Orthopedic Surgery Claims Data Snapshot

2025





Introduction

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

This publication begins with insight into frequency and financial severity profiles by specialty. Then follows an analysis of aggregated data from clinically coded cases opened between 2014-2023 in which Orthopedic Surgery is identified as the primary responsible service.

Keep in mind...

A clinically coded malpractice case can have more than one responsible service, but the "primary responsible service" is the specialty that is deemed to be most responsible for the resulting patient outcome.

Our data system, and analysis, rolls all claims/suits related to an individual patient event into one case for coding purposes. Therefore, a case may be made up of one or more individual claims/suits and multiple defendant types such as hospital, physician, and other healthcare professionals.

Cases that involve attorney representations at depositions, State Board actions, and general liability cases are not included.

This analysis is designed to provide insured doctors, healthcare professionals, hospitals, health systems, and associated risk management staff with detailed case data to assist them in purposefully focusing their risk management and patient safety efforts.

Specialty benchmarking

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Specialties have different frequency and financial severity profiles which combine to produce differing risk levels.

| | | Frequency Tier | | |
|------------------|--------|---|--|--|
| | | Low | Medium | High |
| | Low | Allergy, Dermatology, Occupational Medicine, Psychiatry, Rheumatology | Ophthalmology, Plastic Surgery, Pulmonology | Hospitalists |
| Severity Tier | Medium | Family Medicine, Nephrology, Physiatry, Urgent Care | Cardiology, ENT, Gastroenterology, Internal Medicine | Cardiovascular Surgery, General Surgery, Orthopedic Surgery, Radiology, Urology |
| | High | Hematology/Oncology, Pathology, Pediatrics | Anesthesiology, Neurology | Emergency Medicine, Neurosurgery, OB/GYN |

Specialty trends – Orthopedic Surgery

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Orthopedic Surgery has an average financial severity per case and a higher claim frequency compared to all specialties.



Orthopedic Surgery — All Specialties

Key Points - Clinically Coded Data

- Surgical allegations account for more than three-fourths of Orthopedic Surgery case volume and half of total dollars paid*. Performance-related allegations
 account for half of those, with the majority involving hip and knee replacements/repairs. Cases involving the management of surgical patients, including pre-, intraand post-operatively, are often related to the surgeon's response to developing complications. While complications of procedures may have been the result of
 procedural error, the failure to timely recognize and/or monitor/manage the issue prevents the opportunity for early mitigation of the risk of serious adverse
 outcome.
- Diagnosis-related allegations account for 10% of Orthopedic Surgery case volume. These most commonly reflect missed/delayed diagnoses of musculoskeletal
 disorders and post-operative complications and infections. These cases commonly reflect breaks in the diagnostic process of care, most often including
 inadequate assessment and evaluation of patient symptoms, a narrow diagnostic focus, delays or failures in ordering diagnostic testing, delays in obtaining
 consults or referrals, and suboptimal communication among providers on the patient's care team.
- Medical allegations account for 7% of Orthopedic Surgery case volume. Spinal epidurals and other injections account for the majority of the medical procedurerelated case volume.
- Contributing factors, which are multi-layered issues or failures in the process of care that appear to have contributed to the patient's outcome, and/or to the
 initiation of the case, provide valuable insight into risk mitigation opportunities. Clinical judgment factors, including the selection of the most appropriate procedure
 for the patient's condition and those related to diagnostic decision-making, and technical skill factors, including recognition/management of known complications
 and poor procedural technique, are key drivers of clinical Orthopedic Surgery case severity.

Major Allegations & Financial Severity

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Each case reflects one major allegation category. Categories are designed to enable the grouping and analysis of similar cases and to drive focused risk mitigation efforts. The coding taxonomy includes detailed allegation sub-categories; insight into these is noted later in this report.



Clinical Severity* & Most Common Locations

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

| Clinical severity* categories | Sub-categories | % of case volume | Definitions |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| LOW | Emotional Injury Only | 2% | Mental distress or suffering that is generally temporary; includes HIPAA violations, discrimination, involuntary stay |
| | Temporary Insignificant Injury | 60% | Lacerations, contusions, minor scars, rash; no delay in recovery |
| | Temporary Minor Injury | | Infection, fracture set improperly or a fall in the facility, where recovery is complete but delayed |
| MEDIUM | Temporary Major Injury | 60% | Burns, drug side effect; recovery delayed |
| | Permanent Minor Injury | | Loss of fingers or loss or damage to organs; includes non-disabling injuries |
| | Significant Permanent Injury | | Deafness, loss of limb, loss of eye or loss of one kidney or lung |
| шец | Major Permanent Injury | 200/ | Paraplegia, blindness, loss of two limbs or brain damage |
| пібп | Grave Injury | 30% | Quadriplegia, severe brain damage, life-long care or fatal prognosis |
| | Death | | Death |
| | | 6% | % of cases resulting in patient death |



Patient room 8%

Contributing Factors

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Despite best intentions, processes designed for safe patient outcomes can, and do, fail.

Contributing factors are multi-layered issues or failures in the process of care that appear to have contributed to the patient's outcome, and/or to the initiation of the case, or had a significant impact on case resolution. Multiple factors are identified in each case because generally, there is not just one issue that leads to these cases, but rather a combination of issues.

| Administrative | Behavior-related | Clinical environment | Clinical judgment | Clinical systems | Communication | Documentation | Supervision | Technical skill |
|----------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|

Contributing Factor Category Definitions

| Administrative | Factors related to reporting of adverse events, adequacy of staffing, staff education/training, ethics, failure to follow and/or need for policy/protocols | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| Behavior-related | Factors related to patient nonadherence to treatment or behavior that offsets care; also, provider behavior including breach of confidentiality or sexual misconduct | | | |
| Clinical environment | Factors related to workflow, physical conditions and "off-hours" conditions (weekends/holidays/nights) | | | |
| Clinical judgment | Factors related to patient assessment, diagnostic decision-making, selection and management of therapy, patient monitoring, failure/delay in obtaining a consult, failure to ensure patient safety (falls, burns, etc.), choice of practice setting, failure to question/follow an order, practice beyond scope | | | |
| Clinical systems | Factors related to coordination of care, failure/delay in ordering test, reporting findings, follow-up systems, patient identification, specimen handling, nosocomial infections | | | |
| Communication | Factors related to communication among providers, between patient/family and providers, via electronic communication (texting, email, etc.), and telehealth/tele-radiology | | | |
| Documentation | Factors related to mechanics, insufficiency, content | | | |
| Supervision Factors related to supervision of nursing, house staff, advanced practice clinicians | | | | |
| Technical skill | Factors related to improper use of equipment, medication errors, retained foreign bodies, technical performance of procedures | | | |

Most Common Contributing Factor Categories by Allegation

Focus on Most Common Drivers of Clinical Severity

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Clinical judgment factors, including the selection of the most appropriate procedure for the patient's condition and those related to diagnostic decision-making, and technical skill factors, including recognition/management of known complications and poor procedural technique, are key drivers of clinical Orthopedic Surgery case severity.

Focus on Surgical Treatment Allegations

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Cases involving the management of surgical patients, including pre-, intra-, and post-operatively, are often related to the surgeon's response to developing complications. While complications of procedures may have been the result of procedural error, the failure to timely recognize and/or monitor/manage the issue prevents the opportunity for early mitigation of the risk of serious adverse outcome.

Focus on Diagnosis-Related Allegations

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Diagnosis-related allegations encompass wrong diagnoses, failures/delays, and misdiagnoses. See below for the top diagnoses* noted in these cases.

Focus on Diagnosis-Related Allegations

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Diagnosis-related allegations encompass wrong diagnoses, failures/delays, and misdiagnoses. Note the key opportunities to reduce diagnostic errors along the diagnostic process of care* below.

| Phase 1 | | Phase 2 | | Phase 3 | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------|--|
| Initial diagnostic | Patient notes problem & seeks care | Testing and results | Performance of diagnostic tests | Follow-up and | Physician follows-up with patient |
| assessment 86% of cases | History & physical | processing 31% of cases | Interpretation of diagnostic test results | coordination | Referrals/Consults |
| | Patient assessed, symptoms evaluated | | Test results transmitted to/received by ordering provider | of cases | Patient information communicated among care team |
| | Differential diagnosis established | | | | Patient compliance with follow-up plan |
| | Diagnostic testing ordered | | | | |

Focus on Medical Treatment Allegations

INTRODUCTION | KEY POINTS | GENERAL DATA ANALYSIS | CONTRIBUTING FACTORS | FOCUSED DATA ANALYSIS | RISK MITIGATION

Procedural performance cases can be impacted by delayed recognition of complications, while management cases most often reflect issues with selection of the most appropriate course of treatment for the patient, and appreciating and reconciling symptoms and test results.

Risk Mitigation Strategies

- Ongoing evaluation of procedural skills and competency with equipment is critically important.
- Conduct a thorough assessment of the patient pre-operatively.
 - Ensure that all testing and specialty evaluations are available for review prior to surgery; in an ambulatory setting, these details might not always be as readily available as in the inpatient setting.
 - Maintain a consistent post-procedure assessment process.
 - Update and review medical and family history at every visit to ensure the best decision-making.
 - Maintain problem lists.
- · Communicate with each other.
 - Focus on care coordination if other specialties are involved, including next steps and determining who is responsible for the patient.
 - Elicit a comprehensive patient history and conduct a thorough informed consent with the patient.
 - · Give thorough and clear patient instructions.
- Engage patients as active participants in their care.
 - Consider the patient's health literacy and other comprehension barriers.
 - Recognize that patient satisfaction with treatment outcomes can be influenced by a thorough informed consent and education process.
- Document.
 - The operative record is critically important for detailing the pre-operative patient assessment, intra-operative steps, and post-operative sequence of events. Discrepancies or gaps in the details/timing make it much more difficult to build a supportive framework for defense against potential malpractice cases.

MedPro Group & MLMIC Data

MedPro and MLMIC are partnered with Candello, a national medical malpractice data collaborative and division of CRICO, the medical malpractice insurer for the Harvard-affiliated medical institutions.

Derived from the essence of the word candela, a unit of luminous intensity that emits a clear direction, Candello's best-in-class taxonomy, data, and tools provide unique insights into the clinical and financial risks that lead to harm and loss.

Using Candello's sophisticated coding taxonomy to code claims data, MedPro and MLMIC are better able to highlight the critical intersection between quality and patient safety and provide insights into minimizing losses and improving outcomes.

Leveraging our extensive claims data, we help our insureds stay aware of risk trends by specialty and across a variety of practice settings. Data analyses examine allegations and contributing factors, including human factors and healthcare system flaws that result in patient harm. Insight gained from claims data analyses also allows us to develop targeted programs and tools to help our insureds minimize risk.

This document does not constitute legal or medical advice and should not be construed as rules or establishing a standard of care. Because the facts applicable to your situation may vary, or the laws applicable in your jurisdiction may differ, please contact your attorney or other professional advisors if you have any questions related to your legal or medical obligations or rights, state or federal laws, contract interpretation, or other legal questions. MedPro Group is the marketing name used to refer to the insurance operations of The Medical Protective Company, Princeton Insurance Company, PLICO, Inc. and MedPro RRG Risk Retention Group. All insurance products are underwritten and administered by these and other Berkshire Hathaway affiliates, including National Fire & Marine Insurance Company. Product availability is based upon business and/or regulatory approval and may differ among companies. © 2025 MedPro Group Inc. All rights reserved.

TERMS, CONDITIONS AND DISCLAIMER The presented information is for general purposes only and should not be construed as medical or legal advice. The presented information is not comprehensive and does not cover all possible factual circumstances. Please contact your attorney or other professional advisors for any questions related to legal, medical, or professional obligations, the applicable state or federal laws, or other professional questions. If you are a MLMIC insured, you may contact May-Skinner Law Group at 1-855-325-7529 for any policy related questions. MLMIC Insurance Company does not warrant the presented information, nor will it be responsible for damages arising out of or in connection with the presented information.

