
Costs Attributable to Falls Based on Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) Analysis of Hospitalised Patients: A Case-Control Study

[Mercedes Fernández-Castro](#), [Noel Rivas-González](#)^{*}, [Belén Martín-Gil](#), [Pedro Luis Muñoz-Rubio](#), [Rocío Lozano-Pérez](#), [Pilar Rodríguez-Soberado](#), M. Fe Muñoz-Moreno

Posted Date: 17 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints2025071455.v1

Keywords: Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRG); falls; inpatient falls; nursing management; economic analysis



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Costs Attributable to Falls Based on Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) Analysis of Hospitalised Patients: A Case-Control Study

Mercedes Fernández-Castro ^{1,7}, Noel Rivas-González ^{2,7,*}, Belén Martín-Gil ^{3,7}, Pedro Luis Muñoz-Rubio ⁴, Rocío Lozano-Pérez ⁵ and Pilar Rodríguez-Soberado ⁶, M. Fe Muñoz-Moreno ¹

¹ Research Support Unit, Valladolid University Clinical Hospital, Valladolid, Spain

² Continuing Education Department, Valladolid University Clinical Hospital, 47005 – Valladolid, Spain

³ Department of Nursing Care Information Systems, Valladolid University Clinical Hospital, 47005 – Valladolid, Spain

⁴ Neurology Unit, Valladolid University Clinical Hospital, 47005 – Valladolid, Spain

⁵ Internal Medicine Unit, Valladolid University Clinical Hospital, 47005 – Valladolid, Spain

⁶ Care Service of the Regional Health Management of Castile and León, 47007 – Valladolid, Spain

⁷ Valladolid Biosanitary Research Institute (IBIOVALL)

* Correspondence: nrivas@saludcastillayleon.es

Abstract

Background/objectives: Falls are the most common adverse events in hospitals. **The aim** was to analyse Diagnosis-Related Groups and their associated relative weight as an estimator of resource consumption and costs in hospitalised patients who sustained a fall, compared with a control group of non-fallers, in order to identify the excess costs attributable to a fall. **Methods:** Case-control study. Cases included patients who had sustained a fall during hospitalisation between 2020-2022 in 19 inpatient units. Controls were selected with matching technique based on age and admission period. Diagnosis-Related Groups and their resource consumption and cost estimators (relative weights) were provided by the Hospital's Coding Unit. **Results:** A total of 613 falls were analysed against 623 controls. The Diagnosis-Related Group 'Lower limb amputation except toes' was associated with a fourfold higher risk of falling compared to others. Five more were identified in which the case group incurred significantly higher costs than the control group. These included three surgical Diagnosis-Related Group, 'Urethral and transurethral procedures', 'Heart valve procedures without acute myocardial infarction or complex diagnosis, and 'Arterial procedures on the lower limb', and two medical, 'Heart failure' and 'Major pulmonary infections and inflammations'. **Conclusions/Implications for practice.** Identifying Diagnosis-Related Groups in which falls are associated with increased hospitalisation costs allows for a comprehensive assessment of the process, taking into account resource consumption and the clinical characteristics of hospitalised patients. These findings will enable nurses to develop targeted strategies to enhance the safety of hospitalised patients that contribute to the sustainability of the healthcare system.

Keywords: Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRG); falls; inpatient falls; nursing management; economic analysis

1. Introduction

The study of falls in hospitalised adult patients is an emerging field, as falls are the most common adverse events in hospitals worldwide. They represent a significant issue that undermines the quality of care, prolongs hospital stays, and worsens patient recovery, resulting in increased costs for healthcare systems [1,2]. In Spain, studies estimate an incidence of falls of approximately 2.7% among hospitalised patients over 65 years of age, with a fall rate of 1.61 per 1,000 patient-days. However, it

is recognised that the actual incidence is higher than that reported in official notification systems [3]. Population ageing, high incidence rates, long-term consequences, and the economic burden of falls are expected to increasingly impact healthcare systems. Over the coming years, both the number of falls and their associated costs are projected to rise substantially, potentially jeopardising the sustainability of healthcare systems [4]. Recent studies have focused on evaluating the effectiveness of hospital-based fall prevention programmes and interventions [5–7], as well as analysing the financial burden of falls by quantifying additional procedures, surgical interventions, medications, diagnostic tests, and extended hospital stays resulting from falls. However, studies assessing costs often highlight the challenge of accurately determining the direct financial impact of falls, given the influence of multiple factors. While indirect costs may be more difficult to quantify, they are no less significant [8–11].

The Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) system enables the analysis of costs incurred by each patient during hospitalisation. It was originally developed in the United States in 1969 and has since been adopted by numerous countries across five continents [12]. This system classifies hospital episodes based on clinical characteristics and resource consumption, grouping diagnoses using the Clinical Classifications Software (CCS), a classification tool within the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) in the United States. In Spain, coding is based on the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). Each DRG is assigned a relative weight, which represents the ratio between the estimated cost of that DRG and the average cost. A relative weight of 1 corresponds to the standard average cost for hospitalised patients within a given DRG. A value above 1 indicates that the cost of that group exceeds the average patient cost. The DRG system assigns a relative weight based on stratified cost levels according to the severity of the hospitalisation episode: minor (1), moderate (2), major (3), and extreme (4). These classifications consider patient characteristics, secondary diagnoses, and the procedures performed [13].

Some studies have explored the impact of nursing teams on patient safety and fall prevention in hospitals, highlighting the importance of appropriate nurse staffing levels and organisational structure [14,15]. Some authors have suggested that nursing units with robust safety climates, adequate staffing levels, and high quality care standards are associated with lower rates of falls [16]. Our hospital has recognised the significance of this issue and has implemented the Best Practice Guideline (BPG) *Preventing Falls and Reducing Injury from Falls*, developed by the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario (RNAO®) [17]. This initiative follows the 'Knowledge to Action' framework within the Best Practice Spotlight Organisation® (BPSO®) programme, with implementation led by nurses. This includes designating nurses responsible for promoting adherence to the guideline's recommendations within each hospital unit and fostering a culture of patient safety among their colleagues [18]. To ensure the sustainability of BPG implementation under nurse-led management and optimise its effectiveness, we aim to analyse Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) and their associated relative weight as an estimator of resource consumption and costs in patients who sustained a fall during hospitalisation compared to a control group of non-fallers, in order to identify the excess costs attributable to falls.

2. Methods

2.1. Study Design

Case-control study. This study is reported in accordance with the STROBE guidelines for observational research.

2.2. Participants and Setting

The study population comprised patients aged 18 years or older who were admitted to 19 inpatient units at the Valladolid University Clinical Hospital between 2020 and 2022. This tertiary care hospital is part of the public healthcare network of Castile & León and serves a population of approximately 240,000 inhabitants. The hospital's service area is characterised by higher ageing,

longevity, and dependency rates compared to the rest of the Spanish population, which influences its healthcare strategy regarding dependency, multimorbidity, and chronic conditions.

The case group included all patients who sustained a fall during hospitalisation within the study period, as recorded in their medical history and the standardised fall registry. The control group was selected from a list of patients admitted between 2020 and 2022, provided by the Admissions Department. Cases (patients with a recorded fall) were excluded, and a matching technique was applied based on age, as it is recognised as one of the main intrinsic risk factors for falls (4). Matching was also conducted by year of hospitalisation, to account for the potential influence of COVID-19 in 2020 and the patient isolation measures implemented during that period [19]. Each case was assigned one matched control.

To achieve a 1% precision in estimating the proportion of hospitalised patients who experience a fall during their stay, the sample size was calculated using an asymptotic normal confidence interval with finite population correction at a 95% bilateral confidence level. Assuming an expected incidence of 1.61 falls per 1,000 patient-days (3): a sample size of 391 individuals was deemed sufficient to ensure a 95% confidence level and a ± 1 percentage point precision. A 5% replacement rate was anticipated to account for potential dropouts or exclusions.

2.3. Study Variables

Hospitalisation episode data were collected from electronic medical records, including sociodemographic and clinical variables such as age, sex, type of hospital unit (medical, surgical, or mixed), mean total length of stay, mean length of stay before the fall, and patient autonomy level. The latter was determined using clinical judgement by the nurse following an assessment based on Virginia Henderson's Needs Model, considering whether the patient required assistance with feeding, dressing/personal grooming, bathing and hygiene, and/or mobility. Autonomy levels were classified as independent, requiring partial assistance, or requiring total assistance. The following fall-related records were analysed:

1. Fall risk assessment using the H.J. Downton Scale (1993). This validated scale evaluates previous falls, pharmacological treatment, sensory deficits, mental status, and ambulation, based on nurses' clinical judgement. Scores range from 0 to 11, with a score ≥ 3 indicating a high risk of falling. The assessment is conducted within the first 24 hours of admission and is reassessed in a standardised manner whenever there is a change in the patient's condition or following a fall. For this study, the last recorded assessment before the fall was used for the case group, while for the control group, the last assessment prior to discharge was considered.
2. The standardised fall incident report, which records the date, time, and circumstances surrounding the event.

DRGs and their resource consumption and cost estimators (relative weights) were provided by the Hospital's Coding Unit. The average cost associated with each DRG was obtained from the official website of the Spanish Ministry of Health, which provides estimated relative weights for DRGs within the Spanish healthcare system. The 2020 estimates were used, as they were the most recent figures available at the time of the study [20].

2.4. Statistical Analysis

Quantitative variables are presented as means and standard deviations, while qualitative variables are expressed as frequency distributions. The association between qualitative variables was analysed using Pearson's chi-squared test. When more than 20% of cells had expected values below 5, Fisher's exact test or the Likelihood Ratio test (for variables with more than two categories) was applied.

Quantitative variables were compared using Student's *t*-test for independent samples. Adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for a significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Data were analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 29.0 for Windows. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Description of the Sample and Study Groups

A total of 623 recorded falls were identified among 67,298 patients admitted to the 19 inpatient units between 2020 and 2022. The incidence of falls was 0.915%, with a fall rate of 1.43 per 1,000 patient-days. Seven cases were excluded due to insufficient records, resulting in a final sample of 616 cases and 623 controls.

The mean age in both groups was 73.75 years (SD: 12.53 for cases; SD: 14.68 for controls), with no statistically significant difference (p = 0.996). The distribution of hospitalised patients across the study years was as follows:

- 2020: Cases: n = 140 vs Controls: n = 144
- 2021: Cases: n = 227 vs Controls: n = 227
- 2022: Cases: n = 249 vs Controls: n = 252

Table 1. Descriptive Data of the Case and Control Groups.

		Cases (n=616)		Controls (623)		P-value
		n	Relative %	n	Relative %	
Sex	Male	416	67.53	381	61.15	0.033
	Female	200	32.46	242	38.84	
Previous falls	Yes	41	6.65	25	4.01	<0.001
	No	575	93.34	598	95.98	
Level of dependency	Independent	37	6.00	73	11.71	<0.001
	Partial assistance	77	12.5	45	7.22	
	Total assistance	26	4.22	25	4.05	
Hospital unit	Medical	271	54.2%	229	45.8%	0.235
	Surgical	282	46.8%	320	53.1%	
	Mixed	63	46.6%	72	53.3%	
		Mean	SD*	Mean	SD*	
H.J.Downton Fall Risk Score		3.26	2.05	2.69	1.64	<0.001
Mean length of stay (days)		21.26	21.49	8.05	10.23	<0.001
Length of stay before fall (days)		9.95	15.14	-	-	

SD*= Standard deviation.

As shown in Table 1, the study population consisted predominantly of men in both groups (p = 0.033). The case group exhibited statistically significant differences compared to the control group (p < 0.001) in the following aspects: a higher frequency of previous falls; a greater level of dependency, with a higher proportion of patients requiring partial assistance; higher mean scores on the H.J. Downton Fall Risk Scale; and longer hospital stays.

A total of 203 different DRGs were identified across the 1,239 hospitalisation episodes analysed.

Table 2 presents the most frequently identified DRGs, their distribution in both groups, and their associated relative weights.

Table 2. Descriptive Data of the Most Frequent Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRGs) and Their Relative Weight in the Two Study Groups.

Diagnosis-Related Group (DRG) (Total n)	DRG Code- Weight	Control Group		Case Group	
		n	%	n	%
Major pulmonary infections and inflammations (n=81)	137-2	17	40.5%	6	15.4%
	137-3	21	50.0%	21	53.8%
	137-4	4	9.5%	12	30.8%
	137	42	100%	39	100%
Heart failure (n=55)	194-1	2	6.7%	0	0.0%
	194-2	14	46.7%	5	20.0%
	194-3	11	36.7%	11	44.0%
	194-4	3	10.0%	9	36.0%
	194	30	100%	25	100%
Arterial procedures on the lower limb (n=43)	181-1	10	55.6%	5	20.0%
	181-2	6	33.3%	8	32.0%
	181-3	2	11.1%	11	44.0%
	181-4	0	0.0%	1	4.0%
	181	18	100%	25	100%
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (n=35)	140-2	2	11.1%	1	5.9%
	140-3	10	55.6%	11	64.7%
	140-4	6	33.3%	5	29.4%
	140	18	100%	17	100%
Percutaneous coronary interventions without AMI* (n=35)	175-1	4	22.2%	1	5.3%
	175-2	4	22.2%	3	15.8%
	175-3	3	16.7%	6	31.6%
	175-4	5	27.8%	9	47.4%
	175	16	100%	19	100%
Other pneumonia (n=35)	139-1	1	7.7%	4	18.2%
	139-2	3	23.1%	6	27.3%
	139-3	5	38.5%	7	31.8%
	139-4	4	30.8%	5	22.7%
	139	13	100%	22	100%
Sepsis and disseminated infections (n=28)	720-1	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
	720-2	2	20.0%	5	27.8%
	720-3	7	70.0%	6	33.3%
	720-4	0	0.0%	7	38.9%
	720	10	100%	18	100%
Heart valve procedures without AMI* or complex diagnosis (n=27)	163-1	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
	163-2	6	54.5%	4	25.0%
	163-3	3	27.3%	8	50.0%
	163-4	0	0.0%	4	25.0%

	163	11	100%	16	100%
	305-1	1	20.0%	2	10.5%
	305-2	4	80.0%	12	63.2%
	305-3	0	0.0%	4	21.1%
	305-4	0	0.0%	1	5.3%
Lower limb amputation except toes (n=24)	305	5	100%	19	100%
	463-1	3	18.8%	1	12.5%
	463-2	3	18.8%	2	25.0%
	463-3	8	50.0%	4	50.0%
	463-4	2	12.5%	1	12.5%
Kidney and urinary tract infections (n=24)	463	16	100%	8	100%
	174-1	1	12.5%	1	6.7%
	174-2	4	50.0%	6	40.0%
	174-3	3	37.5%	2	13.3%
Percutaneous coronary interventions with AMI* (n=23)	174-4	0	0.0%	6	40.0%
	174	8	100%	15	100%
	045-1	1	8.3%	1	11.1%
	045-2	8	66.7%	2	22.2%
ACVA** and precerebral occlusions with infarction (n=21)	045-3	3	25.0%	4	44.4%
	045-4	0	0.0%	2	22.2%
	197-1	0	0.0%	1	12.5%
	197-2	6	50.0%	3	37.5%
	197-3	5	41.7%	4	50.0%
	197-4	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
Peripheral vascular disorders and others (n=20)	197	12	100%	8	100%
	282-1	3	30.0%	1	11.1%
	282-2	5	50.0%	3	33.3%
	282-3	2	20.0%	4	44.4%
Pancreatic disorders except malignant neoplasm (n=19)	282-4	0	0.0%	1	11.1%
	282	10	100%	9	100%
	284-1	3	37.5%	2	18.2%
	284-2	3	37.5%	3	27.3%
	284-3	2	25.0%	6	54.5%
Biliary tract and gallbladder disorders (n=19)	284	8	100%	12	100%
	134-1	4	40.0%	0	0.0%
	134-2	2	20.0%	3	37.5%
	134-3	4	40.0%	3	37.5%
	134-4	0	0.0%	2	25.0%
Pulmonary embolism (n=18)	134	10	100%	8	100%
	136-1	1	10.0%	0	0.0%
	136-2	3	30.0%	1	12.5%
	136-3	6	60.0%	6	75.0%
Respiratory neoplasms (n=18)	136-4	0	0.0%	1	12.5%

	136	10	100%	8	100%
	171-1	2	16.7%	0	0.0%
	171-2	8	66.7%	4	80.0%
	171-3	1	8.3%	1	20.0%
Permanent cardiac pacemaker implantation without AMI*, heart failure, or shock (n=17)	171-4	1	8.3%	0	0.0%
	171	12	100%	5	100%
	446-1	7	77.8%	2	25.0%
	446-2	1	11.1%	3	37.5%
	446-3	1	11.1%	3	37.5%
Urethral and transurethral procedures (n=17)	446	9	100%	8	100%

AMI*= Acute Myocardial Infarction; ACVA**=Acute Cerebrovascular Accident.

3.2. Association Between DRGs and Risk of Falling

An association analysis was conducted to identify which DRGs were associated with a higher likelihood of falling. Only one DRG was found to be significantly associated: 'Lower limb amputation except toes'. Hospitalisation episodes classified under this DRG had a fourfold increased risk of falling compared to all other DRGs (OR = 3.933; lower limit = 1.459; upper limit = 10.60). No other DRG was identified as a risk factor for falls.

3.3. Economic Analysis

To identify DRGs in which relative weights were higher than the standard in the case group compared to controls, odds ratios (ORs) and their 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated. The analysis compared relative weights ≥ 2 vs. weights =1 in both study groups for each DRG.

Additionally, since some DRGs had no hospitalisation episodes with a relative weight of 1 in either the case or control group, the analysis was repeated by grouping relative weights ≥ 3 vs. weights ≤ 2 .

Five DRGs were identified in which having experienced a fall was significantly associated with an increase in relative weight and, consequently, with higher costs. See Table 3.

Table 3. Association between number of falls (cases) and DRGs with relative weight ≥ 2 vs. =1 and DRGs with relative weight ≥ 3 vs. ≤ 2 (statistically significant results).

DRG (DRG Code)	Weight	Group		OR	95% CI	
		Caso	Control		Lower limit	Upper limit
Urethral and transurethral procedures (code 446)	≥ 2	6	2	10.50	1.11	98.92
	=1	2	7			
	Total	8	9			
Arterial procedures on the lower limb (code 181)	≥ 2	20	8	5.00	1.30	19.30
	=1	5	10			
	Total	25	18			
Heart valve procedures without AMI* or complex diagnosis (Código 163)	≥ 3	13	3	6.933	1.291	37.225
	≤ 2	5	8			
	total	18	11			
Heart failure (code 194)	≥ 3	20	14	4.571	1.357	15.399
	≤ 2	5	16			
	Total	25	30			
Major pulmonary infections and inflammations (code 137)	≥ 3	33	25	3.74	1.288	10.860
	≤ 2	6	17			
	Total	39	42			

AMI*= Acute Myocardial Infarction.

Based on the DRGs identified in Table 3, the estimated excess costs attributable to a fall were calculated by determining the difference between the relative weights ≥ 2 and the standard weight =1 for each DRG. See Table 4.

Table 4. Attributable excess cost of a fall in DRGs with statistically significant higher relative weights (cost difference compared to the standard cost or weight =1).

DRG	DRG Code- Weight	Standard Cost (€)	Excess Attributable to a Fall (€)	Cost
Urethral and transurethral procedures	446-1	2,906.08		
	446-2	3,629.87	723.79	
	446-3	6,853.68	3,947.6	
	446-4	17,090.95	14,184.87	
Arterial procedures on the lower limb	181-1	11,333.33		
	181-2	14,778.15	3,444.82	
	181-3	20,727.27	9,393.94	
	181-4	34,471.52	2,3138.19	
Heart valve procedures without AMI or complex diagnosis	163-1	23,229.36		
	163-2	26,314.62	3,085.26	
	163-3	34,751.68	11,522.32	
	164-4	54,245.01	31,015.65	
Heart failure	194-1	2,999.35		
	194-2	3,800.06	800.71	
	194-3	4,687.17	887.11	
	194-4	6,004.86	2,204.8	
Major pulmonary infections and inflammations	137-1	4,316.84		
	137-2	4,531.38	214.54	
	137-3	5,054.09	522.71	
	137-4	6,405.67	1,874.29	

From Tables 3 and 4, it was observed that the probability of hospitalisation episodes in patients who had experienced a fall having a significantly higher relative weight was:

- 10.5 times higher for 'Urethral and transurethral procedures', with an excess cost ranging from €723.79 to €14,184.87.
- 6.9 times higher for 'Heart valve procedures without AMI or complex diagnosis', with an excess cost ranging from €3,085.26 to €31,015.65.
- 5 times higher for 'Arterial procedures on the lower limb', with an excess cost ranging from €3,444.82 to €23,138.19.
- 4.57 times higher for 'Heart failure', with an excess cost ranging from €800.71 to €2,204.80.
- 3.74 times higher for 'Major pulmonary infections and inflammations', with an excess cost ranging from €214.54 to €1,874.29.

The first three DRGs are surgical, while the last two are medical.

4. Discussion

Authors should discuss the results and how they can be interpreted from the perspective of previous studies and of the working hypotheses. The findings and their implications should be discussed in the broadest context possible. Future research directions may also be highlighted.

The incidence of falls recorded in our hospital between 2020 and 2022, along with the fall rate per 1,000 patient-days, was lower than that reported in similar studies conducted in Spanish hospitals [3]. This may reflect the effectiveness of the recommendations from the BPG *Preventing Falls and Reducing Injury from Falls*, developed by the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario (RNAO®). These recommendations have been nurse-led and implemented within the hospital as part of the Best Practice Spotlight Organisation® (BPSO®) programme, which has already shown positive outcomes in studies conducted in acute care hospitals in Spain [21].

When comparing the case and control groups, a higher frequency of previous falls within the last year was observed among cases, as well as higher fall risk scores recorded by nurses. These findings align with those reported in other studies [1]. Notably, the average length of stay for patients who had experienced a fall was significantly longer than for those who had not (21 days vs. 8 days). These two variables appear to be interdependent: the longer a patient remains hospitalised, the greater their fall risk, due to both the unfamiliarity of the environment and the progressive decline in health status. Conversely, experiencing a fall itself may contribute to prolonged hospitalisation [4]. In our study population, the length of stay before the fall (9 days) exceeded the overall average length of stay (8 days). This finding suggests that preventive actions should be prioritised for patients who remain hospitalised beyond 8 days, particularly those requiring partial assistance.

One DRG was identified as having a fourfold increased risk of falls compared to the others: 'Lower limb amputation except toes'. A possible explanation is that these patients may not yet have fully adapted to their new level of dependency, transitioning from being independent to requiring partial assistance. As a result, they represent a high-risk group that should be targeted with specific care plans, including active participation in fall prevention strategies. The acquisition of new mobility skills through post-intervention education may require more time than is typically available during a hospital stay [22]. This highlights an opportunity for improvement, as involving patients and their families in their own safety plan is a highly effective recommendation [23].

It is clear that the standard cost per hospitalised patient varies depending on the type of care required. Therefore, when analysing fall-related costs, it is essential not only to quantify direct expenses, but also to consider the entire hospitalisation episode, as classified by DRGs and their relative weights. Some studies have reported a higher incidence of falls in medical units compared to surgical units [24], while others highlight surgical procedures as a risk factor for falls during hospitalisation [25]. In our study, no significant differences were found in fall incidence between medical and surgical units. However, three predominantly surgical DRGs were identified in which falling was associated with increased hospital costs: 'Urethral and transurethral procedures'; 'Heart valve procedures without AMI or complex diagnosis'; and 'Arterial procedures on the lower limb'. Additionally, two medical DRGs—'Major pulmonary infections and inflammations' and 'Heart failure'—also showed increased costs in the case group, albeit to a lesser extent.

These findings suggest the need to closely monitor both medical and surgical services that contributed to these results. This will enable nurses to develop tailored strategies aimed at improving patient safety within these specific DRGs. In this regard, nurses are uniquely positioned to design individualised care plans, promote self-care, and implement targeted interventions to enhance patient safety [14].

4.1. Limitations

There is a possibility of underreporting of falls. However, we believe this risk is minimised, as the BPSO® programme requires a systematic evaluation of the Best BPG indicators. Additionally, at least one designated nurse in each inpatient unit is responsible for promoting adherence to the recommendations of the RNAO® BPG *Preventing Falls and Reducing Injury from Falls*, including compliance with fall reporting and fostering an institutional culture of patient safety.

4.1. Recomendaciones for Further Research

The researchers try to foster further research with large populations including other hospitals in the Castile & Leon Community with similar characteristics, in order to obtain more conclusive results.

4.3. Implications for Policy and Practice

Analysing the costs of falls based on DRGs among hospitalised patients will enable nurses and managers to design effective prevention strategies to improve patient safety. These findings support nurses responsible for implementing the BPG *Preventing Falls and Reducing Injury from Falls*, developed by the Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario, in designing specific nursing management strategies for the identified DRGs. Nurse-led management of fall prevention strategies could contribute to a more sustainable healthcare system.

5. Conclusions

Patients classified under the DRG 'Lower limb amputation except toes' had a fourfold increased risk of falling compared to other DRGs.

Five DRGs were identified in which the probability of hospitalisation episodes involving a fall was associated with higher economic costs (relative weight) compared to episodes without a fall. These included:

- Three surgical DRGs:
 - 'Urethral and transurethral procedures', with an excess cost ranging from €723.79 to €14,184.87.
 - 'Heart valve procedures without AMI or complex diagnosis', with an excess cost ranging from €3,085.26 to €31,015.65.
 - 'Arterial procedures on the lower limb', with an excess cost ranging from €3,444.82 to €23,138.19.
- Two medical DRGs:
 - 'Heart failure', with an excess cost ranging from €800.71 to €2,204.80.
 - 'Major pulmonary infections and inflammations', with an excess cost ranging from €214.54 to €1,874.29.

Identifying DRGs in which falls were associated with increased hospitalisation costs provides a comprehensive approach to cost assessment. This includes not only direct fall-related expenses but also the broader impact in terms of resource consumption and clinical characteristics of hospitalised patients.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: M. F-C., N. R-G., and B. M-G.; Data curation: M. F-C., P. R-S., P.L. M-R. and R. L-P.; Formal analysis: M. F-C., N. R-G. and M.F. M-M.; Methodology: M. F-C., N. R-G. and M.F. M-M.; Supervision: M. F-C.; Writing – original draft: M. F-C., N. R-G., P. R-S., and B. M-G.; Writing – review & editing: M. F-C., N. R-G., and B. M-G.

Funding: This research was funded by a grant awarded by the Castile & León Regional Health Management Board under reference code GRS 2706/A/23. The financial sponsors had no involvement in the design, conduct, analysis, or interpretation of the data, nor in the preparation or writing of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the principles set out in the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Valladolid Ethics Committee for Research with medicinal products (ECRmp) involving humans under the reference code PI-24-257-C.

Informed Consent Statement: Patient consent was waived due to this is a retrospective study.

Data Availability Statement: the research data will be available upon request

Public Involvement Statement: No public involvement in any aspect of this research

Guidelines and Standards Statement: This manuscript was drafted against the STROBE (The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) for observational research. <https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/strobe/>

Use of Artificial Intelligence: AI or AI-assisted tools were not used in drafting any aspect of this manuscript”.

Acknowledgments: The authors wish to thank all the nurses who actively contribute as champions of Best Practices to prevent falls in hospitalised patients.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Saito C, Nakatani E, Sasaki H, E Katsuki N, Tago M, Harada K. Predictive Factors and the Predictive Scoring System for Falls in Acute Care Inpatients: Retrospective Cohort Study. *JMIR Hum Factors*. 2025 Jan 13;12:e58073. doi: 10.2196/58073.
2. LeLaurin JH, Shorr RI. Preventing Falls in Hospitalized Patients: State of the Science. *Clin Geriatr Med*. 2019 May;35(2):273-283. doi: 10.1016/j.cger.2019.01.007.
3. García-Hedraera FJ, Noguera-Quijada C, Sanz-Márquez S, Pérez-Fernández E, Acevedo-García M, Domínguez-Rincón R, Martínez-Simón JJ, González-Piñero B, Carmona-Monge FJ, Camacho-Pastor JL. Incidence and characteristics of falls in hospitalized patients: A cohort study. *Enferm Clin (Engl Ed)*. 2021 Nov-Dec;31(6):381-389. doi: 10.1016/j.enfcle.2021.04.003.
4. Locklear T, Kontos J, Brock CA, Holland AB, Hemsath R, Deal A, Leonard S, Steinmetz C, Biswas S. Inpatient Falls: Epidemiology, Risk Assessment, and Prevention Measures. A Narrative Review. *HCA Healthc J Med*. 2024 Oct 1;5(5):517-525. doi: 10.36518/2689-0216.1982.
5. López-Soto PJ, Rodríguez-Cortés FJ, Miñarro-Del Moral RM, Medina-Valverde MJ, Segura-Ruiz R, Hidalgo-Lopezosa P, Manfredini R, Rodríguez-Borrego MA; CHRONOFALLS project collaborators. CHRONOFALLS: A multicentre nurse-led intervention in the chronoprevention of in-hospital falls in adults. *BMC Nurs*. 2023 May 5;22(1):149. doi: 10.1186/s12912-023-01322-9.
6. Morris ME, Webster K, Jones C, Hill AM, Haines T, McPhail S, Kiegaldie D, Slade S, Jazayeri D, Heng H, Shorr R, Carey L, Barker A, Cameron I. Interventions to reduce falls in hospitals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Age Ageing*. 2022 May 1;51(5):afac077. doi: 10.1093/ageing/afac077.
7. Barker AL, Morello RT, Wolfe R, Brand CA, Haines TP, Hill KD, Brauer SG, Botti M, Cumming RG, Livingston PM, Sherrington C, Zavarsek S, Lindley RI, Kamar J. 6-PACK programme to decrease fall injuries in acute hospitals: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2016 Jan 26;352:h6781. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h6781.
8. Dykes PC, Curtin-Bowen M, Lipsitz S, Franz C, Adelman J, Adkison L, Bogaisky M, Carroll D, Carter E, Herlihy L, Lindros ME, Ryan V, Scanlan M, Walsh MA, Wien M, Bates DW. Cost of Inpatient Falls and Cost-Benefit Analysis of Implementation of an Evidence-Based Fall Prevention Program. *JAMA Health Forum*. 2023 Jan 6;4(1):e225125. doi: 10.1001/jamahealthforum.2022.5125.
9. Baris VK, Seren Intepeler S. Evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of a multicomponent fall prevention program in hospitalized patients. *Nurs Health Sci*. 2023 Dec;25(4):585-596. doi: 10.1111/nhs.13051.
10. Gonzalez VA, Febras LLT, de Lima CCD, Alves BM, Dos Santos DT, Souza MA, Carvalho SM, Rohsig V, Pille A, Wolf J, Maccari JG, Mutlaq MP, Nasi LA. Economic Analysis of Falls in a Private Hospital in Southern Brazil-A Case-Control Study. *Int J Nurs Pract*. 2024 Dec;30(6):e13313. doi: 10.1111/ijn.13313.
11. Wieczorek-Wójcik B, Gaworska-Krzemińska A, Owczarek AJ, Kilańska D. Economic evaluation of the prevention of falls resulting from missed care in polish hospitals. *Front Public Health*. 2024 Sep 16;12:1228471. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1228471.
12. Ni ZY, Zhang BK, Song L, Zang ZY, Yu H. The influence of policy advocacy and education on medical staff's adaptation to diagnosis related groups payment reform in China: an analysis of the mediating effect of policy cognition. *Front Public Health*. 2024 Nov 13;12:1375739. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2024.1375739.
13. Subdirección General de Información Sanitaria. Ministerio de Sanidad. Proceso de Estimación de Pesos y Costes Hospitalarios del Sistema Nacional de Salud. 2022;2019-20.

14. Kim J, Kim S, Park J, Lee E. Multilevel factors influencing falls of patients in hospital: The impact of nurse staffing. *J Nurs Manag.* 2019 Jul;27(5):1011-1019. doi: 10.1111/jonm.12765.
15. Wang L, Lu H, Dong X, Huang X, Li B, Wan Q, Shang S. The effect of nurse staffing on patient-safety outcomes: A cross-sectional survey. *J Nurs Manag.* 2020 Oct;28(7):1758-1766. doi: 10.1111/jonm.13138.
16. Alanazi FK, Lapkin S, Molloy L, Sim J. The impact of safety culture, quality of care, missed care and nurse staffing on patient falls: A multisource association study. *J Clin Nurs.* 2023 Oct;32(19-20):7260-7272. doi: 10.1111/jocn.16792.
17. Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario. *Prevención de Caídas y Disminución de Lesiones derivadas de las Caídas 4ª Ed.* 2017.
18. González-María E, Moreno-Casbas MT, Albornos-Muñoz L, Grinspun D; Grupo de Trabajo del Programa de implantación de buenas prácticas en Centros Comprometidos con la Excelencia en Cuidados®; Grupo metodológico; Grupo de líderes de las instituciones. The implementation of Best practice guidelines in Spain through the Programme of the Best Practice Spotlight Organizations®. *Enferm Clin (Engl Ed).* 2020 May-Jun;30(3):136-144. English, Spanish. doi: 10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.09.018.
19. Shennan S, Coyle N, Lockwood B, DiDiodato G. Visitor Restrictions During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Increased Falls With Harm at a Canadian Hospital: An Exploratory Study. *J Patient Saf.* 2024 Sep 1;20(6):434-439. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0000000000001237.
20. Ministerio de Sanidad - Sanidad en datos - Pesos de los GRDs del Sistema Nacional de Salud - Años Anteriores [Internet]. [citado 14 de julio de 2025]. Available in: <https://www.sanidad.gob.es/estadEstudios/estadisticas/inforRecopilaciones/anaDesarrolloGDRanteriores.htm>
21. Shennan S, Coyle N, Lockwood B, DiDiodato G. Visitor Restrictions During the COVID-19 Pandemic and Increased Falls With Harm at a Canadian Hospital: An Exploratory Study. *J Patient Saf.* 2024 Sep 1;20(6):434-439. doi: 10.1097/PTS.0000000000001237.
22. Chopra A, Azarbal AF, Jung E, Abraham CZ, Liem TK, Landry GJ, Moneta GL, Mitchell EL. Ambulation and functional outcome after major lower extremity amputation. *J Vasc Surg.* 2018 May;67(5):1521-1529. doi: 10.1016/j.jvs.2017.10.051.
23. Radecki B, Keen A, Miller J, McClure JK, Kara A. Innovating Fall Safety: Engaging Patients as Experts. *J Nurs Care Qual.* 2020 Jul/Sep;35(3):220-226. doi: 10.1097/NCQ.0000000000000447.
24. Heikkilä A, Lehtonen L, Junttila K. Fall rates by specialties and risk factors for falls in acute hospital: A retrospective study. *J Clin Nurs.* 2023 Aug;32(15-16):4868-4877. doi: 10.1111/jocn.16594.
25. Fritz BA, King CR, Mehta D, Somerville E, Kronzer A, Ben Abdallah A, Wildes T, Avidan MS, Lenze EJ, Stark S; ENGAGES Research Group. Association of a Perioperative Multicomponent Fall Prevention Intervention With Falls and Quality of Life After Elective Inpatient Surgical Procedures. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2022 Mar 1;5(3):e221938. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.1938.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.