This form contains the measure information submitted by stewards. Blank fields indicate no information was provided. Attachments also may have been submitted and are provided to reviewers. The subcriteria and most of the footnotes from the evaluation criteria are provided in Word comments within the form and will appear if your cursor is over the highlighted area. Hyperlinks to the evaluation criteria and ratings are provided in each section.

TAP/Workgroup (if utilized): Complete all yellow highlighted areas of the form. Evaluate the extent to which each subcriterion is met. Based on your evaluation, summarize the strengths and weaknesses in each section.

Note: If there is no TAP or workgroup, the SC also evaluates the subcriteria (yellow highlighted areas).

Steering Committee: Complete all pink highlighted areas of the form. Review the workgroup/TAP assessment of the subcriteria, noting any areas of disagreement; then evaluate the extent to which each major criterion is met; and finally, indicate your recommendation for the endorsement. Provide the rationale for your ratings.

Evaluation ratings of the extent to which the criteria are met
C = Completely (unquestionably demonstrated to meet the criterion)
P = Partially (demonstrated to partially meet the criterion)
M = Minimally (addressed BUT demonstrated to only minimally meet the criterion)
N = Not at all (NOT addressed; OR incorrectly addressed; OR demonstrated to NOT meet the criterion)
NA = Not applicable (only an option for a few subcriteria as indicated)

(for NQF staff use) NQF Review #: 1486 NQF Project: Cardiovascular Endorsement Maintenance 2010

De.1 Measure Title: Chronic Stable Coronary Artery Disease: Blood Pressure Control

De.2 Brief description of measure: Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of coronary artery disease seen within a 12 month period with a blood pressure <140/90 mm Hg OR patients with a blood pressure =140/90 mm Hg and prescribed 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications during the most recent office visit

De.3 Type of Measure: Process

De.4 National Priority Partners Priority Area: Population health

De.5 IOM Quality Domain: Effectiveness, Equity

De.6 Consumer Care Need: Living with illness

Four conditions must be met before proposed measures may be considered and evaluated for suitability as voluntary consensus standards:

A. The measure is in the public domain or an intellectual property (measure steward agreement) is signed. Public domain only applies to governmental organizations. All non-government organizations must sign a measure steward agreement even if measures are made publicly and freely available.

A.1 Do you attest that the measure steward holds intellectual property rights to the measure and the right to use aspects of the measure owned by another entity (e.g., risk model, code set)?

A.2 Indicate if Proprietary Measure (as defined in measure steward agreement):

A.3 Measure Steward Agreement: Agreement will be signed and submitted prior to or at the time of measure submission

A.4 Measure Steward Agreement attached:

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
### B. The measure owner/steward verifies there is an identified responsible entity and process to maintain and update the measure on a schedule that is commensurate with the rate of clinical innovation, but at least every 3 years. Yes, information provided in contact section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### C. The intended use of the measure includes both public reporting and quality improvement.

- **Purpose:** Public reporting, Internal quality improvement, Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### D. The requested measure submission information is complete. Generally, measures should be fully developed and tested so that all the evaluation criteria have been addressed and information needed to evaluate the measure is provided. Measures that have not been tested are only potentially eligible for a time-limited endorsement and in that case, measure owners must verify that testing will be completed within 12 months of endorsement.

- **Testing:** No, testing will be completed within 12 months
- **Have NQF-endorsed measures been reviewed to identify if there are similar or related measures?** Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment [KP1]: 1a. The measure focus addresses:
- A specific national health goal/priority identified by NQF’s National Priorities Partners; OR
- A demonstrated high impact aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers, leading cause of morbidity/mortality, high resource use (current and/or future), severity of illness, and patient/societal consequences of poor quality).

### 1. IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT

Extent to which the specific measure focus is important to making significant gains in health care quality (safety, timeliness, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, patient-centeredness) and improving health outcomes for a specific high impact aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall poor performance. **Measures must be judged to be important to measure and report in order to be evaluated against the remaining criteria**.

1. **High Impact**

   - **Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare:** Affects large numbers, Leading cause of morbidity/mortality, High resource use
   - **Summary of Evidence of High Impact:**
     - 16.3 million Americans are living with coronary heart disease - of that 16.3 million, 54% are men and 46% are women. (1)
     - Coronary heart disease makes up more than half of all cardiovascular events in men and women less than 75 years of age. (1)
     - The lifetime risk of developing coronary heart disease after age 40 is 49% for men and 32% for women. (1)
     - The incidence of coronary heart disease in women lags behind men by 10 years for total coronary heart disease and by 20 years for more serious clinical events such as myocardial infarction and death. (1)
     - Coronary heart disease caused approximately 1 of every 6 deaths in the United States in 2007. (1)
     - While death rates have fallen from 1968 to the present, coronary heart disease is the largest killer of men and women in the United States. (1) It has been estimated that approximately 47% of this decrease is attributed to treatments (medical and surgical), while approximately 44% is attributed to changes in risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
In 2007, the estimated direct and indirect cost for coronary heart disease in the United States is $177.5 billion. (1)

In 2006, coronary artery disease was the most expensive condition treated in US hospitals at a cost of $52.6 billion (2) and accounted for 5% of total hospitalization costs. (3)

Thirty percent of Medicare’s total expenditures are applied to cardiovascular disease. (4)

In 2007, $5.2 billion was spent on outpatient visits related to chronic ischemic heart disease. (5)

1a.4 Citations for Evidence of High Impact:

1b. Opportunity for Improvement

1b.1 Benefits (improvements in quality) envisioned by use of this measure: Improvement in management of blood pressure in patients with chronic stable coronary artery disease.

1b.2 Summary of data demonstrating performance gap (variation or overall poor performance) across providers:
Performance relating to the National Committee for Quality Assurance measure of controlling high blood pressure shows the following for 2007 (1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Medicare</th>
<th>Medicaid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Rate</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HealthPartners reported performance results in 2006 on their blood pressure control measure, which is part of an optimal coronary artery disease care composite measure. 37.5% of members had all of their CAD risk factors optimally managed (LDL <100, blood pressure <140/90mmHg, daily aspirin, and documented non-tobacco use)2929. 100% performance is not expected for this measure. HealthPartners has set a goal of 55% as excellent performance and 60% as superior performance2929. Individual rates by risk factor are also reported out separately. 73.5% of members with CAD had blood pressure control <140/90mmHg in the measurement year and 55.7% of members had blood pressure control <130/80mmHg in the measurement year. (2)

1b.3 Citations for data on performance gap:
For hypertensive patients with well established coronary artery disease, it is useful to add blood pressure control according to Joint National Conference VII guidelines is recommended (ie, blood pressure <140/90 mm Hg or < 130/80 mm Hg for patients with diabetes or chronic kidney disease) (Class I Evidence) (ACC/AHA, 2007). This does not preclude consideration of measures of preventive screening interventions where there is a C Evidence - not ranked relationship to outcomes.

**1c. Outcome or Evidence to Support Measure Focus**

1c.1 Relationship to Outcomes (For non-outcome measures, briefly describe the relationship to desired outcome. For outcomes, describe why it is relevant to the target population): Effective management of blood pressure in patients with CAD can help prevent cardiovascular events, including myocardial infarction.

1c.2-3. Type of Evidence: Evidence-based guideline

1c.4 Summary of Evidence (as described in the criteria; for outcomes, summarize any evidence that healthcare services/care processes influence the outcome):

1c.5 Rating of strength/quality of evidence (also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):

1c.6 Method for rating evidence:

1c.7 Summary of Controversy/Contradictory Evidence:

1c.8 Citations for Evidence (other than guidelines): None

1c.9 Quote the Specific guideline recommendation (including guideline number and/or page number): Blood pressure control according to Joint National Conference VII guidelines is recommended (ie, blood pressure <140/90 mm Hg or < 130/80 mm Hg for patients with diabetes or chronic kidney disease) (Class I Recommendation, Level A Evidence) (ACC/AHA, 2007)

For hypertensive patients with well established coronary artery disease, it is useful to add blood pressure medication as tolerated, treating initially with beta-blockers and/or ACE inhibitors, with addition of other drugs as needed to achieve target blood pressure. (Class I Recommendation, Level C Evidence) (ACC/AHA, 2007)

1c.10 Clinical Practice Guideline Citation: Fraker JD, Fihn SD, writing on behalf of the 2002 Chronic Stable Angina Writing Committee. 2007 chronic angina focused update of the ACC/AHA 2002 Guidelines for the Management of Patients with Chronic Stable Angina: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines Writing Group to Develop the Focused Update of the 2002 Guidelines for the Management of Patients with Chronic Stable Angina. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007;50:2264-2274.

1c.11 National Guideline Clearinghouse or other URL:

1c.12 Rating of strength of recommendation (also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):

ACC/AHA Recommendations: Class I Recommendation Level A Evidence and Class I Recommendation Level C Evidence - JNC VII - not ranked

1c.13 Method for rating strength of recommendation (if different from USPSTF system, also describe rating and how it relates to USPSTF):

ACC/AHA Classification of Recommendations and Levels of Evidence Classification of Recommendations

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable

**Comment [k4]:** 1c. The measure focus is: an outcome (e.g., morbidity, mortality, function, health-related quality of life) that is relevant to, or associated with, a national health goal/priority, the condition, population, and/or care being addressed; OR if an intermediate outcome, process, structure, etc., there is evidence that supports the specific measure focus as follows: intermediate outcome - evidence that the measured intermediate outcome (e.g., blood pressure, Hba1c) leads to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit. Outcomes of interest include those that the measured clinical or administrative process leads to improved health/avoidance of harm and if the measure focus is on one step in a multi-step care process, it measures the step that has the greatest effect on improving the specified desired outcome(s).

**Comment [k5]:** 4 Clinical care processes typically include multiple steps: assess → identify problem/potential problem → choose/plan intervention (with patient input) → provide intervention → evaluate impact on health status. If the measure focus is one step in such a multi-step process, the step with the greatest effect on the desired outcome should be selected as the focus of measurement. For example, although assessment of immunization status and recommending immunization are necessary steps, they are not sufficient to achieve the desired impact on health status - patients must be vaccinated to achieve immunization. This does not preclude consideration of measures of preventive screening interventions where there is a C Evidence - not ranked relationship to outcomes.

**Comment [k6]:** 3 The strength of the body of evidence for the specific measure focus should be systematically assessed and rated (e.g., USPSTF grading system http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstf/grades.htm). If the USPSTF grading system was not used, the grading system is explained including how it relates to the USPSTF grades or why it does not. However, evidence is not limited to quantitative studies and the best type of evidence depends upon the question being studied (e.g., randomized controlled trials appropriate for studying drug efficacy are not well suited for complex system changes). When qualitative studies are used, appropriate qualitative research criteria are used to judge the strength of the evidence.

**Comment [k7]:** USPSTF grading system http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspstf/grades.htm: A - The USPSTF recommends the service. There is high certainty that the net benefit is substantial. B - The USPSTF recommends the service. There is high certainty that the net benefit is moderate or there is moderate certainty that the net benefit is moderate to substantial. C - The USPSTF recommends against routinely providing the service. There may be considerations that support providing the service in an individual patient. D - The USPSTF recommends against the service.
Class I: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a given procedure or treatment is beneficial, useful, and effective.

Class II: Conditions for which there is conflicting evidence and/or a divergence of opinion about the usefulness/efficacy of a procedure or treatment.

Class IIa: Weight of evidence/opinion is in favor of usefulness/efficacy.

Class IIb: Usefulness/efficacy is less well established by evidence/opinion.

Class III: Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a procedure/treatment is not useful/effective and in some cases may be harmful.

Level of Evidence

Level of Evidence A: Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials or meta-analyses.

Level of Evidence B: Data derived from a single randomized trial, or nonrandomized studies.

Level of Evidence C: Only consensus opinion of experts, case studies, or standard-of-care.

1c.14 Rationale for using this guideline over others:
It is the PCPI policy to use guidelines, which are evidence-based, applicable to physicians and other healthcare providers, and developed by a national specialty organization or government agency. In addition, the PCPI has now expanded what is acceptable as the evidence base for measures to included documented quality improvement (QI) initiatives or implementation projects that have demonstrated improvement in the quality of care.

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Importance to Measure and Report?

Steering Committee: Was the threshold criterion, Importance to Measure and Report, met?

Rationale:

**2. 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. (evaluation criteria)

2a. MEASURE SPECIFICATIONS

2a.1 Numerator Statement (Brief, text description of the numerator - what is being measured about the target population, e.g. target condition, event, or outcome):

Patients with a blood pressure <140/90 mm Hg*

OR

Patients with a blood pressure =140/90 mm Hg and prescribed** 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications during the most recent office visit

*BP value used for measure calculation:
•Must be specified in medical record if >1 value (systolic/diastolic) recorded, and
•Must be value upon which treatment decision was based, and
•May be obtained by measurement during office visit or review of a home blood pressure log, OR of a 24 hour ambulatory blood pressure monitor, but the value on which the treatment decision is being made and which might represent the average of more than 1 reading must be documented as such in the medical record

**Prescribed may include prescriptions given to the patient for 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications at most recent office visit OR patient already taking 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications as documented in current medication list. (Each anti-hypertensive component in a combination medication should be counted individually.)

Instructions:

Comment [KP8]: 2a. The measure is well defined and precisely specified so that it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allow for comparability. The required data elements are of high quality as defined by NQF’s Health Information Technology Expert Panel (HITEP).
All patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of coronary artery disease must have a measurement of blood pressure recorded in order to satisfy the measure.

Report number of patients for 1st numerator component (outcome) AND Report number of patients for 2nd numerator component (process) AND Report total number of patients for all numerator components

2a.2 Numerator Time Window *(The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the numerator)*: Each visit within the measurement period.

2a.3 Numerator Details *(All information required to collect/calculate the numerator, including all codes, logic, and definitions)*:
See attached for EHR Specifications.
For Claims/Administrative: Report CPT II Code Report the CPT Category II code(s) designated for this numerator:
Patients with a blood pressure <140/90 mm Hg*
• 3074F Most recent systolic blood pressure < 130 mm Hg
OR
• 3075F Most recent systolic blood pressure 130 to 139 mm Hg
AND
• 3078F Most recent diastolic blood pressure < 80 mm Hg
OR
• 3079F Most recent diastolic blood pressure 80 - 89 mm Hg
OR
Patients with a blood pressure =140/90 mm Hg and prescribed** 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications during the most recent office visit during the measurement period
• 3077F Most recent systolic blood pressure =140 mm Hg
OR
• 3080F Most recent diastolic blood pressure =90 mm Hg
AND
Patient prescribed 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications**
• 400XF (in development) - Two or more anti-hypertensive medications prescribed

2a.4 Denominator Statement *(Brief, text description of the denominator - target population being measured)*:
All patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of coronary artery disease seen within a 12 month period

2a.5 Target population gender: Female, Male
2a.6 Target population age range: Aged 18 years and older

2a.7 Denominator Time Window *(The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the denominator)*:
12 consecutive months

2a.8 Denominator Details *(All information required to collect/calculate the denominator - the target population being measured - including all codes, logic, and definitions)*:
See attached for EHR Specifications.
For Claims/Administrative: See coding tables attached for coding (ICD-9-CM, ICD-10-CM, CPT)

2a.9 Denominator Exclusions *(Brief text description of exclusions from the target population)*:
Documentation of medical reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications (eg, allergy, intolerant, postural hypotension, other medical reasons)
Documentation of patient reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications (eg, patient declined, other patient reasons)

Comment [k9]: 11 Risk factors that influence outcomes should not be specified as exclusions.
12 Patient preference is not a clinical exception to eligibility and can be influenced by provider interventions.
Documentation of system reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications (eg, financial reasons, other reasons attributable to the health care delivery system)

2a.10 Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to collect exclusions to the denominator, including all codes, logic, and definitions):
For Claims/Administrative:
- Documentation of medical reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications
  - Append modifier to CPT II code 4XXF-1P (in development)
- Documentation of patient reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications
  - Append modifier to CPT II code 4XXF-2P (in development)
- Documentation of system reason(s) for not prescribing 2 or more anti-hypertensive medications
  - Append modifier to CPT II code 4XXF-3P (in development)

2a.11 Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure including the stratification variables, all codes, logic, and definitions):

2a.12-13 Risk Adjustment Type: No risk adjustment necessary

2a.14 Risk Adjustment Methodology/Variables (List risk adjustment variables and describe conceptual models, statistical models, or other aspects of model or method):

2a.15-17 Detailed risk model available Web page URL or attachment:

2a.18-19 Type of Score: Rate/proportion
2a.20 Interpretation of Score: Better quality = Higher score
2a.21 Calculation Algorithm (Describe the calculation of the measure as a flowchart or series of steps):
See attached for calculation algorithm.

2a.22 Describe the method for discriminating performance (e.g., significance testing):

2a.23 Sampling (Survey) Methodology If measure is based on a sample (or survey), provide instructions for obtaining the sample, conducting the survey and guidance on minimum sample size (response rate):

2a.24 Data Source (Check the source(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)
Electronic administrative data/claims, Electronic clinical data, Electronic Health/Medical Record, Registry data

2a.25 Data source/data collection instrument (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument, e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.):

2a.26-28 Data source/data collection instrument reference web page URL or attachment:

2a.29-31 Data dictionary/code table web page URL or attachment: Attachment PCPI_CAD-1_BPControl.pdf

2a.32-35 Level of Measurement/Analysis (Check the level(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)
Clinicians: Individual, Clinicians: Group

2a.36-37 Care Settings (Check the setting(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)
Home, Ambulatory Care: Office, Ambulatory Care: Clinic, Nursing home (NH) /Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF), Ambulatory Care: Hospital Outpatient, Assisted Living, Group homes

2a.38-41 Clinical Services (Healthcare services being measured, check all that apply)
Clinicians: PA/NP/Advanced Practice Nurse, Clinicians: Physicians (MD/DO)

### 2b. Reliability testing

2b.1 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size): PCPI staff analysis of available testing data for this measure is ongoing and will be submitted to NQF separately and at the earliest possible date.

2b.2 Analytic Method (type of reliability & rationale, method for testing):

2b.3 Testing Results (reliability statistics, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted):

### 2c. Validity testing

2c.1 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size):

2c.2 Analytic Method (type of validity & rationale, method for testing):

All PCPI performance measures are assessed for content validity by expert work group members during the development process. Additional input on the content validity of draft measures is obtained through a 30-day public comment period and by also soliciting comments from a panel of consumer, purchaser, and patient representatives convened by the PCPI specifically for this purpose. All comments received are reviewed by the expert work group and the measures are adjusted as needed. Other external review groups (e.g., focus groups) may be convened if there are any remaining concerns related to the content validity of the measures.

2c.3 Testing Results (statistical results, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted):

### 2d. Exclusions Justified

2d.1 Summary of Evidence supporting exclusion(s):

No testing data available at this time.

2d.2 Citations for Evidence:

2d.3 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size):

2d.4 Analytic Method (type analysis & rationale):

2d.5 Testing Results (e.g., frequency, variability, sensitivity analyses):

### 2e. Risk Adjustment for Outcomes/ Resource Use Measures

2e.1 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size): This measure does not employ the use of risk adjustment.

2e.2 Analytic Method (type of risk adjustment, analysis, & rationale):

2e.3 Testing Results (risk model performance metrics):

---

**Rating:** C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable

---

**Comment [KP10]:** 2b. Reliability testing demonstrates the measure results are repeatable, producing the same results a high proportion of the time when assessed in the same population in the same time period.

**Comment [K11]:** 8 Examples of reliability testing include, but are not limited to: inter-rater/abstractor or intra-rater/abstractor studies; internal consistency for multi-item scales; test-retest for survey items. Reliability testing may address the data items or final measure score.

**Comment [KP12]:** 2c. Validity testing demonstrates that the measure reflects the quality of care provided, adequately distinguishing good and poor quality. If face validity is the only validity addressed, it is systematically assessed.

**Comment [K13]:** 9 Examples of validity testing include, but are not limited to: determining if measure scores adequately distinguish between providers known to have good or poor quality assessed by another valid method; correlation of measure scores with another valid indicator of quality for the specific topic; ability of measure scores to predict scores on some other related valid measure; content validity for multi-item scales/tests. Face validity is a subjective assessment by experts of whether the measure reflects the quality of care (e.g., whether the proportion of patients with BP < 140/90 is a marker of quality). If face validity is the only validity addressed, it is systematically assessed (e.g., ratings by relevant stakeholders) and the measure is judged to represent quality care for the specific topic and that the measure focus is the most important aspect of quality for the specific topic.

**Comment [KP14]:** 2d. Clinically necessary measure exclusions are identified and must be: • supported by evidence of sufficient frequency of occurrence so that results are distorted without the exclusion; AND • a clinically appropriate exception (e.g., contraindication) to eligibility for the measure focus; ... [4]

**Comment [K15]:** 10 Examples of evidence that an exclusion distorts measure results include, but are not limited to: frequency of occurrence, sensitivity analyses with and without the exclusion, and variability of exclusions across providers.

**Comment [KP16]:** 2e. For outcome measures and other measures (e.g., resource use) when indicated: • an evidence-based risk-adjustment strategy (e.g., risk models, risk stratification) is specified and is based on patient clinical factors that influence the measured outcome... [5]

**Comment [K17]:** 13 Risk models should not obscure disparities in care for populations by including factors that are associated with differences/inequalities in care such as race, socioeconomic status, gender (e.g., poorer treatment outcomes of African American men with prostate cancer, inequalities in treatment for CVD risk factors between men and women... [6]
2e.4 If outcome or resource use measure is not risk adjusted, provide rationale:

### 2f. Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcriterion</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2f.1 Data/sample from Testing or Current Use (description of data/sample and size):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.2 Methods to identify statistically significant and practically/meaningfully differences in performance (type of analysis &amp; rationale):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f.3 Provide Measure Scores from Testing or Current Use (description of scores, e.g., distribution by quartile, mean, median, SD, etc.; identification of statistically significant and meaningfully differences in performance):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2g. Comparability of Multiple Data Sources/Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcriterion</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2g.1 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g.2 Analytic Method (type of analysis &amp; rationale):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g.3 Testing Results (e.g., correlation statistics, comparison of rankings):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2h. Disparities in Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcriterion</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2h.1 If measure is stratified, provide stratified results (scores by stratified categories/cohorts):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h.2 If disparities have been reported/identified, but measure is not specified to detect disparities, provide follow-up plans:</td>
<td>C=P,M,N,NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAP/Workgroup:** What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties?

**Steering Committee:** Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties, met?

**Rationale:**

### 3. USABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcriterion</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Meaningful, Understandable, and Useful Information</td>
<td>C=P,M,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.1 Current Use: Testing not yet completed</td>
<td>C=P,M,N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.2 Use in a public reporting initiative (disclosure of performance results to the public at large) (if used in a public reporting initiative, provide name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not publicly reported, state the plans to achieve public reporting within 3 years):</td>
<td>C=P,M,N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Criteria (e.g., acceptability of measure properties):**

- **Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties:**
  - Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties, met?
  - Rationale:

**Extent to which intended audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) can understand the results of the measure and are likely to find them useful for decision making:**

**Evaluation:**

- **Rating:** C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable

**Comment [KP18]:** 2f. Data analysis demonstrates that methods for scoring and analysis of the specified measure allow for identification of statistically significant and practically/clinically meaningful differences in performance.

**Comment [k19]:** 14 With large enough sample sizes, small differences that are statistically significant may or may not be practically or clinically meaningful. The substantive question may be, for example, whether a statistically significant difference of one percentage point in the percentage of patients who received smoking cessation counseling (e.g., 74% v. 75%) is clinically meaningful; or whether a statistically significant difference of $25 in cost for an episode of care (e.g., $5,000 v. $5,025) is practically meaningful. Measures with overall poor performance may not demonstrate much variability across providers.

**Comment [KP20]:** 2g. If multiple data sources/methods are allowed, there is demonstration they produce comparable results.

**Comment [KP21]:** 2h. If disparities in care have been identified, measure specifications, scoring, and analysis allow for identification of disparities through stratification of results (e.g., by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender); OR rationale/data justifies why stratification is not necessary or not feasible.

**Comment [KP22]:** 3a. Demonstration that information produced by the measure is meaningful, understandable, and useful to the intended audiences(s) for both public reporting (e.g., focus group, cognitive testing) and informing quality improvement (e.g., quality improvement initiative). An important outcome that may not have an identified improvement strategy still can be useful for informing quality improvement by identifying the need for and stimulating new approaches to improvement.
3a.3 If used in other programs/initiatives (If used in quality improvement or other programs/initiatives, name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not used for QI, state the plans to achieve use for QI within 3 years):

All PCPI measures are suitable for use in quality improvement initiatives and are made freely available on the PCPI website and through the implementation efforts of medical specialty societies and other PCPI members. The PCPI strongly encourages the use of its measures in QI initiatives and seeks to provide information on such initiatives to PCPI members.

Testing of Interpretability (Testing that demonstrates the results are understood by the potential users for public reporting and quality improvement)

3a.4 Data/sample (description of data/sample and size):

3a.5 Methods (e.g., focus group, survey, QI project):

3a.6 Results (qualitative and/or quantitative results and conclusions):

3b/3c. Relation to other NQF-endorsed measures

3b.1 NQF # and Title of similar or related measures:

(for NQF staff use) Notes on similar/related endorsed or submitted measures:

3b. Harmonization

If this measure is related to measure(s) already endorsed by NQF (e.g., same topic, but different target population-setting/data source or different topic but same target population):

3b.2 Are the measure specifications harmonized? If not, why?

3c. Distinctive or Additive Value

3c.1 Describe the distinctive, improved, or additive value this measure provides to existing NQF-endorsed measures:

5.1 If this measure is similar to measure(s) already endorsed by NQF (i.e., on the same topic and the same target population), Describe why it is a more valid or efficient way to measure quality:

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Usability?

Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Usability, met?

Rationale:

4. FEASIBILITY

Extent to which the required data are readily available, retrievable without undue burden, and can be implemented for performance measurement. (evaluation criteria)

4a. Data Generated as a Byproduct of Care Processes

4a.1-2 How are the data elements that are needed to compute measure scores generated?

Data generated as byproduct of care processes during care delivery (Data are generated and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition), Coding/abstraction performed by someone other than person obtaining original information (E.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims, chart abstraction for quality measure or registry)

Rating: C=Completely; P=Partially; M=Minimally; N=Not at all; NA=Not applicable
### 4b. Electronic Sources

4b.1 Are all the data elements available electronically? (elements that are needed to compute measure scores are in defined, computer-readable fields, e.g., electronic health record, electronic claims)

   - **Yes**

4b.2 If not, specify the near-term path to achieve electronic capture by most providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4b</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 4c. Exclusions

4c.1 Do the specified exclusions require additional data sources beyond what is required for the numerator and denominator specifications?

   - **No**

4c.2 If yes, provide justification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4c</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 4d. Susceptibility to Inaccuracies, Errors, or Unintended Consequences

4d.1 Identify susceptibility to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences of the measure and describe how these potential problems could be audited. If audited, provide results.

   - Although we are not currently aware of any unintended consequences related to this measure, we plan through an active redesign of the PCPI website to facilitate the collection of information of unintended consequences from the users of PCPI measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4d</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 4e. Data Collection Strategy/Implementation

4e.1 Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data/missing data, timing/frequency of data collection, patient confidentiality, time/cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues:

   - Costs to implement the measure (costs of data collection, fees associated with proprietary measures):
     - Costs to implement the measure have not been calculated.

4e.2 Evidence for costs:

   - Business case documentation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4e</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Feasibility?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### RECOMMENDATION

Check if measure is untested and only eligible for time-limited endorsement.

- **Time-limited**

### Steering Committee: Do you recommend for endorsement?

   - **Comments:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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American Medical Association, 515 N. State St., Chicago, Illinois, 60654

Co.4 Point of Contact
Mark, Antman, DDS, MBA, mark.antman@ama-assn.org, 312-464-5056-

Co.5 Submitter If different from Measure Steward POC
Mark, Antman, DDS, MBA, mark.antman@ama-assn.org, 312-464-5056-, American Medical Association

Co.6 Additional organizations that sponsored/participated in measure development
American College of Cardiology Foundation, American Heart Association

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development
Ad.1 Provide a listing of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members’ names and organizations.
Describe the members’ role in measure development.
Bruce Abramowitz, MD, FACC (interventional cardiology; measure implementation)
Karen Alexander, MD (cardiology; geriatrics)
Craig T. Beam, CRE (patient representative)
Robert O. Bonow, MD, Macc, FAHA, FACP (cardiology)
Jill S. Burkiewicz, PharmD, BCPS (pharmacy)
Michael Crouch, MD, MSPH (family medicine)
David C. Goff, Jr., MD, PhD, FAHA, FACP (internal medicine)
Richard Hellman, MD, FACP, FACE (endocrinology)
Thomas James, III, FACP, FAAP (health plan representative)
Marjorie L. King, MD, FACC, MAACPR (cardiology; cardiac rehabilitation)
Edison A. Machado, Jr., MD, MBA (measure implementation)
Eduardo Ortiz, MD, MPH (guideline development)
Michael O’Toole, MD (cardiology; electrophysiology; measure implementation)
Stephen D. Persell, MD, MPH (internal medicine; measure implementation)
Jesse M. Pines, MD, MBA, MSCE, FAEM (emergency medicine)
Frank J. Rybicki, MD, PhD (radiology)
Lawrence B. Sadwin (patient representative)
Joanna D. Sikkema, MSN, ANP-BC, FAHA (cardiology)
Peter K. Smith, MD (thoracic surgery)
Patrick J. Torcson, MD, FACP, MMM (hospital medicine)
John B. Wong MD, FACP (internal medicine)

PCPI measures are developed through cross-specialty, multi-disciplinary work groups. All medical specialties and
other health care professional disciplines participating in patient care for the clinical condition or topic under
study must be equal contributors to the measure development process. In addition, the PCPI strives to include on
its work groups individuals representing the perspectives of patients, consumers, private health plans, and
employers. This broad-based approach to measure development ensures buy-in on the measures from all
stakeholders and minimizes bias toward any individual specialty
or stakeholder group. All work groups have at least two co-chairs who have relevant clinical and/or measure
development expertise and who are responsible for ensuring that consensus is achieved and that all perspectives
are voiced.

Ad.2 If adapted, provide name of original measure:
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**Copyright statement/disclaimers:**

This Physician Performance Measurement Set (PPMS) and related data specifications were developed by the Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement (the Consortium) including the American College of Cardiology (ACC), the American Heart Association (AHA) and the American Medical Association (AMA) to facilitate quality improvement activities by physicians. The performance measures contained in this PPMS are not clinical guidelines and do not establish a standard of medical care, and have not been tested for all potential applications. This PPMS is intended to assist physicians to enhance quality of care and is not intended for comparing individual physicians to each other or for individual physician accountability by comparing physician performance against the measure or guideline.
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1c. The measure focus is:
- an outcome (e.g., morbidity, mortality, function, health-related quality of life) that is relevant to, or associated with, a national health goal/priority, the condition, population, and/or care being addressed; OR
- if an intermediate outcome, process, structure, etc., there is evidence that supports the specific measure focus as follows:
  o Intermediate outcome - evidence that the measured intermediate outcome (e.g., blood pressure, Hba1c) leads to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit.
  o Process - evidence that the measured clinical or administrative process leads to improved health/avoidance of harm and if the measure focus is on one step in a multi-step care process, it measures the step that has the greatest effect on improving the specified desired outcome(s).
  o Structure - evidence that the measured structure supports the consistent delivery of effective processes or access that lead to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit.
  o Patient experience - evidence that an association exists between the measure of patient experience of health care and the outcomes, values and preferences of individuals/ the public.
  o Access - evidence that an association exists between access to a health service and the outcomes of, or experience with, care.
  o Efficiency - demonstration of an association between the measured resource use and level of performance with respect to one or more of the other five IOM aims of quality.

4 Clinical care processes typically include multiple steps: assess → identify problem/potential problem → choose/plan intervention (with patient input) → provide intervention → evaluate impact on health status. If the measure focus is one step in such a multi-step process, the step with the greatest effect on the desired outcome should be selected as the focus of measurement. For example, although assessment of immunization status and recommending immunization are necessary steps, they are not sufficient to achieve the desired impact on health status - patients must be vaccinated to achieve immunity. This does not preclude consideration of measures of preventive screening interventions where there is a strong link with desired outcomes (e.g., mammography) or measures for multiple care processes that affect a single outcome.

USPSTF grading system http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/uspsstf/grades.htm: A - The USPSTF recommends the service. There is high certainty that the net benefit is substantial. B - The USPSTF recommends the service. There is high certainty that the net benefit is moderate or there is moderate certainty that the net benefit is moderate to substantial. C - The USPSTF recommends against routinely providing the service. There may be considerations that support providing the service in an individual patient. There is at least moderate certainty that the net benefit is small. Offer or provide this service only if other considerations support the offering or providing the service in an individual patient. D - The USPSTF recommends against the service. There is moderate or high certainty that the service has no net benefit or that the harms outweigh the benefits. I - The USPSTF concludes that the current evidence is insufficient to assess the balance of benefits and harms of the service. Evidence is lacking, of poor quality, or conflicting, and the balance of benefits and harms cannot be determined.
• an evidence-based risk-adjustment strategy (e.g., risk models, risk stratification) is specified and is based on patient clinical factors that influence the measured outcome (but not disparities in care) and are present at start of care, or rationale/data support no risk adjustment.

13 Risk models should not obscure disparities in care for populations by including factors that are associated with differences/inequalities in care such as race, socioeconomic status, gender (e.g., poorer treatment outcomes of African American men with prostate cancer, inequalities in treatment for CVD risk factors between men and women). It is preferable to stratify measures by race and socioeconomic status rather than adjusting out differences.