NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Measure Evaluation 4.1
December 2009

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 #:** 0132 **NQF Project:** Cardiovascular Endorsement Maintenance 2010
MEASURE DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION
De.1 **Measure Title:** Aspirin at arrival for acute myocardial infarction (AMI)
De.2 **Brief description of measure**: Percentage of acute myocardial infarction (AMI) patients who received aspirin within 24 hours before or after hospital arrival
1.1-2 **Type of Measure:** Process De.3 **If included in a composite or paired with another measure, please identify composite or paired measure** N/A
De.4 **National Priority Partners Priority Area:** Population health De.5 **IOM Quality Domain**: Timeliness De.6 **Consumer Care Need:** Getting better

CONDITIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY NQF	
Four conditions must be met before proposed measures may be considered and evaluated for suitability as voluntary consensus standards:	**NQF Staff**
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)?** Yes A.2 **Indicate if Proprietary Measure** (*as defined in measure steward agreement*)**:** A.3 **Measure Steward Agreement:** Government entity and in the public domain - no agreement necessary A.4 **Measure Steward Agreement attached:**	**A** **Y**☒ **N**☐
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	**B** **Y**☐

every 3 years. Yes, information provided in contact section	N☐
C. The intended use of the measure includes both public reporting and quality improvement. ►**Purpose:** Public reporting, Internal quality improvement Accountability, Payment incentive	C Y☒ N☐
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. D.1**Testing:** Yes, fully developed and tested D.2 **Have NQF-endorsed measures been reviewed to identify if there are similar or related measures?** Yes	D Y☒ N☐
(for NQF staff use) **Have all conditions for consideration been met?** **Staff Notes to Steward** (*if submission returned*)**:**	Met Y☒ N☐
Staff Notes to Reviewers (*issues or questions regarding any criteria*)**:**	
Staff Reviewer Name(s): RWinkler	

TAP/Workgroup Reviewer Name:	
Steering Committee Reviewer Name:	
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.* (evaluation criteria) **1a. High Impact**	Eval Rating
(for NQF staff use) **Specific NPP goal**:	
1a.1 **Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare:** Affects large numbers, Leading cause of morbidity/mortality, Severity of illness, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality 1a.2 1a.3 **Summary of Evidence of High Impact:** In 2010, an estimated 785,000 Americans will have a new coronary event, and approximately 470,000 will have a recurrent event. An estimated additional 195,000 silent first myocardial infarctions occur each year. Approximately every 25 seconds, an American will have a coronary event, and approximately every minute, one will die. In 2004, AMI resulted in 695,000 hospital stays and $31 billion in health expenditures. The risk of further cardiovascular complications, including recurrent MI, sudden cardiac death, heart failure, stroke, and angina pectoris, among AMI survivors is substantial. 1a.4 **Citations for Evidence of High Impact:** · Lloyd-Jones D, Adams RJ, Brown TM, Carnethon M, Dai S, De Simone G, Ferguson TB, Ford E, Furie K, Gillespie C, Go A, Greenlund K, Haase N, Hailpern S, Ho PM, Howard V, Kissela B, Kittner S, Lackland D, Lisabeth L, Marelli A, McDermott MM, Meigs J, Mozaffarian D, Mussolino M, Nichol G, Roger VL, Rosamond W, Sacco R, Sorlie P, Stafford R, Thom T, Wasserthiel-Smoller S, Wong ND, Wylie-Rosett J; on behalf of the American Heart Association Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee. Heart disease and stroke statistics—2010 update: a report from the American Heart Association. Circulation. 2010;121:e46–e215.	1a C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
1b. Opportunity for Improvement	1b C☐

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).

Comment [KP2]: 1b. Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating considerable variation, or overall poor performance, in the quality of care across providers and/or population groups (disparities in care).

1b.1 Benefits (improvements in quality) envisioned by use of this measure: Early aspirin use reduces the risk of death. Hospital performance rates have gradually increased over the years this measure has been reported to the public. Providers understand the importance of giving their patients with suspected MI aspirin within 24 hours of arrival. Ongoing use of this measure will help ensure that high performing providers maintain high performance and the relatively lower performing providers have an impetus to improve.

P☐ M☐ N☐

1b.2 Summary of data demonstrating performance gap (variation or overall poor performance) across providers:
National performance rates:
2Q09: 98.3%
3Q09: 98.3%
4Q09: 98.5%
1Q10: 98.5%

1b.3 Citations for data on performance gap:
Clinical warehouse data:
2Q09: 84,684 AMI patients, 3,229 hospitals
3Q09: 81,391 AMI patients, 3,233 hospitals
4Q09: 86,789 AMI patients, 3,235 hospitals
1Q10: 89,484 AMI patients, 3,249 hospitals

1b.4 Summary of Data on disparities by population group:
At the univariate analysis level (unadjusted odds ratios), rates ranged from 97.2% for Hispanic/Latinos, to 97.7% for African-Americans, 98.3 for Asians/Pacific Islanders, 98.4 for White/Caucasians, and 98.8% for Native Americans. The difference from the lowest to the highest rates was 1.5 percentage points. The rate for Caucasians was higher than the rates for minority groups except Native-Americans.

1b.5 Citations for data on Disparities:
2009 Clinical warehouse data (Total 324,780 patients with race not missing): 251,158 Caucasian patients, 37,747 African-American patients, 27,316 Hispanic patients, 7,472 Asian/Pacific Islander patients, and 1,087 Native American patients.

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*)**:** The early use of aspirin in patients with acute myocardial infarction results in a significant reduction in adverse events and subsequent mortality. The benefits of aspirin therapy on mortality are comparable to fibrinolytic therapy. The combination of aspirin and fibrinolytics provides additive benefits for patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Aspirin is also effective in patients with non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction. National clinical guidelines strongly recommend early aspirin for patients hospitalized with AMI. ACC/AHA UA/NSTEMI and STEMI guidelines consider the administration of aspirin to unstable angina/NSTEMI/STEMI patients as soon as possible after hospital presentation a Class I recommendation.

1c.2-3. Type of Evidence: Evidence-based guideline, Randomized controlled trial, Systematic synthesis of research, Meta-analysis

1c.4 Summary of Evidence (*as described in the criteria; for outcomes, summarize any evidence that healthcare services/care processes influence the outcome*)**:**
Some of the strongest evidence available about the long-term benefits of therapy in patients with acute coronary events pertains to ASA. By irreversibly inhibiting COX-1 within platelets, ASA prevents the formation of thromboxane A2, thereby diminishing platelet aggregation. This platelet inhibition is the plausible mechanism for the clinical benefit of ASA, both because it is fully present with low doses of ASA and because platelets represent one of the principal participants in thrombus formation after plaque disruption. Among clinical investigations with ASA, trials in STEMI and NSTEMI have consistently documented a striking benefit of ASA compared with placebo independent of the differences in study design, such as time of entry after the acute phase, duration of follow-up, and dose used. The Second International Study of Infarct Survival (ISIS-2) has shown conclusively the efficacy of aspirin alone for treatment of evolving acute MI, with an absolute risk

1c C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐

Comment [k3]: 1 Examples of data on opportunity for improvement include, but are not limited to: prior studies, epidemiologic data, measure data from pilot testing or implementation. If data are not available, the measure focus is systematically assessed (e.g., expert panel rating) and judged to be a quality problem.

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:
oIntermediate outcome – evidence that the measured intermediate outcome (e.g., blood pressure, Hba1c) leads to improved health/avoidance of harm or cost/benefit.
oProcess – 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).
oStructure – 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.
oPatient 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.
oAccess – evidence that an association exists between access to a health service and the outcomes of, or experience with, care.
oEfficiency – 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.

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 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.

difference in 35-day mortality of 2.4% (relative risk reduction [RRR] 23%). When aspirin was combined with streptokinase, the absolute risk difference in mortality was 5.2% (RRR 42%). A meta-analysis demonstrated that aspirin reduced coronary reocclusion and recurrent ischemic events after fibrinolytic therapy. The prompt action of ASA and its ability to reduce mortality rates in patients with suspected MI enrolled in the Second International Study of Infarct Survival (ISIS-2) trial led to the recommendation that ASA be initiated immediately in the ED once the diagnosis of ACS is made or suspected. Aspirin is an important part of the early management of all patients with suspected MI (NSTEMI and STEMI) and should be given promptly after hospitalization.

1c.5 Rating of strength/quality of evidence (*also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom***):** ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines, Level of Evidence A: [UA/NSTEMI] Data derived from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses, Multiple populations evaluated; [STEMI] Data derived from multiple randomized clinical trials or meta-analyses, Multiple populations evaluated.

1c.6 Method for rating evidence: [UA/NSTEMI] The methodology used by the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines is fully documented in their publication "Methodology Manual and Policies From the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines" (http://assets.cardiosource.com/Methodology_Manual_for_ACC_AHA_Writing_Committees.pdf). The guidelines are based upon a comprehensive assessment, both electronic and manual, of the English-language medical literature. This search focuses on high-quality randomized controlled trials, meta-analyses and systematic reviews, and when applicable observational studies. In some cases where higher quality data is not available, observational studies and case series are also considered. The quality of the design and execution of these studies is determined. When appropriate, data tables are generated from the available literature. After a review of the available literature, the writing committee rates the evidence according to the schemes outlined in their publication.
[STEMI] The method of rating evidence used by the Writing Committee on the Management of Patients with ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction in 2004 is not as well documented, but is implicitly consistent with the approach described in the ACCF/AHA methodology manual. Following comprehensive searching of the scientific and medical literature on AMI, with special emphasis on STEMI, the writing committee weighed the strength of evidence for or against a particular treatment or procedure. A level of evidence rating of "A" was given when multiple (3-5) population risk strata were evaluated (data available from clinical trials or registries about the usefulness/efficacy in different sub-populations, such as gender, age, history of diabetes, history of prior MI, history of heart failure, and prior aspirin use.) and there was general consistency of direction and magnitude of effect.

1c.7 Summary of Controversy/Contradictory Evidence: Aside from avoiding use in patients with clear contraindications to aspirin therapy, there is substantial support in existing guidelines for the use of chronic aspirin therapy for secondary prevention in patients surviving AMI.

1c.8 Citations for Evidence (*other than guidelines***):**
· Antiplatelet Trialists' Collaboration. Collaborative overview of randomised trials of antiplatelet therapy—I: prevention of death, myocardial infarction, and stroke by prolonged antiplatelet therapy in various categories of patients (published erratum appears in BMJ 1994;308:1540). BMJ 1994;308:81–106.
· Lewis HDJ, Davis JW, Archibald DG, et al. Protective effects of aspirin against acute myocardial infarction and death in men with unstable angina: results of a Veterans Administration Cooperative Study. N Engl J Med 1983;309:396–403.
· Cairns JA, Gent M, Singer J, et al. Aspirin, sulfinpyrazone, or both in unstable angina: results of a Canadian multicenter trial. N Engl J Med 1985;313:1369 –75.
· Théroux P, Ouimet H, McCans J, et al. Aspirin, heparin, or both to treat acute unstable angina. N Engl J Med 1988;319:1105–11.
· The RISC Group. Risk of myocardial infarction and death during treatment with low dose aspirin and intravenous heparin in men with unstable coronary artery disease. Lancet 1990;336:827–30.
· Randomized trial of intravenous streptokinase, oral aspirin, both or neither among 17,187 cases of suspected acute myocardial infarction: ISIS-2. ISIS-2 (Second International Study of Infarct Survival) Collaborative Group. Lancet. 1988 Aug 13;2(8607):349-60.
· Roux S, Christeller S, Lüdin E. Effects of aspirin on coronary reocclusion and recurrent ischemia after thrombolysis: a metaanalysis. J Am Coll Cardiol 1992;19:671-7.
· Antithrombotic Trialists' Collaboration. Collaborative metaanalysis of randomised trials of

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/uspstf07/methods/benefit.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.

antiplatelet therapy for prevention of death, myocardial infarction, and stroke in high-risk patients. BMJ 2002;324:71-86.

1c.9 **Quote the Specific guideline recommendation (***including guideline number and/or page number***):**
3.2.1. Antiplatelet Therapy Recommendations (p. e45)
1. Aspirin should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients as soon as possible after hospital presentation and continued indefinitely in patients not known to be intolerant of that medication.
6.3.1.4. Aspirin (p. e36)
Aspirin should be chewed by patients who have not taken aspirin before presentation with STEMI. The initial dose should be: 162 mg to 325 mg. Although some trials have used enteric-coated aspirin for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non–enteric-coated aspirin formulations.

1c.10 **Clinical Practice Guideline Citation:** [3.2.1.] Anderson JL, Adams CD, Antman EM, Bridges CR, Califf RM, Casey DE Jr, et al. ACC/AHA 2007 guidelines for the management of patients with unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2002 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non–ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction): developed in collaboration with the American College of Emergency Physicians, American College of Physicians, Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007;50:e1–157.
[6.3.1.4.] Antman EM, Anbe DT, Armstrong PW, Bates ER, Green LA, Hand M, et al. ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee to Revise the 1999 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction). 2004.
1c.11 **National Guideline Clearinghouse or other URL:** [3.2.1.]
http://content.onlinejacc.org/cgi/reprint/50/7/e1.pdf, [6.3.1.4.]
http://assets.cardiosource.com/STEMI_2004.pdf

1c.12 **Rating of strength of recommendation (***also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom***):**
Ratings made by ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines: [UA/NSTEMI] Class I recommendation – Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a given procedure or treatment is useful and effective. Benefit >>> Risk. Procedure/treatment should be performed/administered; [STEMI] Class I recommendation - Conditions for which there is evidence and/or general agreement that a given procedure or treatment is beneficial, useful, and effective.

1c.13 **Method for rating strength of recommendation** (*If different from USPSTF system, also describe rating and how it relates to USPSTF)***:**
[UA/NSTEMI] The methodology used by the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines is fully documented in their publication "Methodology Manual and Policies From the ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines" (http://assets.cardiosource.com/Methodology_Manual_for_ACC_AHA_Writing_Committees.pdf).
Recommendations are assigned strength by the Task Force based upon evidence, benefit vs. risk vs. harm, and patient preference.
[STEMI] The method of rating the strength of a recommendation used by the Writing Committee on the Management of Patients with ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction in 2004 is not as well documented but is implicitly consistent with the approach described in the ACCF/AHA methodology manual. In sum, strength is assigned based on examination of evidence and careful assessment of benefit vs. risk.
Both the ACCF/AHA Guidelines and the USPSTF assess evidence with respect to two parameters: 1) the magnitude of the benefit, and 2) the certainty of this benefit. However, they use different coding systems. In ascertaining magnitude of the benefit, the ACCF/AHA uses a Class I-III scale and the USPSTF uses a high-moderate-low scale. In determining the certainty of this benefit, the ACCF/AHA uses levels of evidence A-C and USPSTF uses a high-moderate-low scale.

1c.14 **Rationale for using this guideline over others:**
The ACCF/AHA guidelines are widely accepted national guidelines that address the therapy of patients with AMI; they use an explicit and transparent methodology; and have thus served as the foundation of national quality measures.

TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for *Importance to*	**1**

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. 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.

Measure and Report?	
Steering Committee: Was the threshold criterion, *Importance to Measure and Report*, **met?** **Rationale:**	**1** **Y☐** **N☐**
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)	**Eval Rating**
2a. MEASURE SPECIFICATIONS	
S.1 Do you have a web page where current detailed measure specifications can be obtained? **S.2 If yes, provide web page URL:** **2a. Precisely Specified**	
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***):** AMI patients who received aspirin within 24 hours before or after hospital arrival **2a.2 Numerator Time Window (***The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the numerator***):** 24 hours before hospital arrival through 24 hours after hospital arrival **2a.3 Numerator Details (***All information required to collect/calculate the numerator, including all codes, logic, and definitions***):** Refer to http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228760129036: · Section 1 - Data Dictionary | Alphabetical Data Dictionary – pages 1-77 through 1-78. · Appendices | Appendix C - Medication Tables – pages Appendix C-3 through Appendix C-6. · Section 2 - Measurement Information | Section 2.1 - Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) – pages AMI-1-1 through AMI-1-5.	
2a.4 Denominator Statement (*Brief, text description of the denominator - target population being measured***):** AMI patients (International Classification of Diseases, 9th revision, Clinical Modification [ICD-9-CM] principal diagnosis code of AMI: 410.00, 410.01, 410.10, 410.11, 410.20, 410.21, 410.30, 410.31, 410.40, 410.41, 410.50, 410.51, 410.60, 410.61, 410.70, 410.71, 410.80, 410.81, 410.90, 410.91) **2a.5 Target population gender:** Female, Male **2a.6 Target population age range:** Greater than or equal to 18 years old **2a.7 Denominator Time Window (***The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the denominator***):** From hospital arrival to time of hospital discharge **2a.8 Denominator Details (***All information required to collect/calculate the denominator - the target population being measured - including all codes, logic, and definitions***):** ICD-9-CM Principal Diagnosis codes: 410.00: Anterolateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified 410.01: Anterolateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode 410.10: Other anterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified 410.11: Other anterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode 410.20: Inferolateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified 410.21: Inferolateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode 410.30: Inferoposterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified 410.31: Inferoposterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode	**2a-specs** **C☐** **P☐** **M☐** **N☐**

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) .

410.40: Other inferior wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.41: Other inferior wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode
410.50: Other lateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.51: Other lateral wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode
410.60: True posterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.61: True posterior wall, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode
410.70: Subendocardial, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.71: Subendocardial, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode
410.80: Other specified sites, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.81: Other specified sites, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode
410.90: Unspecified site, acute myocardial infarction-episode of care unspecified
410.91: Unspecified site, acute myocardial infarction-initial episode

2a.9 **Denominator Exclusions (***Brief text description of exclusions from the target population***):** Exclusions:
•<18 years of age
•Patients who have a length of stay greater than 120 days
•Patients enrolled in clinical trials
•Discharged to another hospital on day of or day after arrival
•Discharged on day of arrival
•Expired on day of or day after arrival
•Left against medical advice on day of or day after arrival
•Patients with comfort measures only documented on day of or day after arrival
•Patients with a documented reason for no aspirin on arrival

2a.10 **Denominator Exclusion Details (***All information required to collect exclusions to the denominator, including all codes, logic, and definitions***):**
Refer to http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228760129036:
· Section 1 - Data Dictionary | Alphabetical Data Dictionary – pages 1-20 through 1-21, 1-69 through 1-71, 1-90, 1-98 through 1-104, 1-117, 1-118 through 1-120, 1-204, and 1-324 through 1-326.
· Appendices | Appendix C - Medication Tables PDF – pages Appendix C-3 through Appendix C-6 plus Appendix C-9, and Appendix H - Miscellaneous Tables – pages Appendix H-5.
· Section 2 - Measurement Information | Section 2.1 - Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) – pages AMI-5 plus AMI-1-1 through AMI-1-5.

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

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***):**
N/A

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***):**
Refer to http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228760129036: Section 2 - Measurement Information | Section 2.1 - Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) – pages AMI-5 plus AMI-1-1 through AMI-1-5.

2a.22 **Describe the method for discriminating performance** *(e.g., significance testing)***:**
Benchmarks are established using the ABC methodology, based on the actual performance of the top facilities. ABC benchmarks identify superior performance and encourage poorer performers to improve. The methodology is a data-driven, peer-group performance feedback used to positively affect outcomes.

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.

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)*:
Patients admitted to the hospital for inpatient acute care with an ICD-9-CM Principal Diagnosis Code for AMI as defined in section 2a.8, a patient age greater than or equal to 18 years, and a length of stay less than or equal to 120 days would be included in the initial patient population and eligible to be sampled.
Monthly Sample Size Based on Population Size (Average monthly initial patient population size: Minimum required sample size):
>= 516: 104
131-515: 20% of Initial Patient Population size
26-130: 26
< 26: 100%

2a.24 Data Source (*Check the source(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)*
Paper medical record/flow-sheet, Electronic Health/Medical Record

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.***):**
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Abstraction & Reporting Tool (CART). Vendor tools also available.

2a.26-28 Data source/data collection instrument reference web page URL or attachment: URL
http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier3&cid=1135267770141

2a.29-31 Data dictionary/code table web page URL or attachment: URL Refer to
http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228760129036: Section 1 - Data Dictionary | Alphabetical Data Dictionary.

2a.32-35 Level of Measurement/Analysis (*Check the level(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)*
Facility/Agency, Population: national, Program: QIO

2a.36-37 Care Settings (*Check the setting(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)*
Hospital

2a.38-41 Clinical Services (*Healthcare services being measured, check all that apply*)

TESTING/ANALYSIS

2b. Reliability testing

2b.1 Data/sample *(description of data/sample and size)***:** CDAC (Clinical Data Abstraction Center) validation sample: 3Q09.

2b.2 Analytic Method *(type of reliability & rationale, method for testing)***:**
CDAC validation sampling involves SDPS selection of sample of 5 cases/quarter across all topics (AMI, HF, Pneumonia, etc.) from each hospital with a minimum of 6 discharges (across all topics) in the Clinical Data Warehouse within 4 months + 15 days following 3Q09. Hospital-abstracted data is compared to CDAC-adjudicated data.

2b.3 Testing Results *(reliability statistics, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted)***:**
Arrival Date - 96.9%
Aspirin Received Within 24 Hours Before or After Hospital Arrival - 97.3%
Clinical Trial – 98.9%
Comfort Measures Only - 94.3%
Reason for No Aspirin on Arrival - 79.6%
Transfer From Another ED - 97.5%

2b
C ☐
P ☐
M ☐
N ☐

2c. Validity testing — **2c**

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.

2c.1 Data/sample *(description of data/sample and size)*: Face validity is regularly assessed with the Technical Expert Panel responsible for reviewing and supporting the measure topic.

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

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

C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐

2d. Exclusions Justified

2d.1 Summary of Evidence supporting exclusion(s):
The exclusions of age < 18 years, length of stay > 120 days, and enrollment in a clinical trial are common to the other measures in the AMI measure set, and to the inpatient Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program measure set in general. Patients with documented comfort measures only (on the day of or day after arrival) are appropriate exclusions, as the goal in these cases is palliative care – Therefore, the non-use of aspirin is often clinically appropriate. The exclusions that omit patients discharged on the day of arrival (or the day after arrival, in cases where patients are transferred to hospitals, expired, AMA, etc.) are built in to address the timing issues (the 24-hour timeframe). Lastly, there are clinically important contraindications to the use of aspirin. Reasons vary, from patient refusal, aspirin allergies, and current Coumadin therapy (on Coumadin at home), to clinical conditions such as active GI bleeding. In these types of cases, the non-use of aspirin should not count against the provider if the clinical reason for not prescribing aspirin is documented. All exclusions in this measure (with the exception of the age, length of stay, and clinical trial) are concordant with the current ACC/AHA Clinical Performance Measures for Adults With ST-Elevation and Non-ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction.

2d.2 Citations for Evidence:

- Krumholz HM, Anderson JL, Bachelder BL, Fesmire FM, Fihn SD, Foody JM, et al. ACC/AHA 2008 performance measures for adults with ST-elevation and non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Performance Measures (Writing Committee to Develop Performance Measures for ST-Elevation and Non-ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction). J Am Coll Cardiol. 2008;52:2046 -99.
- Anderson JL, Adams CD, Antman EM, Bridges CR, Califf RM, Casey DE Jr, et al. ACC/AHA 2007 guidelines for the management of patients with unstable angina/non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 2002 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non-ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction): developed in collaboration with the American College of Emergency Physicians, American College of Physicians, Society for Academic Emergency Medicine, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2007;50:e1–157.
- Antman EM, Anbe DT, Armstrong PW, Bates ER, Green LA, Hand M, et al. ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee to Revise the 1999 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction). 2004.

2d.3 Data/sample *(description of data/sample and size)*: Clinical warehouse data: 144,251 AMI patients, 3,503 hospitals, 1Q10.

2d.4 Analytic Method *(type analysis & rationale)*:
A frequency count was conducted to calculate the percentages outlined in section 2d.5. Frequency counts are a simple, efficient way to determine the occurrence of specific values of a data element in a given data set.

2d.5 Testing Results *(e.g., frequency, variability, sensitivity analyses)*:
Rates of Exclusion:
- Patients with comfort measures only documented on day of or day after arrival: 2.3%
- Patients enrolled in clinical trials: .5%

2d C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐ NA☐

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;
AND
•precisely defined and specified:
–if there is substantial variability in exclusions across providers, the measure is specified so that exclusions are computable and the effect on the measure is transparent (i.e., impact clearly delineated, such as number of cases excluded, exclusion rates by type of exclusion);
if patient preference (e.g., informed decision-making) is a basis for exclusion, there must be evidence that it strongly impacts performance on the measure and the measure must be specified so that the information about patient preference and the effect on the measure is transparent (e.g., numerator category computed separately, denominator exclusion category computed separately).

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.

· Discharged on day of arrival: 1.6%
· Discharged/transferred to another hospital for inpatient care, discharged/transferred to a federal health care facility, expired, or left against medical advice or discontinued care on day of or day after arrival: 4.6%
· Patients with a documented reason for no aspirin on arrival: 3.1%

2e. Risk Adjustment for Outcomes/ Resource Use Measures

2e.1 **Data/sample** *(description of data/sample and size)*: N/A

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

2e.3 **Testing Results** *(risk model performance metrics)*:
N/A

2e.4 **If outcome or resource use measure is not risk adjusted, provide rationale:** N/A

2e
C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐ NA☐

2f. Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance

2f.1 **Data/sample from Testing or Current Use** *(description of data/sample and size)*: Clinical warehouse data:
2Q09: 84,684 AMI patients, 3,229 hospitals
3Q09: 81,391 AMI patients, 3,233 hospitals
4Q09: 86,789 AMI patients, 3,235 hospitals
1Q10: 89,484 AMI patients, 3,249 hospitals

2f.2 **Methods to identify statistically significant and practically/meaningfully differences in performance** *(type of analysis & rationale)*:
Analysts review quarterly benchmarks established (using the ABC methodology) and trends to identify differences in performance scores and investigate the possible causes. ABC benchmarks identify superior performance and encourage poorer performers to improve. The methodology is a data-driven, peer-group performance feedback used to positively affect outcomes. If measure specifications (algorithms, data elements) are found to cause the difference in performance, they are reviewed for possible updates.

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)*:
National performance rates:
2Q09: 98.3% (benchmark 100.0%)
3Q09: 98.3% (benchmark 100.0%)
4Q09: 98.5% (benchmark 100.0%)
1Q10: 98.5% (benchmark 100.0%)

2f
C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐

2g. Comparability of Multiple Data Sources/Methods

2g.1 **Data/sample** *(description of data/sample and size)*: Both paper records and electronic health records can be used to collect data. Some allowances have been made as facilities incorporate EHRs in their facilities because vendors do not utilize identical data fields, but customize products according to facility need and preferences.

2g.2 **Analytic Method** *(type of analysis & rationale)*:
No tests have been performed on this measure to determine comparability of sources (paper medical record vs. EHR).

2g.3 **Testing Results** *(e.g., correlation statistics, comparison of rankings)*:
N/A

2g
C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐ NA☐

2h. Disparities in Care

2h
C☐

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 (but not disparities in care) and are present at start of care;[Error! Bookmark not defined.] OR rationale/data support no risk adjustment.

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). It is preferable to stratify measures by race and socioeconomic status rather than adjusting out differences.

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.

2h.**1 If measure is stratified, provide stratified results** *(scores by stratified categories/cohorts)***:** Not stratified, but results according to race, sex, etc can be determined. 2h.2 **If disparities have been reported/identified, but measure is not specified to detect disparities, provide follow-up plans:** Since the preliminary univariate analyses do not show a clear indication of disparities (the largest difference is less than 2.0 percentage points as described in 1b.4), further analyses are needed to control for the simultaneous effect of other potential factors such as age, gender, comorbidity, and hospital characteristics and to take into account the correlation/cluster effect of patients discharged from the same hospitals.	P☐ M☐ N☐ NA ☐
TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for *Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties?*	**2**
Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, *Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties***, met?** **Rationale:**	*2* C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
3. USABILITY	
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 criteria)	**Eval Rating**
3a. Meaningful, Understandable, and Useful Information 3a.1 **Current Use:** In use 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*)**:** Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program: · http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1138115987129 · http://www.hospitalcompare.hhs.gov/ 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***):** Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program (Measures can be used by individual hospitals for internal quality improvement): · http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1138115987129 · http://www.hospitalcompare.hhs.gov/ Additionally, the Joint Commission also uses this measure for accreditation. **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)***:** Unknown. [Feedback on the Hospital Compare website (used for public reporting) is collected through another contractor.] 3a.5 **Methods** *(e.g., focus group, survey, QI project)***:** Voluntary electronic survey by visitors to website. 3a.6 **Results** *(qualitative and/or quantitative results and conclusions)***:** Not available.	**3a** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
3b/3c. Relation to other NQF-endorsed measures	

Comment [KP22]: 3a. Demonstration that information produced by the measure is meaningful, understandable, and useful to the intended audience(s) for both public reporting (e.g., focus group, cognitive testing) and informing quality improvement (e.g., quality improvement initiatives). 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.

3b.1 NQF # and Title of similar or related measures: NQF #0092: Aspirin at Arrival of AMI	
(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?** No, this measure's specifications are not harmonized with NQF #0092 measure specifications, as the latter's measure population includes all patients, regardless of age, with an emergency department discharge diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction, and assesses the proportion of patients who received aspirin either within 24 hours before emergency department arrival or during the emergency department stay. This measure is concentrated on care of the AMI patient who is subsequently admitted for inpatient care; a completely different focus in terms of setting and care. NQF #0092 does provide for the exclusion of patients with documentation of reason(s) for taking/receiving aspirin within 24 hours before emergency department arrival or during emergency department stay, similar to this measure. Additionally, NQF #0092 includes the same ICD-9-CM codes that this measure does, but incorporates the necessary CPT codes and a "Place of service code" of 23 (which this measure does not).	**3b** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐ NA☐
3c. Distinctive or Additive Value **3c.1 Describe the distinctive, improved, or additive value this measure provides to existing NQF-endorsed measures:** No NQF-endorsed measures with same topic and target population. **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:** No NQF-endorsed measures with same topic and target population.	**3c** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐ NA☐
TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for *Usability*?	**3**
Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, *Usability*, met? **Rationale:**	**3** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
4. FEASIBILITY	
Extent to which the required data are readily available, retrievable without undue burden, and can be implemented for performance measurement. (evaluation criteria)	**Eval Rating**
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)	**4a** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
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*) No **4b.2 If not, specify the near-term path to achieve electronic capture by most providers.** Retooling work with HHS is expected to be completed in 2011.	**4b** C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐
4c. Exclusions **4c.1 Do the specified exclusions require additional data sources beyond what is required for the**	**4c** C☐ P☐

Comment [KP23]: 3b. The measure specifications are harmonized with other measures, and are applicable to multiple levels and settings.

Comment [k24]: 16 Measure harmonization refers to the standardization of specifications for similar measures on the same topic (e.g., *influenza immunization* of patients in hospitals or nursing homes), or related measures for the same target population (e.g., eye exam and HbA1c for *patients with diabetes*), or definitions applicable to many measures (e.g., age designation for children) so that they are uniform or compatible, unless differences are dictated by the evidence. The dimensions of harmonization can include numerator, denominator, exclusions, and data source and collection instructions. The extent of harmonization depends on the relationship of the measures, the evidence for the specific measure focus, and differences in data sources.

Comment [KP25]: 3c. Review of existing endorsed measures and measure sets demonstrates that the measure provides a distinctive or additive value to existing NQF-endorsed measures (e.g., provides a more complete picture of quality for a particular condition or aspect of healthcare, is a more valid or efficient way to measure).

Comment [KP26]: 4a. For clinical measures, required data elements are routinely generated concurrent with and as a byproduct of care processes during care delivery. (e.g., BP recorded in the electronic record, not abstracted from the record later by other personnel; patient self-assessment tools, e.g., depression scale; lab values, meds, etc.)

Comment [KP27]: 4b. The required data elements are available in electronic sources. If the required data are not in existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection by most providers is specified and clinical data elements are specified for transition to the electronic health record.

Comment [KP28]: 4c. Exclusions should not require additional data sources beyond what is required for scoring the measure (e.g., numerator and denominator) unless justified as supporting measure validity.

numerator and denominator specifications?
No

M☐ N☐ NA☐

4c.2 **If yes, provide justification.**

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.**

1. Since the time of last NQF endorsement (May 2007), the HeartCare measures team met with other topic teams within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program (namely, children's asthma and surgical care) to examine the medication constructs being used. The measure designs at that time automatically excluded patients with a documented contraindication to a medication or reason for not giving a medication from the measure, regardless of whether the medication ended up being given. That type of design was resulting in a substantial amount of "false exclusions" from the measure. The decision was made to rearrange the measure such that patients who receive the medication would remain in the measure (i.e., be included in the numerator) when a reason for not administering the medication was documented, effective with April 1, 2009 discharges. It is believed that the number of false exclusions has significantly decreased as a result.
2. Again, since the time of last NQF endorsement (May 2007), feedback was received from a number of providers concerning the automatic exclusion of patients transferred in from other hospitals. Responsible hospitals assess whether or not the patient received aspirin at the transferring facility, and if not, they either give the aspirin (with the first 24 hours after arrival) or document a reason for withholding the aspirin. As such, they argued they deserve credit for appropriate care of these patients. Changes were made to accommodate these types of cases, effective October 1, 2010 discharges.
3. Because the denominator exclusion "Patients with a documented reason for no aspirin on arrival" allows for any physician/advance practice nurse/physician assistant/pharmacist-documented "other reason" for no aspirin within 24 hours of arrival to count as an exclusion, overuse of this exclusion has the potential for distorting performance rates. However, overall trends in measure numerator and denominator counts do not suggest obvious gaming of the measure. There is no increasing trend in the use of this reason data element. Nevertheless, exclusion rates for this measure will continue to be monitored for consistency, from quarter to quarter.
4. The data elements used in this measure are closely tracked. Questions submitted by abstractors are recorded, and trends related to published abstraction guidelines and disagreements over measure inclusions and exclusions in general are discussed in-depth every 6 months. Revisions in measure specifications, including data element definitions, are made as issues surface (e.g., how to handle documentation of a hold on aspirin in the ED or a delay in starting aspirin, what constitutes acceptable physician documentation of a reason for not prescribing aspirin). The frequency of questions pertaining to each data element are tracked by the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program QIOSC. Clearly the number of questions a data element receives is another indication of how difficult the specifications for the measure might be. Frequency reports are reviewed regularly, to help identify where issues in data element definitions may exist. Of note, in an August 2010 report run by the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program QIOSC, the number of questions about the abstraction of the two data elements unique to this measure, Aspirin Received Within 24 Hours Before or After Hospital Arrival and Reason for No Aspirin on Arrival, amounted to 38, only 8% of the total 458 Quest questions received for AMI for that month. Lastly, CDAC validation reports (which compare hospital data to CDAC data) and internal CDAC abstractor accuracy reports are monitored, to ensure good quality data. In sum, issues which may surface in questions submitted by users and CDAC validation/accuracy reports will continue to be closely monitored to identify any additional problems, and revisions will be made if warranted.

4d C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐

Comment [KP29]: 4d. Susceptibility to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences and the ability to audit the data items to detect such problems are identified.

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:**
The reordering of the "medication prescribed" and "reason for no medication" specifications done for April 1, 2009+ discharges (as described in section 4d.1) reduces abstraction burden. Abstractors no longer have to do an exhaustive search for acceptable reasons for not giving aspirin on arrival in cases where the patient

4e C☐ P☐ M☐ N☐

Comment [KP30]: 4e. Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, etc.) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use).

received the aspirin, saving valuable abstraction time. 4e.2 **Costs to implement the measure** (*costs of data collection, fees associated with proprietary measures*)**:** Varies according to data collection method (use of vendor) and type of abstractor used to collect clinical data. We have not received feedback that this measure has caused undue burden to the facilities collecting data. 4e.3 **Evidence for costs:** N/A 4e.4 **Business case documentation:** N/A	
TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for *Feasibility*?	**4**
Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, *Feasibility***, met?** **Rationale:**	**4** **C☐** **P☐** **M☐** **N☐**
RECOMMENDATION	
(for NQF staff use) **Check if measure is untested and only eligible for time-limited endorsement.**	**Time-limited ☐**
Steering Committee: Do you recommend for endorsement? **Comments:**	**Y☐** **N☐** **A☐**
CONTACT INFORMATION	
Co.1 **Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner)** Co.1 **Organization** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard , Baltimore, Maryland, 21244-1850 Co.2 **Point of Contact** Kristie, Baus, RN, MS, kristie.baus@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-8161-	
Measure Developer If different from Measure Steward Co.3 **Organization** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland, 21244-1850 Co.4 **Point of Contact** Kristie, Baus, RN, MS, kristie.baus@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-8161-	
Co.5 **Submitter If different from Measure Steward POC** Jo, DeBuhr, RN, BSN, broncosrule@att.net, 303-457-3195-, OFMQ	
Co.6 **Additional organizations that sponsored/participated in measure development** The Joint Commission	
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION	
Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development Ad.1 **Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.** This measure is reviewed and maintained by the Heart Care Technical Expert Panel. Quarterly teleconferences are held to discuss issues pertinent to this measure (and its specifications) and potential revisions. Current members: Frederick Masoudi, MD, MSPH Workgroup Chair: Denver Health Medical Center, University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center Don Casey, MD, MPH, MBA: VP Quality and Chief Medical Officer, Atlantic Health, Rep. of the American College of	

Physicians
Elizabeth Delong, PhD: Professor and Chair, Duke University, Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Co-Director, Outcomes Research and Assessment
Joseph Drozda, MD: Clinical Investigator, Mercy Health Research, Executive Committee Member, PCPI, Rep. of American Medical Association
John P. Erwin, III: Professor of Medicine, Co-Director, Cardiovascular Fellowship Program, Hospital Champion, Acute Myocardial Infarction Quality Improvement, Scott and White Hospital and Clinic
Kerri Fei: Senior Policy Analyst, Measure Development Operations, American Medical Association
Susan Fitzgerald, RN, MS: Associate Director, Science and Quality, American College of Cardiology
Gary Francis, MD: Professor of Medicine, University of Minnesota, Rep. of Heart Failure Society of America
David C. Goff, MD, PhD: Professor and Chair, Department of Epidemiology and Prevention, Division of Public Health Sciences, Wake Forest University School of Medicine
Kathleen Grady, CNS: Administrative Director, Center for Heart Failure, Bluhm Cardiovascular Institute Division of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Northwestern Memorial Hospital
Darryl Gray, MD: Medical Officer, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
Lee Green, MD: Professor, University of Michigan Medical School
Ed Havranek, MD: Professor of Medicine, Denver Health Medical Center, University of Colorado School of Medicine
Paul A. Heidenreich: Assistant Professor of Medicine, Associate Professor by courtesy of Health Research and Policy at the VA Palo Alto Health Care System and CHP/PCOR Fellow
Alice C. Jacobs, MD: Professor of Medicine, Director, Cardiac Cath Lab, Boston University Medical Center
Marvin Konstam, MD: Director, Cardiovascular Center, Tufts Medical Center, Rep. of Heart Failure Society of America
Harlan Krumholz, MD: Harold H. Hines, Jr. Professor of Medicine and Epidemiology and Public Health, Yale University School of Medicine
Jerod Loeb, PhD: Executive Vice President, Quality Measurement & Research, The Joint Commission
Ann [Hiniker] Loth, RN, MS, CNS: Certified Clinical Nurse Specialist, Mayo Foundation
Joseph Messer, MD, MACC: Professor of Medicine, Rush University Medical Center, Rep. of American Medical Association
Eric Peterson, MD, MPH: Professor of Medicine, Director Cardiovascular Research, Duke Clinical Research Institute, Duke University Medical Center
Martha Radford, MD: Chief Quality Officer, Professor of Medicine, New York University School of Medicine
Rose Marie Robertson, MD: Chief Science Officer, American Heart Association
John Rumsfeld, MD, PhD, FACC, FAHA: Staff Cardiologist, Cardiovascular Outcomes Researcher, Denver Veterans Affairs Medical Center
David Shahian, MD: Research Director, Center for Quality and Safety, Massachusetts General Hospital
Melanie Shahriary, RN, BSN: Associate Director, Performance Measures and Data Standards, American College of Cardiology
John Spertus, MD, MPH, FACC: Director of Cardiovascular Education and Outcomes Research, Mid America Heart Institute, University of Missouri
Samantha Tierney: Senior Policy Analyst I, American Medical Association
Gayle Whitman, PhD, RN, FAAN, FAHA: Sr Vice President, Office of Science Operations, American Heart Association
Janet Wright, MD, FACC: Senior Vice President for Science and Quality, American College of Cardiology
Contractor Staff:
Dale Bratzler, DO, MPH: CEO, Principal Clinical Coordinator, Oklahoma Foundation for Medical Quality
Jo DeBuhr, RN: Project Specialist, AMI/HF Inpatient Measures, Oklahoma Foundation for Medical Quality/Colorado Foundation for Medical Care
Chris Leber, RN: Project Specialist, AMI/HF Inpatient Measures, Oklahoma Foundation for Medical Quality/Colorado Foundation for Medical Care
CMS Staff:
Kristie Baus, MS, RN: Government Task Leader, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
David Nilasena, MD: Chief Medical Officer, Region VI, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid

Ad.2 If adapted, provide name of original measure: N/A
Ad.3-5 If adapted, provide original specifications URL or attachment

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance
Ad.6 Year the measure was first released: 1999
Ad.7 Month and Year of most recent revision: 10, 2010

Ad.8 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Every 6 months **Ad.9 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?** 07, 2011
Ad.10 Copyright statement/disclaimers:
Ad.11 -13 Additional Information web page URL or attachment:
Date of Submission (*MM/DD/YY*)**:** 12/27/2010