



Ad Hoc Review Policy

Definition

An ad hoc review is a formal measure evaluation and endorsement reconsideration outside of the scheduled maintenance of endorsement process. An ad hoc review is limited and focused on a specific issue regarding an evaluation criterion and is not the same as a maintenance of endorsement evaluation.

Ad hoc triggers

An ad hoc review may be triggered in a variety of ways:

1. A material change to an endorsed measure is submitted by a measure developer during an annual update. Material change is defined as any modification to the measure specifications that significantly affects the measure result such as:
 - a. change to the population being measured (e.g., changes in age inclusions, changes in diagnoses or other inclusion criteria, changes in excluded populations);
 - b. changes to what is being measured (e.g., changes in target values like blood pressure or lipid values);
 - c. inclusion of new data source(s); or
 - d. expansion of the level of analysis or care settings.

Examples include:

CONSIDERED MATERIAL CHANGE
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Adding a new variable or deleting an element/component of the numerator/denominator or inclusion/exclusion specifications.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change in the timeframe of the measure (e.g., all patients last year versus all patients this year and last year).
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change to the age groups in the measured population.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The addition or deletion of a diagnostic code that is not merely an update, but that represents a different or new classification/category
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A change in the risk-adjustment approach (e.g., from risk-stratification to a model-based approach) or the addition or deletion of a variable in the risk-adjustment approach (e.g., inclusion of a new SDS factor).

NOT CONSIDERED MATERIAL CHANGE

- Updating codes, to reflect current coding nomenclature for a specific condition, disease, procedure, test, or drug.
- Adding a new drug to a family of drugs already specified in the measure.
- A change in the risk adjustment involving a modification to the value of a coefficient. (e.g., the statistical model remains the same, but new data updates the relationships among the variables, so that the estimates of the coefficients change).
- Clarifying or adding a clarifying detail to a numerator or denominator, inclusions or exclusions, or other specification elements that does not change the measure result.
- Documenting an exclusion that already existed in the measure's algorithm would not be a material change to a measure that already excluded it, but did not document it as an exclusion.)

2. Directive by the Standing Committee or the Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) to review a specific criterion sooner than the scheduled maintenance of endorsement evaluation.
3. Request by a developer or third party. An ad hoc review can be requested by any party, as long as there is adequate evidence to justify the review.

Ad hoc review process

1. The NQF Measure Maintenance team will review all annual updates for material changes. If none are identified, the annual update will be accepted. If material changes are identified, the Measure Maintenance team will notify the developer and schedule an ad hoc review.
2. An ad hoc review directed by the Standing Committee or the CSAC will be carried out by the project team with assistance from the Measure Maintenance team as needed.



NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

3. Each request for an ad hoc review is reviewed by NQF's Measure Maintenance team, which includes clinical experts and methodologists. Any request for an ad hoc review must be submitted online via the [Quality Positioning System \(QPS\)](#) or via email at measuremaintenance@qualityforum.org. Requests must indicate which criterion the ad hoc review should address and include adequate written evidence to justify the review. Multiple criteria can be used in the justification. The criteria are:
- the evidence supporting the measure has changed (e.g., for risk adjusted measures, evidence of conceptual relationship between socioeconomic and other social demographic factors (SDS) and the measure's performance);
 - implementation of the measure results in unintended consequences; or
 - material changes have been made to the measure (including changes to the measure's setting and data source).

The ad hoc review process follows an abbreviated version of the Consensus Development Process and includes,

- Evaluation by a relevant topic-specific standing committee. (If the relevant topic-specific standing committee has not been constituted, NQF will post a call for nominations for technical experts to conduct the ad hoc review);
- Public and Member comment period for no less than 10 days;
- Review and final endorsement decision by the CSAC; and
- An appeals period.

An ad hoc review may be carried out at the same time as an active endorsement maintenance project. The measure under ad hoc review will follow the timeline of the active project.

If a measure remains endorsed after an ad hoc review, it is still subject to its original maintenance cycle.