NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to sub criterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 1550
Corresponding Measures:
De.2. **Measure Title:** Hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)
Co.1.1. **Measure Steward:** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
De.3. **Brief Description of Measure:** The measure estimates a hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) associated with elective primary THA and TKA in Medicare Fee-For-Service beneficiaries who are age 65 and older. The outcome (complication) is defined as any one of the specified complications occurring from the date of index admission to 90 days post date of the index admission (the admission included in the measure cohort).
1b.1. **Developer Rationale:** The goal of this measure is to improve patient outcomes by providing patients, physicians, hospitals, and policy makers with information about hospital-level, risk-standardized complication rates (RSCRs) following hospitalization for primary elective THA and TKA. Measurement of patient outcomes allows for a broad view of quality of care that encompasses more than what can be captured by individual process-of-care measures. Complex and critical aspects of care, such as communication between providers, prevention of and response to complications, patient safety, and coordinated transitions to the outpatient environment, all contribute to patient outcomes but are difficult to measure by individual process measures. The goal of outcomes measurement is to risk adjust for patients' conditions at the time of hospital admission and then evaluate patient outcomes. This measure was developed to identify institutions whose performance is better or worse than would be expected based on each institution's patient case mix, and therefore promote hospital quality improvement and better inform consumers about care quality. THA and TKA complications is a priority area for outcome measure development, as it is an outcome that is likely attributable to care processes and is an important outcome for patients. Measuring and reporting complication rates will inform healthcare providers and facilities about opportunities to improve care, strengthen incentives for quality improvement, and ultimately improve the quality of care received by Medicare patients. The measure will also provide patients with information that could guide their choices. In addition, it has the potential to lower health care costs associated with complications.

S.4. **Numerator Statement:** The outcome for this measure is any complication occurring during the index admission (not coded present on arrival) to 90 days post-date of the index admission. Complications are counted in the measure only if they occur during the index hospital admission or during a readmission. The complication outcome is a dichotomous (yes/no) outcome. If a patient experiences one or more of these complications in the applicable time period, the complication outcome for that patient is counted in the measure as a "yes".
S.6. **Denominator Statement:** The target population for the publicly reported measure includes admissions for Medicare FFS beneficiaries who are at least 65 years of age undergoing elective primary THA and/or TKA procedures.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.
S.8. **Denominator Exclusions:** This measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Without at least 90 days post-discharge enrollment in FFS Medicare;
2. Who were discharged against medical advice (AMA); or,
3. Who had more than two THA/TKA procedure codes during the index hospitalization.

After applying these exclusion criteria, we randomly select one index admission for patients with multiple index admissions in a calendar year. We therefore exclude the other eligible index admissions in that year.

De.1. **Measure Type:** Outcome
S.17. **Data Source:** Claims, Enrollment Data
S.20. **Level of Analysis:** Facility

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Jan 31, 2012 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Jan 25, 2017

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. **IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results?** This measure is not formally paired with another measure; however, it is harmonized with the hospital-level, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA), as well as the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment (RSP) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA) measures.

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. ***Measures must be judged to meet all sub criteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form
NQF_evidence_THATKAcomplications_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.docx
1a.1 For Maintenance of Endorsement: Is there new evidence about the measure since the last update/submission?
Do not remove any existing information. If there have been any changes to evidence, the Committee will consider the new evidence. Please use the most current version of the evidence attachment (v7.1). Please use red font to indicate updated evidence.
Yes

1b. Performance Gap

Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- Disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. **Briefly explain the rationale for this measure** *(e.g., how the measure will improve the quality of care, the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)*
If a COMPOSITE (e.g., combination of component measure scores, all-or-none, any-or-none), SKIP this question and answer the composite questions.
The goal of this measure is to improve patient outcomes by providing patients, physicians, hospitals, and policy makers with information about hospital-level, risk-standardized complication rates (RSCRs) following hospitalization for primary elective THA and TKA. Measurement of patient outcomes allows for a broad view of quality of care that encompasses more than what can be captured by individual process-of-care measures. Complex and critical aspects of care, such as communication between providers, prevention of and response to complications, patient safety, and coordinated transitions to the outpatient environment, all contribute to patient outcomes but are difficult to measure by individual process measures. The goal of outcomes measurement is to risk adjust for patients' conditions at the time of hospital admission and then evaluate patient outcomes. This measure was developed to identify institutions whose performance is better or worse than would be expected based on each institution's patient case mix, and therefore promote hospital quality improvement and better inform consumers about care quality.
THA and TKA complications is a priority area for outcome measure development, as it is an outcome that is likely attributable to care processes and is an important outcome for patients. Measuring and reporting complication rates will inform healthcare providers and facilities about opportunities to improve care, strengthen incentives for quality improvement, and ultimately improve the quality of care received by Medicare patients. The measure will also provide patients with information that could guide their choices. In addition, it has the potential to lower health care costs associated with complications.

1b.2. **Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis**. *(This is*

required for maintenance of endorsement. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.
Variation in complication rates indicates opportunity for improvement. We conducted analyses using data from April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2019 Medicare administrative claims data (n= 962,744 admissions from 3,418 hospitals).

The three-year hospital-level risk standardized complication rate (RSCR) has a mean of 2.5% and range from 1.2-10.6% in the study cohort. As shown below, the median risk-standardized rate is 2.4%. The distribution of RSCRs across hospitals is shown below:

Distribution of Hospital THA/TKA RSCRs over Different Time Periods
Results for each data year
Characteristic//04/2016-03/2017//04/2017-03/2018//04/2018-03/2019//04/2016-03/2019
Number of Hospitals//3274//3271//3250//3418
Number of Admissions//336445//330765//295534//962744
Mean (SD)//2.6(0.4)//2.4(0.4)//2.3(0.3)//2.5(0.5)
Range (Min-Max)//1.1-9.3//1.3-13//1.2-4.5//1.2-10.6
Minimum//1.1//1.3//1.2//1.2
10th percentile//2.1//2.1//2.0//1.9
20th percentile//2.3//2.2//2.1//2.1
30th percentile//2.4//2.3//2.2//2.3
40th percentile//2.5//2.3//2.2//2.3
50th percentile//2.5//2.4//2.3//2.4
60th percentile//2.5//2.4//2.3//2.5
70th percentile//2.7//2.5//2.4//2.6
80th percentile//2.8//2.7//2.5//2.8
90th percentile//3.0//2.9//2.7//3.0
Maximum//9.3//13.0//4.5//10.6

1b.3. If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.
N/A

1b.4. Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability. *(This is required for maintenance of endorsement. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included.) For measures that show high levels of performance, i.e., "topped out", disparities data may demonstrate an opportunity for improvement/gap in care for certain sub-populations. This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*
Distribution of THA/TKA RSCRs by Proportion of Dual Eligible Patients:
Data Source: Medicare FFS claim and Medicare Beneficiary Summary File (MBSF) data
Dates of Data: April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2019

Variation in RSCRs across hospitals (with at least 25 cases) by proportion of patients with social risk//
Description of Social Risk Variable//Dual Eligibility
Quartile//Q1//Q4
Social Risk Proportion (%)//(0-5.32)//(21.26-79.17)
# of Hospitals//690//691
100%Max//4.1//6.0
90%//3.0//3.2
75%//2.6//2.8
50%//2.3//2.5
25%//2.1//2.2

10%//1.8//2.1
0%Min//1.2//1.5

Distribution of THA/TKA RSCRs by Proportion of Patients with AHRQ SES Index Scores:
Data Source: Medicare FFS claims and The American Community Survey (2013-2017) data
Dates of Data: April 1, 2016 to March 31, 2019

Variation in RSCRs across hospitals (with at least 25 cases) by proportion of patients in lower and upper social risk quartiles//
Description of Social Risk Variable //AHRQ SES Index
Quartile//Q1//Q4
Social Risk Proportion (%)//(0-1.74)//(6.82-95.38)
# of Hospitals//690//691
100%Max//4.6//6.9
90%//3.0//3.1
75%//2.7//2.8
50%//2.3//2.5
25%//2.1//2.2
10%//1.8//2.1
0%Min//1.3//1.6

1b.5. **If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b.4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations. Not necessary if performance data provided in 1b.4**
N/A

2. Reliability and Validity—Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. ***Measures must be judged to meet the sub criteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. **Subject/Topic Area** *(check all the areas that apply):*
Musculoskeletal : Joint Surgery, Musculoskeletal : Osteoporosis, Musculoskeletal : Rheumatoid Arthritis, Surgery

De.6. **Non-Condition Specific***(check all the areas that apply):*
Care Coordination, Safety, Safety : Complications, Safety : Overuse

De.7. **Target Population Category** *(Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):*
Elderly, Populations at Risk

S.1. **Measure-specific Web Page** *(Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)*
https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/complication/methodology

S.2a. **If this is an eMeasure**, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)
This is not an eMeasure **Attachment:**

S.2b. **Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets** *(and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)*
Attachment **Attachment:** NQF_datadictionary_THATKAcomp_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

S.2c. Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.
No, this is not an instrument-based measure **Attachment:**

S.2d. Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.
Not an instrument-based measure

S.3.1. **For maintenance of endorsement:** Are there changes to the specifications since the last updates/submission. If yes, update the specifications for S1-2 and S4-22 and explain reasons for the changes in S3.2.
No

S.3.2. **For maintenance of endorsement,** please briefly describe any important changes to the measure specifications since last measure update and explain the reasons.
Updates consisted of updating the specifications to include new and modified ICD-10 CM/PCS codes.

S.4. **Numerator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome) DO NOT include the rationale for the measure.*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
The outcome for this measure is any complication occurring during the index admission (not coded present on arrival) to 90 days post-date of the index admission. Complications are counted in the measure only if they occur during the index hospital admission or during a readmission. The complication outcome is a dichotomous (yes/no) outcome. If a patient experiences one or more of these complications in the applicable time period, the complication outcome for that patient is counted in the measure as a "yes".

S.5. **Numerator Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
The composite complication is a dichotomous outcome (yes for any complication(s); no for no complications). Therefore, if a patient experiences one or more complications, the outcome variable will get coded as a "yes". Complications are counted in the measure only if they occur during the index hospital admission (and are not present on admission) or during a readmission.
The complications captured in the numerator are identified during the index admission OR associated with a readmission up to 90 days post-date of index admission, depending on the complication. The follow-up period for complications from date of index admission is as follows:
The follow-up period for AMI, pneumonia, and sepsis/septicemia/shock is seven days from the date of index admission because these conditions are more likely to be attributable to the procedure if they occur within the first week after the procedure. Additionally, analyses indicated a sharp decrease in the rate of these complications after seven days.
Death, surgical site bleeding, and pulmonary embolism are followed for 30 days following admission because clinical experts agree these complications are still likely attributable to the hospital performing the procedure during this period and rates for these complications remained elevated until roughly 30 days post admission.
The measure follow-up period is 90 days after admission for mechanical complications and periprosthetic joint infection/wound infection. Experts agree that mechanical complications and periprosthetic joint infection/wound infections due to the index THA/TKA occur up to 90 days following THA/TKA.
The measure counts all complications occurring during the index admission regardless of when they occur. For example, if a patient experiences an AMI on day 10 of the index admission, the measure will count the AMI as a complication, although the specified follow-up period for AMI is seven days. Clinical experts agree with this approach, as such complications likely represent the quality

of care provided during the index admission.
As of 2014 reporting, the measure does not count complications in the complications outcome that are coded as present on admission (POA) during the index admission; this prevents identifying a condition as a complication of care if it was present on admission for the THA/TKA procedure.
For full list of codes defining complications, see the Data Dictionary attached in field S.2b.

S.6. **Denominator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)*
The target population for the publicly reported measure includes admissions for Medicare FFS beneficiaries who are at least 65 years of age undergoing elective primary THA and/or TKA procedures.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

S.7. **Denominator Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b.)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the target population is identified. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).
To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following additional inclusion criteria:
1. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of admission; and enrolled in Part A during the index admission;
2. Aged 65 or older
3. Having a qualifying elective primary THA/TKA procedure; elective primary THA/TKA procedures are defined as those procedures without any of the following:
- Fracture of the pelvis or lower limbs coded in the principal or secondary discharge diagnosis fields on the index admission claim (Note: Periprosthetic fractures must be additionally coded as present on admission [POA] in order to disqualify a THA/TKA from cohort inclusion, unless exempt from POA reporting.);
- A concurrent partial hip or knee arthroplasty procedure;
- A concurrent revision, resurfacing, or implanted device/prosthesis removal procedure;
- Mechanical complication coded in the principal discharge diagnosis field on the index admission claim;
- Malignant neoplasm of the pelvis, sacrum, coccyx, lower limbs, or bone/bone marrow or a disseminated malignant neoplasm coded in the principal discharge diagnosis field on the index admission claim; or,
- Transfer from another acute care facility for the THA/TKA.
Patients are eligible for inclusion in the denominator if they had an elective primary THA and/or a TKA AND had continuous enrollment in Part A and Part B Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) 12 months prior to the date of index admission.
This measure can also be used for an all-payer population aged 18 years and older. We have explicitly tested the measure in both patients aged 18+ years and those aged 65+ years (see Testing Attachment for details).

S.8. **Denominator Exclusions** *(Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)*
This measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Without at least 90 days post-discharge enrollment in FFS Medicare;
2. Who were discharged against medical advice (AMA); or,
3. Who had more than two THA/TKA procedure codes during the index hospitalization.

After applying these exclusion criteria, we randomly select one index admission for patients with multiple index admissions in a calendar year. We therefore exclude the other eligible index admissions in that year.

S.9. **Denominator Exclusion Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b.)*
This measure excludes index admissions for patients:
1. Without at least 90 days post-discharge enrollment in FFS Medicare
Rationale: The 90-day complication outcome cannot be assessed in this group since claims data are used to determine whether a

complication of care occurred.

2. Who were discharged against medical advice (AMA); or,
Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

3. Who had more than two THA/TKA procedure codes during the index hospitalization
Rationale: Although clinically possible, it is highly unlikely that patients would receive more than two elective THA/TKA procedures in one hospitalization, which may reflect a coding error.

S.10. **Stratification Information** *(Provide all information required to stratify the measure results, if necessary, including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets, and the risk-model covariates and coefficients for the clinically-adjusted version of the measure when appropriate – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b.)*
N/A

S.11. **Risk Adjustment Type** (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in measure testing attachment)
Statistical risk model
If other:

S.12. **Type of score:**
Rate/proportion
If other:

S.13. **Interpretation of Score** *(Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score)*
Better quality = Lower score

S.14. **Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic** (*Diagram or describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; time period for data, aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)*
The measure estimates hospital-level RSCRs following elective primary THA/TKA using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals (Normand and Shahian, 2007). At the patient level, it models the log-odds of a complication occurring within 90 days of the index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a complication at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.
The RSCR is calculated as the ratio of the number of "predicted" to the number of "expected" admissions with a complication at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed complication rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of complications within 90 days predicted on the basis of the hospital's performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator is the number of complications expected based on the nation's performance with that hospital's case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of "observed" to "expected" used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital's performance given its case mix to an average hospital's performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected complication rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected complication rates or worse quality.
The "predicted" number of admissions with a complication (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of having an admission with a complication. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added to the sum of the estimated regression coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are log transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The "expected" number of admissions with a complication (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific effect. The results are log transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.
This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed complication

rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet: https://www.qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/complication/methodology.

References:

Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Stat Sci 22(2): 206-226.

S.15. **Sampling** *(If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)*

IF an instrument-based performance measure (e.g., PRO-PM), identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.

N/A

S.16. **Survey/Patient-reported data** *(If measure is based on a survey or instrument, provide instructions for data collection and guidance on minimum response rate.)*

Specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

N/A

S.17. **Data Source** *(Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).*
If other, please describe in S.18.

Claims, Enrollment Data

S.18. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument (e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc., and describe how data are collected.)*

IF instrument-based, identify the specific instrument(s) and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.

Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

Medicare Part A Inpatient and Part B Outpatient Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims for the 12 months prior to an index admission.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB): This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This data source was used to obtain information on several inclusion/exclusion indicators such as Medicare status on admission as well as vital status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al., 1992). The Master Beneficiary Summary File (MBSF) is an annually created file derived the EDB that contains enrollment information for all Medicare beneficiaries including dual eligible status. Years 2016-2019 were used.

The American Community Survey (2013-2017): We used the American Community Survey (2013-2017) to derive an updated Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic (SES) index score at the patient nine-digit zip code level for use in studying the association between our measure and social risk factors (SRFs).

References:

Fleming C., Fisher ES, Chang CH, Bubolz D, Malenda J. Studying outcomes and hospital utilization in the elderly: The advantages of a merged data base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. Medical Care. 1992; 30(5): 377-91.

S.19. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)*

No data collection instrument provided

S.20. **Level of Analysis** *(Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*

Facility

S.21. **Care Setting** *(Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*

Inpatient/Hospital

If other:

S.22. **COMPOSITE Performance Measure** - Additional Specifications *(Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)*

N/A

2. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

NQF_testing_THATKAcomplications_Fall2020_final_11.02.20-637418270788250049.docx

2.1 For maintenance of endorsement

Reliability testing: If testing of reliability of the measure score was not presented in prior submission(s), has reliability testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.

Yes

2.2 For maintenance of endorsement

Has additional empirical validity testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.

Yes

2.3 For maintenance of endorsement

Risk adjustment: For outcome, resource use, cost, and some process measures, risk-adjustment that includes social risk factors is not prohibited at present. Please update sections 1.8, 2a2, 2b1,2b4.3 and 2b5 in the Testing attachment and S.140 and S.11 in the online submission form. NOTE: These sections must be updated even if social risk factors are not included in the risk-adjustment strategy. You MUST use the most current version of the Testing Attachment (v7.1) -- older versions of the form will not have all required questions.

Yes - Updated information is included

3. Feasibility

Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.

3a. Byproduct of Care Processes

For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).

3a.1. **Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.**

Generated or collected by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care (e.g., blood pressure, lab value, diagnosis, depression score), Coded by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims)

If other:

3b. Electronic Sources

The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.

3b.1. **To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields** (*i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields*) Update this field for **maintenance of endorsement**.

ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic claims

3b.2. **If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources.** For **maintenance of endorsement**, if this measure is not an eMeasure (eCQM), please describe any efforts to develop an eMeasure (eCQM).

N/A

3b.3. **If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL. Please also complete and attach the NQF Feasibility Score Card.**

Attachment:

3c. Data Collection Strategy

Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs

associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.

3c.1. **Required for maintenance of endorsement. Describe difficulties (as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure) regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues.**
IF instrument-based, consider implications for both individuals providing data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.
This measure uses administrative claims and enrollment data and as such, offers no data collection burden to hospitals or providers.

3c.2. **Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified** *(e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm)*.
N/A

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. **Current and Planned Use**
NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

Specific Plan for Use	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
	Public Reporting Hospital Value Based Purchasing (HVBP) Program https://www.qualitynet.org/inpatient/hvbp Hospital Value Based Purchasing (HVBP) Program https://www.qualitynet.org/inpatient/hvbp Payment Program Hospital Compare https://www.medicare.gov/hospitalcompare/search.html?

4a1.1 **For each CURRENT use, checked above (update for maintenance of endorsement), provide:**

- Name of program and sponsor
- Purpose
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included
- Level of measurement and setting

Public Reporting
Program Name, Sponsor: Hospital Compare, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

Purpose: Under Hospital Compare and other CMS public reporting websites, CMS collects quality data from hospitals, with the goal of driving quality improvement through measurement and transparency by publicly displaying data to help consumers make more informed decisions about their health care. It is also intended to encourage hospitals and clinicians to improve the quality and cost of inpatient care provided to all patients. The data collected are available to consumers and providers on the Hospital Compare

website at: https://www.medicare.gov/hospitalcompare/search.html. Data for selected measures are also used for paying a portion of hospitals based on the quality and efficiency of care, including the Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program, Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program, and Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program.

Payment Program
Program Name, Sponsor: Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (HVBP) Program, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)

Purpose: The Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (VBP) Program is a CMS initiative that rewards acute-care hospitals with incentive payments for the quality of care they provide to people with Medicare. It was established by the Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA), which added Section 1886(o) to the Social Security Act. The law requires the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to establish a value-based purchasing program for inpatient hospitals. To improve quality, the ACA builds on earlier legislation—the 2003 Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act and the 2005 Deficit Reduction Act. These earlier laws established a way for Medicare to pay hospitals for reporting on quality measures, a necessary step in the process of paying for quality rather than quantity.
Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included: More than 3,000 hospitals across the country are eligible to participate in Hospital VBP. The program applies to subsection (d) hospitals located in the 50 states and the District of Columbia and acute-care hospitals in Maryland. More details about the Hospital VBP program are online at https://www.qualitynet.org/inpatient/hvbp.

The following hospitals are excluded from Hospital VBP:
• Hospitals and hospital units excluded from the Inpatient Prospective Payment System, such as psychiatric, rehabilitation, long-term care, children's, and cancer hospitals;
• Hospitals that are located in the state of Maryland participating in the Maryland All-Payer Model;
• Hospitals subject to payment reductions under the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program;
• Hospitals cited by the Secretary of HHS for deficiencies during the performance period that pose an immediate jeopardy to patients' health or safety;
• Hospitals with an approved extraordinary circumstance exception specific to Hospital VBP; and
• Hospitals that do not meet the minimum number of cases, measures, or surveys required by Hospital VBP.

4a1.2. **If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons?** (*e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?*)
N/A. This measure is currently publicly reported.

4a1.3. **If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement.** (*Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.*)
N/A. This measure is currently publicly reported.

4a2.1.1. **Describe how performance results, data, and assistance with interpretation have been provided to those being measured or other users during development or implementation.**
How many and which types of measured entities and/or others were included? If only a sample of measured entities were included, describe the full population and how the sample was selected.
The exact number of measured entities (acute care hospitals) varies with each new measurement period. For the period between 2016 – 2019, all non-federal short-term acute care hospitals (including Indian Health Service hospitals) and critical access hospitals (3,418 hospitals) were included in the measure calculation. Only those hospitals with at least 25 THA/TKA procedures were included in public reporting.

Each hospital generally receives their measure results in the Spring of each calendar year through CMS's QualityNet website. The results are then publicly reported on CMS's public reporting websites in the summer of each calendar year. Since the measure is risk standardized using data from all hospitals, hospitals cannot independently calculate their score.

However, CMS provides each hospital with several resources that aid in the interpretation of their results (described in detail below). These include Hospital-Specific Reports with details about every patient from their facility that was included in the measure calculation (for example, dates of admission and discharge, discharge diagnoses, outcome [died or not], transfer status, and facility transferred from). These reports facilitate quality improvement activities such as review of individual deaths and patterns of deaths; make visible to hospitals post-discharge outcomes that they may otherwise be unaware of; and allow hospitals to look for patterns that may inform quality improvement (QI) work (e.g. among patient transferred in from particular facilities). CMS also provides measure FAQs, webinars, and measure-specific question and answer inboxes for stakeholders to ask specific questions.

The Hospital-Specific Reports also provide hospitals with more detailed benchmarks with which to gauge their performance relative to peer hospitals and interpret their results, including comorbidity frequencies for their patients relative to other hospitals in their state and the country.

Additionally, the code used to process the claims data and calculate measure results is written in SAS (Cary, NC) and is provided each year to hospitals upon request.

4a2.1.2. **Describe the process(es) involved, including when/how often results were provided, what data were provided, what educational/explanatory efforts were made, etc.**
During the Spring of each year, hospitals have access to the following list of updated resources related to the measure which is provided directly or posted publicly for hospitals to use:

1. Hospital-Specific Reports (HSR): available for hospitals to download from QualityNet in April/May of each calendar year; includes information on the index admissions included in the measure calculation for each facility, detailed measure results, and state and national results.
2. HSR User Guide: available with the HSR and posted on QualityNet; provides instructions for interpreting the results and descriptions of each data field in the HSR.
3. Mock HSR: posted on QualityNet; provides real national results and simulated state and hospital results for stakeholders who do not receive an HSR.
4. HSR Tutorial Video: A brief animated video to help hospitals navigate their HSR and interpret the information provided.
5. Public Reporting Preview and Preview Help Guide: available for hospitals to view from QualityNet in Spring of each calendar year; includes measure results that will be publicly reported on CMS's public reporting websites.
6. Annual Updates and Specification Reports: posted in April/May of each calendar year on QualityNet with detailed measure specifications, descriptions of changes made to the measure specifications with rationale and impact analysis (when appropriate), updated risk variable frequencies and coefficients for the national cohort and updated national results for the new measurement period.
7. Frequently asked Questions (FAQs): includes general and measure-specific questions and responses, as well as infographics that explain complex components of the measure's methodology and are posted in April/May of each calendar year on QualityNet.
8. The SAS code used to calculate the measure with documentation describing what data files are used and how the SAS code works. This code and documentation are updated each year and are released upon request beginning in July of each year.
9. Measure Fact Sheets: provides a brief overview of measures, measure updates, and are posted in April/May of each calendar year on QualityNet.

During the summer of each year, the publicly-reported measure results are posted on CMS's public reporting websites, a tool to find hospitals and compare their quality of care that CMS created in collaboration with organizations representing consumers, hospitals, doctors, employers, accrediting organizations, and other federal agencies. Measure results are updated in July of each calendar year.

4a2.2.1. **Summarize the feedback on measure performance and implementation from the measured entities and others described in 4d.1.**
Describe how feedback was obtained.
Question and Answer Inbox (Q&A)
The measured entities (acute care hospitals) and other stakeholders or interested parties submit questions or comments about the measure through an email inbox (CMScomplicationmeasures@yale.edu). Experts on measure specifications, calculation, or implementation, prepare responses to those inquiries and reply directly to the sender. We consider issues raised through the Q&A process about measure specifications or measure calculation in measure reevaluation.

Literature Reviews
In addition, we routinely scan the literature for scholarly articles describing research related to this measure. We summarize new information obtained through these reviews every 3 years as a part of comprehensive reevaluation as mandated by the Measure Management System (MMS) Blueprint.

4a2.2.2. **Summarize the feedback obtained from those being measured.**
Summary of Questions or Comments from Hospitals submitted through the Q & A process:

For the THA/TKA complications measure, we have received the following inquiries from hospitals since the last endorsement maintenance cycle:
1. Requests for detailed measure specifications including the codes used to define the measure cohort or in the risk-adjustment model;
2. Requests for the SAS code used to calculate measure results;
3. Requests about the data source used to calculate the measure;
4. Questions about how transfers are handled in the measure calculation;
5. Requests for hospital-specific measure information such as HSRs; and
6. Requests for clarification of how inclusion and exclusion criteria are applied.

4a2.2.3. **Summarize the feedback obtained from other users**
Summary of Question and Comments from Other Stakeholders:

For the THA/TKA complications measure, we have received the following feedback from other stakeholders since the last endorsement maintenance cycle:
1. Requests for detailed measure specifications including the narrative specifications for the measure, CC-to-ICD code crosswalks, and codes used to define the measure cohort or in the risk-adjustment model;
2. Requests for the data source and the SAS code used to calculate measure results;
3. Requests for clarification of how inclusion and exclusion criteria are applied;
4. Queries about how cohorts and outcomes are defined, including how planned readmissions are defined;
5. Questions about how transfers are handled in the measure calculation; and
6. Requests for clarification on measure national rates.

Summary of Relevant Publications from the Literature Review:
Since the last endorsement cycle, we have reviewed more than 500 articles related to 90-day complications following an elective THA/TKA procedure. Relevant articles shared key themes related to: additional risk variables for consideration, including social risk factors and other clinical comorbidities; outcome rate and risk variable comparisons between inpatient and outpatient settings for both TKA and THA procedures; exploration of potential association between length of stay and THA/TKA complication outcome rates; and the relationship between complication rates and costs of care.

4a2.3. **Describe how the feedback described in 4a2.2.1 has been considered when developing or revising the measure specifications or implementation, including whether the measure was modified and why or why not.**
Each year, issues raised through the Q&A or in the literature related to this measure are considered by measure and clinical experts. Any issues that warrant additional analytic work due to potential changes in the measure specifications are addressed as a part of annual measure reevaluation. If small changes are indicated after additional analytic work is complete, those changes are usually incorporated into the measure in the next measurement period. If the changes are substantial, CMS may propose the changes through rulemaking and adopt the changes only after CMS receives public comment on the changes and finalizes those changes in the IPPS or other rule. There were no questions or issues raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.

Improvement
Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4b1. **Refer to data provided in 1b but do not repeat here. Discuss any progress on improvement (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare; Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included.)**
If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.
The median hospital 30-day, all-cause, RSCR for the THA/TKA complications measure for the 3-year period between April 1, 2016 – March 31, 2019 was 2.4%. The median RSCR decreased by 0.1 absolute percentage points from April 2016-March 2017 (median RSCR: 2.5%) to April 2018-March 2019 (median: RSCR: 2.4%). Recent peer-reviewed literature confirms these trends (Bozic et al., 2020).

References:
Bozic K, Yu H, Zywiel MG, Li L, Lin L, Simoes JL, Sheares KD, Grady J, Bernheim S, Suter LG. Quality Measure Public Reporting Associated with Improving Hip/Knee Replacement Outcomes. JBJS 2020 (In press).

4b2. Unintended Consequences

The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

4b2.1. **Please explain any unexpected findings (positive or negative) during implementation of this measure including unintended impacts on patients.**
We did not identify any unintended consequences during measure development, model testing, or re-specification. However, we are committed to monitoring this measure's use and assessing potential unintended consequences over time, such as the inappropriate shifting of care, increased patient morbidity and mortality, and other negative unintended consequences for patients.

4b2.2. **Please explain any unexpected benefits from implementation of this measure.**
N/A

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures
Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.
Yes

5.1a. **List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)**
1551 : Hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)
3493 : Risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA) for Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) Eligible Clinicians and Eligible Clinician Groups

5.1b. **If related or competing measures are not NQF endorsed please indicate measure title and steward.**

5a. Harmonization of Related Measures

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;
OR
The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed**

measure(s):
Are the measure specifications harmonized to the extent possible?
Yes

5a.2. **If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden.**
We did not include in our list of related measures any non-outcome measures (for example, process measures) with the same target population as our measure. Because this is an outcome measure, clinical coherence of the cohort takes precedence over alignment with related non-outcome measures. Furthermore, non-outcome measures are limited due to broader patient exclusions. This is because they typically only include a specific subset of patients who are eligible for that measure (for example, patients who receive a specific medication or undergo a specific procedure).

5b. Competing Measures

The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);
OR
Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):**
Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible.)
N/A

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.
Attachment **Attachment:** Procedure_Specific_Complications.pdf

Contact Information

Co.1 **Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner):** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Co.2 **Point of Contact:** Helen, Dollar-Maples, Helen.Dollar-Maples@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-7214-
Co.3 **Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward:** Yale New Haven Health Services Corporation/Center for Outcomes Research and Evaluation (YNHHSC/ CORE)
Co.4 **Point of Contact:** Doris, Peter, Doris.Peter@yale.edu

Additional Information

Ad.1 **Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development**
Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.
The working group involved in the initial measure development is detailed in the original technical report available at www.qualitynet.org.

Our measure development team consisted of the following members:
Laura M. Grosso, PhD, MPH
Jeptha P. Curtis, MD
Zhenqiu Lin, PhD
Lori L. Geary, MPH
Smitha Vellanky, MSc
Carol Oladele, MPH

Yongfei Wang, MS
Elizabeth E. Drye, MD, SM
Harlan M. Krumholz, MD, SM

Working Group Members:
Daniel J. Berry, MD
Kevin J. Bozic, MD, MBA
Robert Bucholz, MD
Lisa Gale Suter, MD
Charles M. Turkelson, PhD
Lawrence Weis, MD

Technical Expert Panel Members:
Mark L. Francis, MD
Cynthia Jacelon, PhD, RN, CRRN
Norman Johanson, MD
C. Kent Kwoh, MD
Courtland G. Lewis, MD
Jay Lieberman, MD
Peter Lindenauer, MD, M.Sc.
Russell Robbins, MD, MBA
Barbara Schaffer
Nelson SooHoo, MD, MPH
Steven H. Stern, MD
Richard E. White, Jr., MD

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 **Year the measure was first released:** 2013

Ad.3 **Month and Year of most recent revision:** 03, 2019

Ad.4 **What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?** Annual

Ad.5 **When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?** 2020

Ad.6 **Copyright statement:** N/A

Ad.7 **Disclaimers:** N/A

Ad.8 **Additional Information/Comments:** N/A