

# 1 Harmonization of ICF Body Structures and ICD-11

## 2 Anatomic Detail: one foundation for two classifications

3 **Vincenzo Della Mea<sup>1,6</sup>, Ann-Helene Almborg<sup>2,7</sup>, Michela Martinuzzi<sup>3</sup>, Samson W. Tu<sup>4,8</sup>,**  
4 **Andrea Martinuzzi<sup>5,6,\*</sup>**

5 <sup>1</sup>Dept. of Mathematics, Computer Science and Physics, University of Udine, Italy

6 <sup>2</sup>National Board of Health and Welfare, Sweden

7 <sup>3</sup>Sandwell & West Birmingham NHS trust, UK

8 <sup>4</sup>Stanford Center for Biomedical Informatics Research, Stanford University, Stanford,CA, USA

9 <sup>5</sup>IRCCS Medea, Conegliano Research Centre, Conegliano, Italy

10 <sup>6</sup>Italian WHO-FIC Collaboration Center, Udine, Italy

11 <sup>7</sup>Nordic WHO-FIC Collaboration Center, Norway

12 <sup>8</sup>Stanford WHO-FIC Collaboration Center, Stanford, CA, USA

13

14 \* Corresponding author

15 Email: [andrea.martinuzzi@lanostrafamiglia.it](mailto:andrea.martinuzzi@lanostrafamiglia.it)

16 <sup>¶</sup> These authors contributed equally to this work.

## 17 **Abstract**

18           The Family of International Classifications of the World Health Organization currently includes  
19 three reference classifications, namely International Classification of Diseases (ICD), International  
20 Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health (ICF), and International Classification of Health  
21 Interventions (ICHI). Each of them serves a specific classification need. However, they share some  
22 common concepts that are present, in different forms, in two or all of them. One important set of shared  
23 concepts is the representation of human anatomy entities, which are not always modeled in the same way  
24 and with the same level of detail. To understand the relationships among the three anatomical  
25 representations, an effort is needed to compare them, identifying common areas, gaps, and compatible and  
26 incompatible modeling. The work presented here contributes to this effort, focusing on the anatomy  
27 representations in ICF and ICD-11.

28           For this aim, three experts were asked to identify, for each entity in the ICF Body Structures, one  
29 or more entities in the ICD-11 Anatomic Detail that could be considered identical, broader or narrower.  
30 To do this, they used a specifically developed web application, which also automatically identified the  
31 most obvious equivalences.

32           A total of 631 maps were independently identified by the three mappers for 218 ICF Body  
33 Structures, with an interobserver agreement of 93.5%. Together with 113 maps identified by the software,  
34 they were then consolidated into 434 relations. The results highlight some differences between the two  
35 classifications: in general, ICF is less detailed than ICD-11; ICF favors lumping of structures; in very few  
36 cases, the two classifications follow different anatomic models. For these issues, solutions have to be  
37 found that are compliant with the WHO approach to classification modeling and maintenance.

38 .

## 39 Introduction

40 The Family of International Classifications of the World Health Organization (WHO-FIC)  
41 currently includes three reference classifications, namely:

- 42 • ICD: the International Classification of Diseases
- 43 • ICF: the International Classification of Functioning, Disabilities and Health
- 44 • ICHI: the International Classification of Health Interventions

45 Each of them covers a specific need that may arise when classifying the content of health  
46 documentation. Furthermore, while they share common principles, their structures depend in part on  
47 choices made at their initial design and development phases, which were done at different times and which  
48 in turn depend on knowledge and constraints defined at the times. In particular, the 11th revision of ICD  
49 (1) marks a departure from the paper-based model that led the development of the previous revisions, with  
50 a specific attention to information technology aspects, including proper formalization of the represented  
51 concepts, and a double-layered structure composed of an ICD-11 Foundation that includes all possible  
52 ICD-related information and one or more linearizations that represents different versions of the  
53 classification designed to satisfy specific use cases (2). The ICD-11 experience informs the development  
54 of ICHI, which is the youngest classification of the family; on the other side, ICF might be considered the  
55 oldest one, as it is still oriented towards traditional paper-based usage, although recently it is subjected to  
56 some enhancement in the computerized direction (3,4).

57 The most notable recent enhancement to the three classifications is that all of them have been  
58 incorporated into a single WHO-FIC Foundation that allows both ICF and ICHI to be generated as  
59 linearizations of the Foundation (5). In this combined representation, ICD-11 and ICF concepts are

60 represented separately, while ICHI, because of its recent provenance, references some ICD-11 and ICF  
61 concepts.

62 Even though they cover different needs, the classifications share some common concepts that are  
63 present, in different forms in the Foundation, in two or all of them. It is the aim of a current WHO effort  
64 to harmonize the shared concepts among the reference classifications of the family (6) in the Foundation.

65 Identifying and characterizing all the possible shared concepts is a complex task involving the  
66 semantics of the reference classification, however there is one set of concepts that is obviously shared and  
67 easy to recognize, i.e., human anatomy. In fact, an anatomical entity may define the site of a disease in  
68 ICD-11, the body structure subject to impairment in ICF and also the target of some health interventions  
69 defined in ICHI.

70 While they are present everywhere, it is not obvious that all the anatomical entities are modeled  
71 the same way and with the same level of detail in the three reference classifications. To understand the  
72 relationships among the three anatomical representations, an effort is needed to compare them, identifying  
73 common areas, gaps, and compatible and incompatible models. The work presented here contributes to  
74 this effort, focusing on the anatomy representations in ICF and ICD-11 at first.

- 75 • The aims of the present paper are thus:
- 76 • To identify anatomical detail as represented in ICF and ICD-11;
- 77 • To compare the representations by setting relationships among specific entities;
- 78 • To characterize the level of detail in each classification;
- 79 • To characterize areas where the underlying modeling is different or even incompatible;
- 80 • Finally, to suggest measures to be taken to harmonize and consolidate the representations.

81 While there exists a deeply formalized representation of anatomy, namely the Foundational Model  
82 of Anatomy (7), it is much too detailed for our goal, which is to harmonize the anatomical representations  
83 in the WHO-FIC Foundation, minimizing the changes needed to the classifications, with the aim of  
84 continuity and compatibility with current applications.

## 85 **Methods**

86 To understand the relationship between ICF and ICD-11 anatomy, we decided to begin by mapping  
87 anatomical entities in the two classifications. In particular, the specific areas considered were the ICF  
88 Body Structures, and the section of ICD-11 Extension codes called “Anatomic Detail”. Both have a  
89 partially heterogeneous hierarchical representation, including both partonomic and taxonomic  
90 relationships.

### 91 **Expert mappings**

92 An initial qualitative analysis showed that inside these subsets, some entities have exactly the same  
93 title, some others are named differently, and some others do not have a direct correspondence, because an  
94 entity explicitly mentioned in one classification may only be found as part of a larger, or as specialization  
95 of a more general entity in the other classification.

96 Thus, three experts were asked to identify, for each entity in the ICF Body Structures, one  
97 equivalent entity in the ICD-11 Anatomic Detail if possible; if not, one or more entities that could be  
98 considered *broader\_than* or *narrower\_than*. We opted for these generic relationships because they  
99 encompass both the partonomic and taxonomic views. Furthermore, for practical aims, we also subdivided  
100 the equivalence relationship in two subtypes: *identical\_to*, when the title and concept was substantially  
101 the same, and *synonym\_of*, when the title of the concept was different, yet equivalent. Matching has been  
102 attempted not only on the terminal entities in the hierarchy, but also for all the higher level entities.

103 While this effort was not aimed at mapping electronic health records, when possible the principles  
104 described in the WHO paper on mapping have been respected (8).

## 105 **Classifications**

106 The source list for ICF Body Structures was obtained from a ClAML representation of ICF version  
107 2017, and included 321 entities. Of these 321, 103 were identified as residuals, i.e., categories of the kinds  
108 “not otherwise specified” or “other specified”. Residuals were not mapped, because semantically  
109 equivalent to the parent category.

110 The target ICD-11 list was composed by a subset of the Extension Codes (9), namely the  
111 “Anatomical Detail” branch, taken from the Foundation layer. It was not extracted in advance, but  
112 dynamically obtained through the ICD-11 API (10) when needed, as explained in the next paragraphs.

## 113 **Software**

114 To support the matching effort by the three experts, an ad-hoc web-based software has been  
115 developed. The main interface of the software shows the ICF Body Structures hierarchy on the left side,  
116 with the capability of selecting a kind of relationship among those previously mentioned, and the  
117 corresponding ICD-11 entity, for each ICF entity. The ICD-11 entity is identified by accessing an instance  
118 of the ICD-11 Foundation coding tool (10) on the right side, set to automatically search for the ICF title  
119 in the ICD-11 Foundation, Extension Codes chapter, “Anatomic Detail” branch. However, since this could  
120 not always be found, the expert may also edit the search term with synonyms that might be present in  
121 ICD-11. Figure 1 shows a screenshot from the Map Editor.

122

123 **Figure 1:** on the left side, part of ICF Body Structures. The user is selecting a relationship (synonym of)  
124 for the ICF entity “Lens of eyeball”. On the right side, the ICD-11 Coding tool attempted a search with  
125 that term, which is not directly found. However, the expert may choose “Crystalline lens” and have it  
126 automatically inputted in the left side field, to propose it as candidate relationship. In the top left, some  
127 already defined relationships could be seen. Those identified as “auto” are automatically set by the  
128 software.

129 To reduce the effort needed, the software has a module that automatically identifies  
130 straightforward relationships, i.e., those where titles are identical, or obvious synonyms. Among the latter,  
131 many entities in ICF are named as “Structure of X”, which were automatically mapped as synonyms of  
132 “X” if available in ICD-11 . Technically “structure of X” is not synonymous with “X.” However, given  
133 that parent/child links in both ICD-11 anatomy extension codes and ICF body structures are a mix of  
134 taxonomic and partonomic relationship, identifying “structure of X” with “X” yields the most economical  
135 set of maps. As an example, ‘Structure of brain’ from ICF is automatically mapped as synonym\_of ‘Brain’  
136 in ICD-11.

137 While doing their work, experts do not see matches already found by the others, in order to allow  
138 the computation of a measure of inter-observer agreement.

139 Another interface shows a tree representation of the ICF Body Structures, with color codings for  
140 the different relationships, when available. Figure 2 shows a screenshot depicting part of the ICF Body  
141 Structures tree with mappings.

142

143 **Figure 2:** part of the tree view of the ICF Body Structure, with color-coded matches towards ICD-11.

144

145 Finally, a further module allows the export of matches to a CSV file for further processing.

## 146 Results

147 Of 218 entities considered in the source list and excluding residuals, 113 were found by software  
148 to have identical corresponding entities in the ICD-11 Anatomic Detail extension, basing on lexical  
149 criteria.

150 Three independent knowledgeable raters considered the 105 entities for which the tool did not  
151 automatically confirm identity matches. The search for the most appropriate matching entity could result  
152 in finding identical, equivalent, broader or narrower items or no match. The three mappers independently  
153 produced 631 maps to a total of 297 ICD-11 entities, independently and without accessing others' maps  
154 until the end of the experiment. For all the ICF entities, at least one expert found a map in ICD-11. Table  
155 1 shows a breakdown of the experts' mappings. While *identical\_to* and *synonym\_of* maps were collected,  
156 for the sake of simplicity, and considering that they are semantically the same, for the analysis they were  
157 collapsed in a single *equivalent\_to* category.

158

159 Table 1: mappings proposed by each expert

mapper	relations			
	<i>equivalent_to</i>	<i>broader_than</i>	<i>narrower_than</i>	<b>total</b>
A	50	106	11	167
B	55	226	26	307



C	36	84	37	157
<b>total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>416</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>631</b>

160

161

162

### 163 **Interobserver agreement**

164 the 26 in disagreement, some typical examples are as follows:

- 165 • Bronchial tree in ICF *equivalent\_to* or *broader\_than* Bronchus in ICD-11;
- 166 • Vaginal canal in ICF *equivalent\_to* or *narrower\_than* Vagina in ICD-11;
- 167 • Ligaments and fasciae of hand in ICF *broader\_than* or *narrower\_than* Ligament of the wrist and  
168 hand in ICD-11.

169 On the other side, by considering the 115 mapped ICF categories, some further differences became  
170 visible due to different choices in *narrower\_than* or *broader\_than* relationships (for example, obvious or  
171 redundant *broader\_than* relationships). This involved the same ICF source, but possibly different ICD-11  
172 targets. Examples from a total of 12 cases are:

- 173 • Structure of diencephalon *narrower\_than* Supratentorial region of brain  
174 *narrower\_than* Brain : this one is redundant  
175 *broader\_than* Thalamus
- 176 • Structure of skin glands *broader\_than* Sebaceous gland  
177 *broader\_than* Apocrine sweat gland

178 *broader\_than* Eccrine gland  
179 *narrower\_than* Skin  
180 • atria *equivalent\_to* Cardiac atrium  
181 *broader\_than* Right atrium

182 Discrepancies were examined by the experts to delete from the final set the maps on which there  
183 was not an agreement, that were redundant, or that were mistakes.

## 184 Mapping details

185 The mappings have been consolidated in a single set of agreed-upon relationships, including  
186 automatically calculated equivalencies.

187 In order to obtain a consolidated mapping, we prioritized relationships as follows. First of all, if  
188 there is agreement on an equivalency, it is considered as the selected relationship, even if others are  
189 available. Without an equivalency, if a *narrower\_than* relationship is available, that will be selected.  
190 Finally, *broader\_than* relationships are selected.

191 After this step, the consolidated mappings are as described in Table 2.

192

193 Table 2: Consolidated mappings

	<b>relations</b>			
	<i>equivalent_to</i>	<i>broader_than</i>	<i>narrower_than</i>	<b>total</b>
consolidated	164	230	40	434

194

## 195 **Discussion**

196           The common Foundation from which the various WHO reference classifications are derived  
197 through linearizations requires that every entity be uniquely and unambiguously defined. This might  
198 require a process of harmonization of concepts that share similar meanings but may or may not be  
199 identical, also to favor joint use of the reference classifications. The process may be more or less complex  
200 according to the entities considered, but could be easier for entities already sharing strong similarities. For  
201 further automatic mappings of concepts that may not be of the same semantic types, lexical mappings  
202 resulting in identical maps need to be evaluated to make sure that the concepts are identical. The “low  
203 hanging fruits” of harmonization include the anatomy entities as described in ICD-11 and in the body  
204 structure domain of ICF, which have been the subject of this paper.

205           Three main issues arise from this experiment are as follows:

- 206           A. Different levels of specificity: in general, ICF is less detailed than ICD (*74 narrower\_than* vs 416  
207           *broader\_than* maps);
- 208           B. ICF favors lumping of structures: e.g. “The eye, ear and related structures; Structures of  
209           cardiovascular, immunological and respiratory systems; Structure of vagina and external genitalia;  
210           Testes and scrotum”;
- 211           C. The two classifications may have different anatomic models: e.g., Where is the shoulder? For ICD:  
212           in upper extremity; for ICF: in structures related to movement.

213 For these issues, solutions have to be found that are compliant with the WHO approach to  
214 classification modeling and maintenance, which includes the concept of a common Foundation that  
215 embodies all the relevant entities.

216 Issue A does not represent a real problem: according to the approach for creating linearizations  
217 from the Foundation, the “boundary” of specificity is called “shoreline”; and to select different  
218 specificities, it is only a matter of defining a different shoreline for each classification.

219 Issue B might have two different solutions. The solution with least impact, from the point of view  
220 of classifications, is to introduce the ICF groupings as new groupings in the Foundation’s Anatomic Detail,  
221 while not using them in the ICD-11 linearization. However, such groupings are often heterogeneous and  
222 missing a strong semantic similarity (e.g., “The eye, ear and related structures”), and are present only for  
223 the sake of aggregation in a classification that was born with a printed edition in mind, but can be useful  
224 for aggregation of data at a higher level. Thus, the ideal solution would be to revise the hierarchy  
225 organization in ICF, without modifying terminal entities, in order to split heterogeneous groupings into  
226 more semantically homogeneous groups.

227 Issue C is apparently the most complex: different models may mean a totally different hierarchy,  
228 and such differences in modeling is intrinsic in the different points of view expressed by ICF and ICD (the  
229 former centered on functioning, the latter on clinical aspects). Figure 3 shows a clear and compelling  
230 example: in ICF terms, mouth and nose are structures devoted to speech, while in ICD terms, mouth is  
231 part of the digestive system, and nose of the respiratory system. Both views are perfectly reasonable, yet  
232 both miss the aspect highlighted by the other classification. Nevertheless, both views may be  
233 accommodated in the WHO-FIC Foundation, which differs from traditional classifications in that it allows  
234 for multiple parenthood relationships. The use of multiple parents might enable us to express the different

235 views without forcing one classification to adopt the point of view of the other, and leaving to the  
236 linearization phase the choice of one or the other parent in each classification.

237

238 *Figure 3: Nose and mouth have different parents in ICF and in ICD-11.*

239

240 The consolidated maps are made available in SSOM format (11) at  
241 <https://github.com/whoficite/harmonization/blob/main/ICF-ICD-anatomy-v1.tsv>.

242

## 243 **Conclusion**

244 The harmonization experiment now needs to be extended to ICHI and might be replicated for the  
245 examples of related impairments described in ICF and found in ICD as symptoms or health conditions.

246

## 247 **References**

- 248 1. Harrison JE, Weber S, Jakob R et al. ICD-11: an international classification of diseases for the twenty-  
249 first century. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak 21 (Suppl 6), 206 (2021). [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01534-6)  
250 [021-01534-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01534-6)
- 251 2. Chute, C.G., Çelik, C. Overview of ICD-11 architecture and structure. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak  
252 21 (Suppl 6), 378 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01539-1>
- 253 3. Heerkens YF, de Weerd M, Huber M, de Brouwer CPM, van der Veen S, Perenboom RJM, van Gool  
254 CH, Ten Napel H, van Bon-Martens M, Stallinga HA, van Meeteren NLU. Reconsideration of the

- 255 scheme of the international classification of functioning, disability and health: incentives from the  
256 Netherlands for a global debate. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2018;40(5):603–11.
- 257 4. Cozzi, S., Martinuzzi, A. Della Mea, V. Ontological modeling of the International Classification of  
258 Functioning, Disabilities and Health (ICF): Activities&Participation and Environmental Factors  
259 components. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 21, 367 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01729->  
260 x
- 261 5. World Health Organization.. WHO-FIC Foundation. <https://icd.who.int/dev11/f/en>
- 262 6. Tu S, Nyulas C, Tudorache T, Musen M, Martinuzzi A, van Gool C, Della Mea V, Chute C, Frattura  
263 L, Hardiker N, Napel H, Madden R, Almborg A-H, Ginige J, Sykes C. Toward a harmonized WHO  
264 family of international classifications content model. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2020;270:1409–10.
- 265 7. Rosse C, Mejino JL Jr. A reference ontology for biomedical informatics: the Foundational Model of  
266 Anatomy. *J Biomed Inform.* 2003 Dec;36(6):478-500. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2003.11.007. PMID:  
267 14759820.
- 268 8. WHO-FIC Network. WHO-FIC Classifications and terminology mapping. Principles and best practice.  
269 WHO, 2021. <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/who-fic-classifications-andterminology->  
270 mapping
- 271 9. Drösler, S.E., Weber, S. & Chute, C.G. ICD-11 extension codes support detailed clinical abstraction  
272 and comprehensive classification. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 21 (Suppl 6), 278 (2021).  
273 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-021-01635-2>
- 274 10. Celik C, Della Mea V, Donada M, Kostanjsek N, Jakob R, Chute CG. The ICD Platform: end-user  
275 and developer tools. Submitted, 2022

276 11. Matentzoglou N, Balhoff JP, Bello SM, et al. A Simple Standard for Sharing Ontological Mappings  
277 (SSSOM). Database (Oxford). 2022 May 25;2022:baac035. doi: 10.1093/database/baac035.

278

279