responsible for overseeing vital statistics systems in the United States. These jurisdictions send data to CDC NCHS to create national-level vital statistics. CDC NCHS provides written guidance and best practices to ensure high quality death certificate and COD data, including handbooks and guides for physicians, medical examiners, and funeral directors on medical certification of death and death registration. These can be found at www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/training-and-instructional-materials.htm.

The COD section on the death certificate is where the medical certifier reports the final diseases or conditions that resulted in death, according to their best medical judgment. The COD section on the Texas death certificate is divided into two parts – Part 1 and Part 2 – and follows the national standard set by the CDC.

Part 1 in the COD section on the death certificate contains four lines - a, b, c, and d - to use for recording, in reverse chronological order, the causal sequence of events or conditions leading to death. The medical certifier must complete Part 1(a) with the immediate cause of death, which is the specific condition that directly preceded the death. To complete the sequence leading to death, the medical certifier works backwards from Part 1(a). The intermediate cause(s) are the significant conditions that preceded and gave rise to the immediate cause of death, and these are listed on the lines below Part 1(a) on the death certificate. The last line is used for the underlying cause of death, which is the initiating condition that triggered the sequence of events leading to death ([see Appendix A](#)). The underlying

² Fetal deaths, as defined in 25 Texas Administrative Code, Section 181.1 (11), do not have associated birth and death certificates and instead have a Certificate of Fetal Death as the sole vital record to evidence the pregnancy.

cause of death reported on the death certificate is what drives mortality statistics on leading causes of death.

In general, the medical certifier should try to provide a specific and clear causal sequence of events that resulted in death. If the medical certifier is unable to determine a sequence or chain of events that ends in death, then the medical examiner or JP may need to be consulted about conducting an investigation.

The medical certifier can use terms like *probable* or *presumed* when reporting the COD on the death certificate. Also, if the certifier is unable to determine the cause, they should record the cause as *unknown, undetermined, or unspecified*.³

Part 2 is for reporting all other significant diseases, conditions, or injuries that contributed to death, but which did not result in the underlying cause of death given in Part 1.

An excerpt from the CDC's *Physicians' Handbook on Medical Certification of Death* is reproduced in [Appendix B](#) to show the accurate completion of Part I and Part II of the cause of death section of the death certificate.⁴

2017 Death Certificate Data Analysis

Basic descriptive statistics were conducted in order to understand the context in which deaths are registered in Texas.

Using 2017 provisional data, there were 200,863 total deaths registered in Texas, of which 80 percent were certified by physicians, 10 percent by medical examiners, and 10 percent by JPs.

Of the total deaths, 63 percent took place in a medical facility setting (of which 39 percent took place in a hospital), 31 percent at the decedent's home, and 6 percent in an "other" setting.

There were 13,558 physicians who certified death certificates in 2017, with an average 12 deaths being certified by each physician.

³ Ibid.

⁴ https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/misc/hb_cod.pdf

4. Assessments and Findings

The Department of State Health Services (DSHS) Vital Statistics Section (VSS) has conducted multiple assessments to study the quality of cause of death (COD) data on death certificates, the current process of collecting cause of death information, and any challenges relating to the quality of that information.

Assessments

To study the quality of cause of death information on death certificates, DSHS VSS relied on the following assessments.

Literature Review

DSHS VSS began their assessment by reviewing the related academic and professional research to identify challenges to process and quality experienced in other vital records jurisdictions.

Focus Groups on the Death Certificate Process

In 2017, DSHS began partnering with Texas A&M University School of Public Health, USA Center for Rural Public Health Preparedness to develop online trainings for data providers responsible for completing death certificates. The trainings are scheduled to roll out in 2019. Focus groups were conducted in early 2018, using a facilitation guide, to gather information on current practices. There was one focus group session held with funeral directors, physicians, and Justices of the Peace (JPs), respectively. See [Appendix C](#) for the Focus Group Questions.

Panel of Experts

As part of its review of the quality of COD data on death certificates, the Vital Statistics State Registrar convened a panel of experts in July 2018. The panel participants are listed in [Appendix D](#).

The panel represented broad expertise and experience with vital registration in Texas, other states, and at the national level. The central question posed to the group was *What are the challenges in collecting accurate death data?*

DSHS VSS has used the above assessments to study the quality of COD information on death certificates, the current process of collecting COD information, and any challenges relating to the quality of that information, such as

- the accuracy and completeness of COD information on death certificates;
- roles and perceptions of medical certifiers; and
- structural, procedural, and technological issues.

Findings from this study are described below

Findings

Finding 1

Errors often occur in attempting to identify the underlying cause of death.

Through literature review, DSHS has identified common errors made in the COD section of death certificates. The most common error is listing the mechanism of death as the underlying cause of death. In the CDC case history presented in [Appendix B](#), if only “cardiac arrest” was reported, information regarding pneumocystis carinii pneumonia, AIDS, and HIV would have been lost, along with the potential for public health programs and policies to prevent such deaths. Other common errors in COD reporting include listing conditions in the incorrect causal order or listing a nonspecific condition as an underlying cause.

Another common error among physician certifiers is not including the initial event that brought a patient to the hospital. Physicians may focus on the natural disease processes experienced by the patient in the hospital and only include that information on the death certificate. However, there are cases when a non-natural process, such as trauma, brought the patient to the hospital in the first place. If a non-natural event initiated the chain of processes leading to death, the event should be listed as the underlying COD. However, if this detail is missing, the physician may not notify the medical examiner or JP whose role it is to certify the non-natural deaths. Also, the true underlying cause of death would not be included in the vital statistics that inform public health funding and programming.

Finding 2

Lack of training is a barrier to quality reporting on death certificates.

The lack of training for medical certifiers, particularly physicians, is frequently cited in the literature as a common barrier to quality reporting on death certificates. In Texas, there are three general categories of medical certifiers on death certificates, all of whom have varied education and experience: physicians, medical examiners, and JPs.

Physicians are generally not trained on how to complete death certificates and determine causes of death in medical school, whereas, it is part of the training to become a board certified medical examiner.

JPs are elected officials and are medical certifiers where there is no county medical examiner office and the death is considered not natural (e.g. manner of death is suicide or homicide) or a physician is not available to medically certify the death. Medical training is not required for JPs, and they do not always have training on completing the death certificate. Often, they will seek out the decedent's physician to obtain any medical history for completing the cause of death.

The focus groups and the panel confirmed that training and education are likely large contributing factors to data quality. Focus group participants expressed concern about the lack of training opportunities on how to complete the death certificate and why an accurate death certificate is important.

Finding 3

Some providers do not understand the important role of death certificates in public health.

In the focus group of funeral directors, participants reported that their biggest challenge in the death certificate process is that physicians have little understanding of the importance of the death certificate. Funeral homes report regularly having to contact physicians because a death certificate must be completed and/or cause of death information needs to be corrected. From the family perspective, a more accurate cause of death means that an insurance company could pay a claim sooner. When a cause of death is unclear, processing an insurance claim can take longer. From a public health perspective, cause of death information has significant impact on public health research, surveillance, and

intervention planning. The physician's focus group confirmed that there is often little awareness among some physicians as to importance of the death certificate or how to complete the COD section.

This challenge may reflect the lack of training that physicians receive on how to complete a death certificate, an issue often cited in the literature.

Finding 4

Logistical inefficiencies within the death registration process lower data quality.

The process to file a death certificate requires coordination among the funeral director, the person responsible for medically certifying the death, and others to obtain all necessary demographic and medical information, identify the appropriate medical certifier, and file the certificate within the required ten-day timeframe.

Feedback across the focus groups indicated that it is usually the funeral home/funeral director who receives the initial notification that a death certificate must be filed, often receiving calls from county clerks, the State, families, and medical examiners. Ultimately, funeral homes drive the entire process of death registration. Funeral home administrative staff support the process to ensure quality procedures. This includes keeping logs of calls to other stakeholders and maintaining timeframes for all cases to ensure timely death registration.

A completed death certificate requires signatures from both an authorized data provider attesting to the demographic and disposition information on a decedent, and an authorized data provider attesting to the cause of death and associated medical information. However, there are challenges in obtaining the necessary information to complete the death certificate.

For instance, the physician's focus group stated that when the patient dies at home without a physician present to understand the circumstances of the death, it is challenging to complete that patient's death certificate accurately. They further explained that they need to be careful not to upset the grieving family in asking them questions about the patient's history.

At times, the issue is identifying who should certify the cause of death for a specific death. The panel discussed that the appropriate medical certifier for a death certificate is not always immediately evident, and professionals may have varying opinions on their responsibilities.

Focus groups found that the medical certifier who is immediately available may feel they are not the best individual to sign a death certificate. In other situations, such as those identified by some JPs, the challenge may be getting emergency room physicians to sign death certificates for patients who die in the emergency room or are dead on arrival. Many physicians also rotate among hospitals, making it more difficult for those in the death registration process to establish who should certify a specific death.

Finding 5

Some medical certifiers need more resources to support them in their role in the death registration process.

Whereas medical examiners and JPs routinely complete death certificates, many physicians do not use the electronic system every day. As per medical examiners and JPs, some physicians do not want to sign death certificates because they do not know how to use the electronic system and do not have support when using it. This often leaves the death certificate to be completed by the medical examiner or JP, who has minimal knowledge of the patient.

Physicians report no administrative support for completing death certificates. Processes and workflows to streamline and standardize collection of information do not always exist in medical facilities, resulting in operational inefficiencies in the death registration process.

All participants agreed that a more user-friendly electronic system used to file death certificates, including prompts and data checks, would be helpful in providing immediate assistance and feedback during the data entry process.

5. Recommendations to Improve Data Quality

The Department of State Health Services (DSHS) Vital Statistics Section (VSS) has developed, from their assessments, recommendations on potential measures they could implement that would improve the quality of cause of death (COD) information on death certificates. Some of the recommended actions are included in the DSHS Legislative Appropriations Request submitted for fiscal years 2019 and 2020. These recommendations are listed below.

Recommendation 1 (for Finding 1, 2, and 3)

Improve death certificate quality through medical certifier training and support.

Findings from all three assessments identified the perceived lack of training for medical certifiers as a barrier to quality COD reporting on death certificates. Medical certifiers have varying experience and training with completing death certificates. Physicians report not receiving such training in medical school and many note they do not recognize the importance of these documents to public health activities. Justices of the Peace (JPs) are not required to receive training on medically certifying deaths, often do not have a medical background, and must rely on others for information to accurately complete the death certificate.

The panel confirmed the relationship between training and quality cause of death reporting. As such, DSHS VSS recommends data providers receive increased training on the death registration process and how to properly complete a death certificate. Such training will give data providers an understanding of the important role of death certificates in public health as well as what their responsibility is in the process. Any training should include information on best-practice workflows and systems that facilitate efficient death registration and promote a timelier and more accurate process. Such support would be especially helpful to data providers who have little experience with the death registration process or time to devote to this activity.

DSHS VSS has customer and field services representatives whose responsibilities entail training and outreach to data providers, and data quality is being integrated into trainings. The development of online trainings on cause of death reporting is in

progress, and there are plans to add disaster-related cause of death reporting trainings as well.

DSHS expects that through these training opportunities, and those through other organizations, medical certifiers will improve their ability and motivation to complete death certificates accurately.

Recommendation 2 (for Findings 3 and 4)

Facilitate communication among stakeholders to reduce role confusion in completing individual death certificates.

High quality death data is essential to public health activities and must be supported by all participants in the death registration system. DSHS VSS has found that communication among data providers can be difficult. Focus group participants described the challenges they have in identifying the appropriate medical certifier for certain deaths and collecting the necessary information to complete the COD information.

DSHS VSS recommends promoting opportunities to expand communication and discussion on roles among members of the death registration process. This may involve working with institutes of higher education, medical schools, medical societies, and professional associations to forge new connections between medical certifiers and to clarify their role in different circumstances.

One mechanism where DSHS has already begun this promotion is with their vital statistics regional and annual conferences. At these conferences, DSHS emphasizes the importance of data quality and encourages those involved in the death registration process to improve working relationships and receive training on medically certifying deaths.

DSHS VSS expects that by facilitating communications and networking in the death registration system, participating members will increase in knowledge, ability, and confidence and the quality of the resulting data will improve.

Recommendation 3 (for Findings 1, 2, and 4)

Enhance DSHS capacity and expertise to support continued evaluation and improvement in cause of death reporting.

Focus group participants, especially physicians, expressed the desire for more support completing death certificate information. Many physicians are unfamiliar with the current electronic death registration system and are as such hesitant to act as medical certifiers. All participants agreed that a more user-friendly system would help them in their work.

DSHS VSS has initiated a process to enhance their ability to focus on data quality in its ongoing work. DSHS VSS' proposed exceptional item will expand the capabilities of the section in identifying potential improvements to systems and processes in order to improve the quality of data being reported.

The launch of Texas Electronic Vital Events Registrar (TxEVER) will update the state's electronic death registration system, and the system will be continuously updated to incorporate stakeholder feedback.

Recommendation 4 (for Finding 4)

Foster stakeholder input to identify opportunities and challenges to improve quality of death registration data.

Stakeholders in the death registration process are a vital resource in identifying issues and solutions to death data quality. DSHS VSS has benefitted from this opportunity to reach out to stakeholders and experts and to learn from their experiences through the assessment process.

Building upon the findings of this report, DSHS will begin formalizing the creation of a stakeholder workgroup. A stakeholder workgroup will give voice to the concerns of those participating in death registration and cultivate ambassadors of cause of death data quality improvement initiatives related to the above recommendations. The stakeholder workgroup will have the ability to work with DSHS VSS and assist in identifying and developing action plans for the most pressing issues affecting the death registration process and reporting quality data.

6. Conclusion

Death certificates serve public health, administrative, and legal purposes. Incomplete, inaccurate, or nonspecific reporting on death certificates can lead to under- or over-counting of causes of deaths, which can incorrectly affect public health programs, policy, and funding as well as responses to disasters, outbreaks, and emergencies.

The Department of State Health Services (DSHS) Vital Statistics Section (VSS) has reviewed literature, conducted focus groups, and led a panel of experts to assess the current state of death data quality in Texas. Through these assessments, DSHS VSS found there to be a need for training, improved communications, and modern electronic systems.

To achieve improvements in death data quality, DSHS recommends the following activities.

- Improve death certificate quality through medical certifier training and support.
- Facilitate communication among stakeholders to reduce role confusion in completing individual death certificates. Enhance DSHS capacity and expertise to support continued evaluation and improvement in cause of death reporting.
- Fostering stakeholder input to identify opportunities and challenges to improve quality of death registration data.

Finding 5, regarding need for more resources to support medical certifiers in their role in the death registration process, is not addressed in these recommendations. While training on completing a death certificate will improve the knowledge and skills of medical certifiers, providing administrative support falls outside the purview of DSHS and is reliant upon the resources and circumstances of medical certifiers.

DSHS will address the above recommendations in current and future activities and asks stakeholders to support improved quality in cause of death reporting through similar endeavors. Through a proposed exceptional item (EI) in the Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) for fiscal years 2020-20201, DSHS has requested additional funding to support hiring additional staff to focus on evaluation and implementing quality improvement projects. The proposed EI also requests

additional funds to increase the security, quality, and capacity of vital records, and improve customer service.

Addressing challenges with the quality of cause of death information necessitates a broad participatory approach focused on improving the death registration process.

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Full Name
CDC	United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
COD	Cause of Death
DSHS	Department of State Health Services
EDRS	Electronic Death Registration System
JP	Justice of the Peace
NCHS	National Center for Health Statistics
S.B.	Senate Bill
TER	Texas Electronic Registrar
TMA	Texas Medical Association
TxEVER	Texas Electronic Vital Events Registrar
VSS	Vital Statistics Section

Appendix A. Death Certificate Cause of Death Section

Figure 1. A Texas Death Certificate Form Showing Parts 1 and 2 for Cause of Death

CAUSE OF DEATH	<p>33. PART 1. ENTER THE <u>CHAIN OF EVENTS</u> – DISEASES, INJURIES, OR COMPLICATIONS – THAT DIRECTLY CAUSED THE DEATH. <u>DO NOT</u> ENTER TERMINAL EVENTS SUCH AS CARDIAC ARREST, RESPIRATORY ARREST, OR VENTRICULAR FIBRILLATION WITHOUT SHOWING THE ETIOLOGY. DO NOT ABBREVIATE. ENTER ONLY ONE CAUSE ON EACH LINE.</p>		Approximate interval: Onset to death
	<p>IMMEDIATE CAUSE (Final disease or condition -----> resulting in death)</p>	a. _____ Due to (or as a consequence of):	_____
	<p>Sequentially list conditions, if any, leading to the cause listed on line a. Enter the UNDERLYING CAUSE (disease or injury that initiated the events resulting in death) LAST.</p>	b. _____ Due to (or as a consequence of):	_____
		c. _____ Due to (or as a consequence of):	_____
		d. _____ Due to (or as a consequence of):	_____
	PART 2. ENTER OTHER <u>SIGNIFICANT CONDITIONS CONTRIBUTING TO DEATH</u> BUT NOT RESULTING IN THE UNDERLYING CAUSE GIVEN IN PART I.		34. WAS AN AUTOPSY PERFORMED? ↑ Yes ↑ No
			35. WERE AUTOPSY FINDINGS AVAILABLE TO COMPLETE THE CAUSE OF DEATH? ↑ Yes ↑ No

Appendix B. CDC Excerpt on Death Certificate Completion

An excerpt from the CDC's *Physicians' Handbook on Medical Certification of Death* is reproduced below to show the accurate completion of Part I and Part II of the cause of death section of the United States standard death certificate.⁵

Case History no. 6

A 34-year-old male was admitted to the hospital with severe shortness of breath. He had a 9-month history of unintentional weight loss, night sweats, and diarrhea. The patient had no history of any medical condition that would cause immunodeficiency. An Elisa test and confirmatory Western Blot test for human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) were positive. T-lymphocyte tests indicated a low T helper-suppressor ratio. A lung biopsy was positive for pneumocystis carinii pneumonia (PCP), indicating a diagnosis of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS).

The patient's pneumonia responded to pentamidine therapy, and the patient was discharged. The patient had two additional admissions for PCP. Seventeen months after the patient was first discovered to be HIV positive, he again developed PCP but did not respond to therapy. He died 2 weeks later.

Figure 2: Cause of Death Section of Death Certificate for Case History no. 6

CAUSE OF DEATH (See instructions and examples)		Approximate interval: Onset to death
32. PART I. Enter the chain of events--diseases, injuries, or complications--that directly caused the death. DO NOT enter terminal events such as cardiac arrest, respiratory arrest, or ventricular fibrillation without showing the etiology. DO NOT ABBREVIATE. Enter only one cause on a line. Add additional lines if necessary.		
IMMEDIATE CAUSE (Final disease or condition resulting in death)	a. <u>Pneumocystis carinii pneumonia</u> Due to (or as a consequence of):	<u>2 weeks</u>
Sequentially list conditions, if any, leading to the cause listed on line a. Enter the UNDERLYING CAUSE (disease or injury that initiated the events resulting in death) LAST	b. <u>Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome</u> Due to (or as a consequence of):	<u>17 months</u>
	c. <u>HIV infection</u> Due to (or as a consequence of):	<u>Over 17 months</u>
	d. _____	
PART II. Enter other significant conditions contributing to death but not resulting in the underlying cause given in PART I.		

Source: DHHS Publication No. (PHS) 2003-1108 03-0002 (4/2003)⁴

⁵ https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/misc/hb_cod.pdf

Figure 1 shows an accurate completion of the decedent's death certificate⁶. The immediate cause of death was pneumocystis carinii pneumonia (PCP) and is correctly named on Part I(a). The individual's HIV infection is the last item listed in Part I and is therefore correctly identified as the underlying cause of death. Because this death certificate accurately captures the individual's underlying cause of death as the HIV infection, public health programs and policies will have accurate information to guide their actions.

When the cause of death section on the death certificate is not completed accurately, inaccurate information is introduced into the public health statistics analysis and vital information is lost, as would be the case if only "cardiac arrest" was listed as the cause of death.

Part 2 of this death certificate is left blank because there were no other known contributing factors that may have contributed to the death, but did not directly cause the death to occur.

⁶ The CDC uses the US standard death certificate in this example.

Appendix C. Focus Group Questions

1. What training(s) were you provided with to determine cause of death? How widely is training available?
2. Are medical records considered when determining a cause of death, and if so, how?
3. Is the purpose and use of the death certificate clear? Why is it important to provide more information on a death certificate than simply something like quit breathing?
4. Who drives the process of completing a death certificate from the point a patient passes away until it is registered with the State? How is the process of completing the death certificate handled from start to finish? Do you have any administrative support at your facility to complete death certificate reporting? If so, does that administrative support also assist with reporting the cause of death data?
5. What challenges are involved in completing accurate cause of death statements on death certificates?
6. What structural, procedural, and technological barriers does the medical certifier perceive in filling out the death certificate, both in terms of knowledge about the cause of death and the mechanics of completing the certificate?
7. What do you see as the best way to receive training for completion of death certificates? Would tools such as a mobile app or a pocket card for easy reference (or possibly both) be beneficial?
8. What would you see as the types of questions that could be included as prompts in an electronic system to get to the real cause of death?
9. How do different entities (funeral home, JP, hospital, attending physician, etc.) work together (or do they) to complete death certificates? What could improve that part of the process?
10. How do you see your role in regard to the previous question, and how do you see the role of others?
11. What has traditionally been the rule for completing the death certificate in terms of collaboration, and does your facility have a standardized process in terms of collaborating with others?
12. How do facilities communicate with funeral homes, and what role does the funeral home play in influencing the cause of death statement?

13. How does a medical facility inform physicians of the manners of death in which they would certify a death versus a Medical Examiner or Justice of the Peace?
14. What is the medical facility's procedure for referring a death to a Medical Examiner or Justice of the Peace?

Appendix D. Panelist List

Participant Name	Participant Affiliation
Dr. Robert N. Anderson	National Center for Health Statistics
Dr. Tara Das	Texas DSHS Vital Statistics Section
Chris Guerrero	Texas DSHS Vital Statistics Section
Dr. Matthew Harbison	Memorial Hermann Hospital
Judge Judy Hobbs	Williamson County Justice of the Peace
Dr. John Holcomb	Texas Medical Association
Dr. Robert E. Jackson	Texas Medical Association
Carrie Kroll	Texas Hospital Association
Dr. Kimberly Molina	Bexar County Medical Examiner's Office
Dr. Karen Ruggiero	Texas DSHS Office of Child and Maternal Health
Gary Sammet	Florida Bureau of Vital Statistics
Jessica Schmidt	Williamson County Office of Judge Hobbs
Dr. Gary Sheppard	Texas Medical Association
Warren Stewart	Texas DSHS Vital Statistics Section
Shae Sutton	National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems