



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 subcriterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 0241

De.2. Measure Title: Stroke and Stroke Rehabilitation: Anticoagulant Therapy Prescribed for Atrial Fibrillation (AF) at Discharge

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: American Academy of Neurology

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) with documented permanent, persistent, or paroxysmal atrial fibrillation who were prescribed an anticoagulant at discharge

1b.1. Developer Rationale: Atrial fibrillation/flutter (AF), a strong risk factor for stroke, is arguably the most important finding on cardiac workup in patients with ischemic stroke. Once identified, introduction of oral anticoagulant therapy (eg, warfarin; international normalized ratio 2 to 3) provides an additional 40% risk reduction in recurrent stroke compared with antiplatelet therapy. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that therapeutic oral anticoagulation (international normalized ratio 2 to 3) may also be associated with reduced stroke severity, if ischemic stroke does occur in patients with AF.

Liao J, Khalid Z, Scallan C, Morillo C, O'Donnell M. Noninvasive Cardiac Monitoring for Detecting Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation or Flutter After Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Stroke* 2007;38:2935-2940.

S.4. Numerator Statement: Patients who were prescribed an anticoagulant at discharge

S.7. Denominator Statement: All patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) with documented permanent, persistent, or paroxysmal atrial fibrillation

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: All patients that expired during inpatient stay are excluded.

Documentation of medical reason(s) for not prescribing anticoagulant therapy at discharge (eg, other medical reason(s))

Documentation of patient reason(s) for not prescribing anticoagulant therapy at discharge (eg, patient is receiving comfort care only, patient left against medical advice, other patient reason(s))

De.1. Measure Type: Process

S.23. Data Source: Administrative claims, Electronic Clinical Data, Electronic Clinical Data : Electronic Health Record, Electronic Clinical Data : Registry

S.26. Level of Analysis: Clinician : Group/Practice, Clinician : Individual, Clinician : Team

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: May 01, 2007 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Nov 01, 2012

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 included in a composite.

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 subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form
[0241_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data.doc](#)

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., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure) Atrial fibrillation/flutter (AF), a strong risk factor for stroke, is arguably the most important finding on cardiac workup in patients with ischemic stroke. Once identified, introduction of oral anticoagulant therapy (eg, warfarin; international normalized ratio 2 to 3) provides an additional 40% risk reduction in recurrent stroke compared with antiplatelet therapy. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that therapeutic oral anticoagulation (international normalized ratio 2 to 3) may also be associated with reduced stroke severity, if ischemic stroke does occur in patients with AF.

[Liao J, Khalid Z, Scallan C, Morillo C, O'Donnell M. Noninvasive Cardiac Monitoring for Detecting Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation or Flutter After Acute Ischemic Stroke. Stroke 2007;38:2935-2940.](#)

1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis. (This is required for endorsement maintenance. 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 included). This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

This measure was used in the 2007-2012 CMS Physician Quality Reporting Initiative/System claims, registry and group reporting options. There is a gap in care as shown by this data; 51.52% of patients reported on did not meet the measure.(1)

10th percentile: 0.00%

25th percentile: 0.00%

50th percentile: 50.00%

75th percentile: 100.00%

90th percentile: 100.00%

Exception Rate: 15.05%

CMS 2010 Reporting Experience(2)

Average Performance Rate per Eligible Professional

2009: 45.4%

2010: 79.4%

It is important to note that PQRS is currently a voluntary reporting program, with about 24% of eligible professionals participating in 2010, and performance rates may not be nationally representative.

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.

1. Confidential CMS PQRI 2008 Performance Information by Measure. Jan-Sept TAP file

2. CMS 2010 Physician Quality Reporting System and eRx Experience Report. Accessed at: <http://www.CMS.gov/PQRS>.

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 endorsement maintenance. 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 subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

In an analysis among 19,051 nursing home residents with recent ischemic stroke, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were less likely to receive an antithrombotic agent than non-Hispanic whites, whereas American Indians/Alaskan Natives were more likely to receive treatment. Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, blacks or African Americans, and Hispanics were less likely to receive warfarin when indicated than non-Hispanic whites. In REGARDS, investigators found that blacks or African Americans were less likely than whites to be aware they had atrial fibrillation or to be treated with warfarin.(1)

Overall, only half of our elderly population who had an ischemic stroke within the past 6 months received any secondary prevention agent for recurrent stroke. Of those residents eligible for anticoagulant therapy for secondary stroke prevention, only 25% to 40% received warfarin.(2)

1b.5. If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations.

1. Cruz-Flores S, Rabinstein A, Biller J, Elkind MSV, et al. Racial-Ethnic Disparities in Stroke Care: The American Experience: A Statement for Healthcare Professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. Stroke 2011;42:2091-2116.

2. Christian JB, Lapane KL, Toppa RS. Racial Disparities in Receipt of Secondary Stroke Prevention Agents Among US Nursing Home Residents. Stroke 2003;34:2693-2697.

1c. High Priority (previously referred to as High Impact)

The measure addresses:

- a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or the National Priorities Partnership convened by NQF; OR
- a demonstrated high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers of patients and/or has a substantial impact for a smaller population; leading cause of morbidity/mortality; high resource use (current and/or future); severity of illness; and severity of patient/societal consequences of poor quality).

1c.1. Demonstrated high priority aspect of healthcare

Affects large numbers, A leading cause of morbidity/mortality

1c.2. If Other:

1c.3. Provide epidemiologic or resource use data that demonstrates the measure addresses a high priority aspect of healthcare.

List citations in 1c.4.

An estimated 7,000,000 Americans > or = 20 years of age have had a stroke. Overall stroke prevalence during this period is an estimated 3.0%.(1)

Stroke is the leading cause of serious long-term disability in the United States.(1)

AF is associated with an increased long-term risk of stroke, HF, and all-cause mortality, especially in women. The mortality rate of patients with AF is about double that of patients in normal sinus rhythm and linked to the severity of underlying heart disease.(2)

In patients with nonvalvular AF, prior stroke or TIA is the strongest independent predictor of stroke, significantly associated with stroke in all 6 studies in which it was evaluated with incremental relative risk between 1.9 and 3.7 (averaging) approximately 3.0).(2)

The pathogenic constructs of stroke in AF are incomplete, but available data indicate that all patients with prior stroke or TIA are at a high risk of recurrent thromboembolism and require anticoagulation unless there are firm contraindications in a given patient. Patients with atrial fibrillation (permanent, persistent, or paroxysmal) and stroke should be prescribed an anticoagulant to prevent recurrent strokes.(2)

In a small, retrospective, population-based study in Olmsted County, Minnesota, over 3 decades, the 15-y cumulative stroke rate in people with lone AF (defined as those younger than 60y with no clinical history or echocardiographic signs of cardiopulmonary disease) was 1.3%. Conversely, in the Framingham Study, the age-adjusted stroke rate over a mean follow-up period of 11y was 28.2% in those with lone AF, more liberally defined to include patients with a history of hypertension or cardiomegaly on chest roentgenography,, compared with 6.8% in normal controls. In the SPAF study, the annualized rate of ischemic stroke during aspirin

treatment was similar in those with paroxysmal (3.2%) and permanent (3.3%) AF. Those with prior stroke or TIA have a rate of subsequent stroke of 10% to 12% per year when treated with aspirin, and these patients benefit substantially from adjusted-dose oral anticoagulation.(2)

1c.4. Citations for data demonstrating high priority provided in 1a.3

1. Roger VL, Go AS, Lloyd-Jones DM, Benjamin EJ, et al. Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2012 Update: A Report from the American Heart Association. *Circulation* 2012;125:e2-e220.

2. Fuster V, Rydén LE, Cannom DS, Crijns HJ, et al. ACC/AHA/ESC 2006 Guidelines for the Management of Patients with Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the European Society of Cardiology Committee for Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2001 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation) Developed in Collaboration With the European Heart Rhythm Association and the Heart Rhythm Society. *J. Am. Coll. Cardiol.* 2006;48:e149-e246.

1c.5. If a PRO-PM (e.g. HRQoL/functional status, symptom/burden, experience with care, health-related behaviors), provide evidence that the target population values the measured PRO and finds it meaningful. (Describe how and from whom their input was obtained.)

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 subcriteria 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):
Neurology, Neurology : Stroke/Transient Ischemic Attack (TIA)

De.6. Cross Cutting Areas (check all the areas that apply):

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.)

The updated specifications for this measure are attached with this form. Additional measure information can be found at www.physicianconsortium.org.

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)

No data dictionary Attachment:

S.3. For endorsement maintenance, please briefly describe any changes to the measure specifications since last endorsement date and explain the reasons.

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)

IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

Patients who were prescribed an anticoagulant at discharge

S.5. Time Period for Data (What is the time period in which data will be aggregated for the measure, e.g., 12 mo, 3 years, look back to August for flu vaccination? Note if there are different time periods for the numerator and denominator.)

At each hospital discharge during measurement period

S.6. 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, 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.

Definitions:

Anticoagulants – warfarin, low molecular weight heparin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban*

*The above list of medications/drug names is based on clinical guidelines and other evidence. The specified drugs were selected based on the strength of evidence for their clinical effectiveness. This list of selected drugs may not be all-inclusive or current. Physicians and other health care professionals should refer to the FDA's web site page entitled "Drug Safety Communications" for up-to-date drug recall and alert information when prescribing medications.

Prescribed – May include prescription given to the patient for anticoagulant therapy at discharge OR anticoagulant to be continued after discharge as documented in the discharge medication list.

NUMERATOR NOTE: In order to meet the measure, anticoagulant therapy is to be prescribed at the time of discharge. If a physician other than the discharging physician (e.g., consulting physician) is reporting on this measure, it should be clear from the documentation that the prescription is being ordered for the patient at the time of discharge, and included in the "medications prescribed at discharge."

For Claims:

CPT II Code 4075F: Anticoagulant therapy prescribed at discharge

For EHR:

eSpecification currently under development.

S.7. Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)

All patients aged 18 years and older with a diagnosis of ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) with documented permanent, persistent, or paroxysmal atrial fibrillation

S.8. Target Population Category (Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):

Senior Care

S.9. Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, 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)

Definitions:

First Detected – Only one diagnosed episode.

Persistent Atrial Fibrillation – Recurrent episodes that last more than 7 days.

Paroxysmal Atrial Fibrillation – Recurrent episodes that self terminate in less than 7 days.

Permanent Atrial Fibrillation – An ongoing long term episode.

For Claims:

Patients aged >= 18 years on date of encounter

AND

Diagnosis for ischemic stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) (ICD-9-CM): 433.01, 433.11, 433.21, 433.31, 433.81, 433.91, 434.01, 434.11, 434.91, 435.0, 435.1, 435.2, 435.3, 435.8, 435.9

OR

Diagnosis for ischemic Stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA) (ICD-10-CM): G45.0, G45.1, G45.2, G45.8, G45.9, G46.0, G46.1, G46.2, I63.00, I63.011, I63.012, I63.019, I63.02, I63.031, I63.032, I63.039, I63.09, I63.10, I63.111, I63.112, I63.119, I63.12, I63.131, I63.132, I63.139, I63.19, I63.20, I63.211, I63.212, I63.219, I63.22, I63.231, I63.232, I63.239, I63.29, I63.30, I63.311, I63.312, I63.319, I63.321, I63.322, I63.329, I63.331, I63.332, I63.339, I63.341, I63.342, I63.349, I63.39, I63.40, I63.411, I63.412, I63.419, I63.421, I63.422, I63.429, I63.431, I63.432, I63.439, I63.441, I63.442, I63.449, I63.49, I63.50, I63.511, I63.512, I63.519, I63.521, I63.522, I63.529, I63.531, I63.532, I63.539, I63.541, I63.542, I63.549, I63.59, I63.6, I63.8, I63.9

AND

Diagnosis for atrial fibrillation (ICD-9-CM): 427.31

OR

Diagnosis for atrial fibrillation (ICD-10-CM): I48.0, I48.1, I48.2

AND

Patient encounter during the reporting period (CPT): 99221, 99222, 99223, 99231, 99232, 99233, 99238, 99239

For EHR:

eSpecification currently under development

S.10. Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)

All patients that expired during inpatient stay are excluded.

Documentation of medical reason(s) for not prescribing anticoagulant therapy at discharge (eg, other medical reason(s))

Documentation of patient reason(s) for not prescribing anticoagulant therapy at discharge (eg, patient is receiving comfort care only, patient left against medical advice, other patient reason(s))

S.11. Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, 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)

For Claims:

Exclusions- All patients that expired during inpatient stay are excluded

Exceptions-

Report CPT Category II code with modifier:

4075F-1P Anticoagulant therapy not prescribed at discharge for medical reasons (eg, patient expired during inpatient stay, other medical reason(s))

OR

4075F-2P Anticoagulant therapy not prescribed at discharge for patient reasons (eg, patient left against medical advice, other patient reason(s))

For EHR:

eSpecification currently under development

S.12. Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables,

definitions, 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 with at S.2b)

We encourage the results of this measure to be stratified by race, ethnicity, primary language, and administrative sex.

S.13. Risk Adjustment Type (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in S.12 and for statistical model in S.14-15)

No risk adjustment or risk stratification

If other:

S.14. Identify the statistical risk model method and variables (Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development and testing should be addressed with measure testing under Scientific Acceptability)

No risk adjustment or stratification

S.15. Detailed risk model specifications (must be in attached data dictionary/code list Excel or csv file. Also indicate if available at measure-specific URL identified in S.1.)

Note: Risk model details (including coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, definitions), should be provided on a separate worksheet in the suggested format in the Excel or csv file with data dictionary/code lists at S.2b.

S.15a. Detailed risk model specifications (if not provided in excel or csv file at S.2b)

S.16. Type of score:

Rate/proportion

If other:

S.17. 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 = Higher score

S.18. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic (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; aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)

To calculate performance rates:

- 1) Find the patients who meet the initial patient population (ie, the general group of patients that the performance measure is designed to address).
- 2) From the patients within the initial patient population criteria, find the patients who qualify for the denominator (ie, the specific group of patients for inclusion in a specific performance measure based on defined criteria). Note: in some cases the initial patient population and denominator are identical.
- 3) From the patients within the denominator, find the patients who qualify for the numerator (ie, the group of patients in the denominator for whom a process or outcome of care occurs). Validate that the number of patients in the numerator is less than or equal to the number of patients in the denominator.
- 4) From the patients who did not meet the numerator criteria, determine if the physician has documented that the patient meets any criteria for denominator exception when exceptions have been specified [for this measure: medical reason(s)]. If the patient meets any exception criteria, they should be removed from the denominator for performance calculation. –Although exception cases are removed from the denominator population for the performance calculation, the number of patients with valid exceptions should be calculated and reported along with performance rates to track variations in care and highlight possible areas of focus for QI.

If the patient does not meet the numerator and a valid exception is not present, this case represents a quality failure.

S.19. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic Diagram URL or Attachment (You also may provide a diagram of the Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic described above at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

S.20. Sampling (If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.

This measure is not based on a sample or survey.

S.21. Survey/Patient-reported data (If measure is based on a survey, provide instructions for conducting the survey and guidance on minimum response rate.)

IF a PRO-PM, specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

S.22. Missing data (specify how missing data are handled, e.g., imputation, delete case.)

Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.

S.23. Data Source (Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).

If other, please describe in S.24.

Administrative claims, Electronic Clinical Data, Electronic Clinical Data : Electronic Health Record, Electronic Clinical Data : Registry

S.24. Data Source or Collection Instrument (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.)

IF a PRO-PM, identify the specific PROM(s); and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.

Not applicable

S.25. Data Source or Collection Instrument (available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

S.26. Level of Analysis (Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Clinician : Group/Practice, Clinician : Individual, Clinician : Team

S.27. Care Setting (Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Hospital/Acute Care Facility

If other:

S.28. 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.)

2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

0241_MeasureTesting_MSF5.0_Data.doc

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 by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition

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*)

ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic health records (EHRs)

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.

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.

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. 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 and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues.

IF a PRO-PM, consider implications for both individuals providing PROM data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

This measure was found to be reliable and feasible for implementation.

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*).

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.

Planned	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Public Reporting	
Quality Improvement with Benchmarking (external benchmarking to multiple organizations)	

Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)

4a.1. For each CURRENT use, checked above, provide:

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

4a.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?)

4a.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.)

4b. 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.

4b.1. Progress on Improvement. (Not required for initial endorsement unless available.)

Performance results on this measure (current and over time) should be provided in 1b.2 and 1b.4. Discuss:

- Progress (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

4b.2. 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.

4c. 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).

4c.1. Were any unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations identified during testing; OR has evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations been reported since implementation? If so, identify the negative unintended consequences and describe how benefits outweigh them or actions taken to mitigate them.

We are not aware of any unintended consequences related to this measurement.

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)

[0436 : STK-03: Anticoagulation Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation/Flutter](#)

[1525 : Atrial Fibrillation and Atrial Flutter: Chronic Anticoagulation Therapy](#)

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

5a. Harmonization

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 completely harmonized?

[No](#)

5a.2. If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden.

[This measure specifically focuses on the ischemic stroke and TIA patient population with atrial fibrillation, in the inpatient setting, which is a different target population than measure 1525. Patients with a diagnosis of stroke have and atrial fibrillation should be treated for prevention of a secondary stroke.](#)

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.)

[Our measure is specified at the clinician level, but measure results can be aggregated at a higher level of measurement.](#)

[We have developed and will maintain specifications for multiple data sources, including Electronic Health Records \(EHRs\) and Claims-Based Reporting. Our specifications for EHRs are developed in accordance with the terminology standards \(eg, SNOMED, RxNorm, LOINC\) named in the Meaningful Use Program \(CMS EHR Incentive Program\).](#)

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:

Contact Information

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): [American Academy of Neurology](#)

Co.2 Point of Contact: [Amy, Bennett, \[abennett@aan.com\]\(mailto:abennett@aan.com\), 612-928-6072-](#)

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: [American Academy of Neurology](#)

Co.4 Point of Contact: Amy, Bennett, abennett@aan.com, 612-928-6072-

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.

List of Work Group Members:

Joseph Drozda, Jr., MD (Co-Chair) (methodology)
 Robert G. Holloway, MD, MPH (Co-Chair) (neurology)
 David Seidenwurm, MD (Co-chair) (neuroradiology)
 David N. Alexander, MD (neurology, vascular neurology, spinal cord injury)
 M. Carolyn Baum, PhD, OTR/L (occupational therapy)
 Christopher Bever, Jr., MD, MBA (neurology)
 Thomas P. Bleck, MD, FCCM (internal medicine, critical care, neurology, vascular neurology, clinical neurophysiology)
 John Y. Choi, MD, MPH (neurology)
 Janet Y. Forbes, MD (internal medicine)
 Millie Hepburn-Smith, MSN, RN, ACNS-BC (neuroscience nursing)
 Judith Hinchey, MD, MS (neurology)
 Peggy Jones (patient representative)
 Irene Katzan, MD (neurology)
 Adam Kelly, MD (neurology)
 Rahul K. Khare, MD, MS, FACEP (emergency medicine)
 Michael Lev, MD (radiology)
 David Likosky, MD, SFHM (neurology, internal medicine, vascular neurology)
 Constantine Moschonas, MD (neurology)
 Suresh Mukherji, MD, FACR (neuroradiology)
 Robert C. Mullen, MPH (speech-language pathology)
 Charles Prestigiacomo, MD (neurological surgery)
 Eric Russell, MD, FACR (radiology/neuroradiology)
 Pina C. Sanelli, MD, MPH (radiology/neuroradiology)
 Daniel Triezenberg, MD (family medicine)
 Patrick Turski, MD, FACR (neuroradiology)
 Richard Zorowitz, MD (physical medicine and rehabilitation)

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.

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: 2006

Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: 05, 2012

Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Please see section Ad.9.

Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 09, 2013

Ad.6 Copyright statement: Physician Performance Measures (Measures) and related data specifications have been developed by the American Medical Association (AMA) convened Physician Consortium for Performance Improvement® (PCPI™) and the National Committee for Quality Assurance (NCQA).

These performance Measures are not clinical guidelines and do not establish a standard of medical care, and have not been tested for all potential applications.

The Measures, while copyrighted, can be reproduced and distributed, without modification, for noncommercial purposes, e.g., use by health care providers in connection with their practices. Commercial use is defined as the sale, license, or distribution of the

Measures for commercial gain, or incorporation of the Measures into a product or service that is sold, licensed or distributed for commercial gain. Commercial uses of the Measures require a license agreement between the user and the AMA, (on behalf of the PCPI) or NCQA. Neither the AMA, NCQA, PCPI nor its members shall be responsible for any use of the Measures.
THE MEASURES AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE PROVIDED "AS IS" WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND

© 2012 American Medical Association and the National Committee for Quality Assurance. All Rights Reserved.
Limited proprietary coding is contained in the Measure specifications for convenience. Users of the proprietary code sets should obtain all necessary licenses from the owners of these code sets. The AMA, NCQA, the PCPI and its members disclaim all liability for use or accuracy of any Current Procedural Terminology (CPT®) or other coding contained in the specifications.
CPT® contained in the Measure specifications is copyright 2004- 2011 American Medical Association.
LOINC® copyright 2004--2011 Regenstrief Institute, Inc. This material contains SNOMED Clinical Terms® (SNOMED CT®) copyright 2004-2011 International Health Terminology Standards Development Organisation. ICD-10 Copyright 2011 World Health Organization. All Rights Reserved.

Ad.7 Disclaimers: See copyright statement above.

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: Coding/Specifications updates occur annually. The PCPI has a formal measurement review process that stipulates regular (usually on a three-year cycle, when feasible) review of the measures. The process can also be activated if there is a major change in scientific evidence, results from testing or other issues are noted that materially affect the integrity of the measure.