



November 30, 2021

To: Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC)
From: Cost and Efficiency Project Team
Re: Cost and Efficiency Spring 2021 Cycle

CSAC Action Required

The CSAC will review recommendations from the Cost and Efficiency project at its November 30 and December 1, 2021, meeting, and vote on whether to uphold the recommendations from the Standing Committee.

This memo includes a summary of the project, measure recommendations, themes identified, responses to the public and member comments, and results from member expression of support. The following document accompanies this memo:

- **Cost and Efficiency spring 2021 Cycle Draft Report.** The draft report has been updated to reflect the changes made following the Standing Committee's discussion of public and member comments. The complete draft report and supplemental materials are available on the [project webpage](#).

Background

Healthcare cost measurement continues to be a critical component to assessing and improving the efficiency of the U.S. healthcare system. Improving U.S. health system efficiency has the potential to simultaneously reduce cost growth and improve the quality of care provided. Cost measures are the building blocks to efficiency and value.

The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee oversees NQF's portfolio of Cost and Efficiency measures, which includes both condition-specific and non-condition-specific measures. The Standing Committee seeks to take a holistic view of drivers of healthcare spending and identify sources of inefficiency and waste across the system.

The Standing Committee recommended the following measures for continued endorsement:

- NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-based Per Member Per Month (PMPM) Index (HealthPartners) (maintenance)
- NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-based PMPM Index (HealthPartners) (maintenance)
- NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)
- NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)
- NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)

Draft Report

The Cost and Efficiency spring 2021 cycle draft report presents the results of the evaluation of five measures considered under the Consensus Development Process (CDP). All five are recommended for continued endorsement.

The measures were evaluated against the 2019 version of the [measure evaluation criteria](#).

Measures under Review	Maintenance	New	Total
Measures under review	5	0	5
Measures recommended for endorsement	5	0	5
Measures not recommended for endorsement or trial use	0	0	0
Reasons for not recommending	Importance – 0 Scientific Acceptability - 0 Use - 0 Overall - 0 Competing Measure -0	Importance - 0 Scientific Acceptability - 0 Use - 0 Overall - 0 Competing Measure – 0	0

CSAC Action Required

Pursuant to the CDP, the CSAC is asked to consider endorsement of five candidate measures.

Measures Recommended for Endorsement

- NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based Per Member Per Month (PMPM) Index (HealthPartners) (maintenance)
Overall Suitability for Endorsement: Yes-15; No-0 (denominator = 15)
- NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index (HealthPartners) (maintenance)
Overall Suitability for Endorsement: Yes-14; No-1 (denominator = 15)
- NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)
Overall Suitability for Endorsement: Yes-11; No-4 (denominator = 15)
- NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)
Overall Suitability for Endorsement: Yes-14; No-1 (denominator = 15)
- #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (CMS/Yale CORE) (maintenance)
Overall Suitability for Endorsement: Yes-15; No-0 (denominator = 15)

Comments and Their Disposition

NQF received three comments from one member organization pertaining to the draft report and to three of the measures under review (#2431, #2436, and #2579).

Comments submitted during the comment period, with the responses to each comment and the actions taken by the Standing Committee and measure developers, can be found in the Cost and Efficiency spring 2021 Draft Report.

Comment Themes and Standing Committee Responses

Comments about specific measure specifications and rationale were forwarded to the developers, who were invited to respond.

The Standing Committee reviewed all of the submitted comments (general and measure specific) and developer responses. Standing Committee members focused their discussion on measures or topic areas with the most significant and recurring issues.

Themed Comments

Theme 1 – RELIABILITY/MINIMUM RELIABILITY THRESHOLDS

The AMA voices concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2431 (median-0.404; interquartile range [IQR] 0.298-0.594) and measure #2436 (median-0.679; IQR 0.528-0.801). While the AMA recognizes that the minimum acceptable threshold accepted by CMS is currently 0.4, they state that the minimum threshold should be set at 0.7. The AMA voices concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2431 (median-0.404; IQR 0.298-0.594) and measure #2436 (median-0.679; IQR 0.528-0.801). While the AMA recognizes that the minimum acceptable threshold accepted by CMS is currently 0.4, they state that the minimum threshold should be set at 0.7.

Committee Response

Thank you for your comments. During the Standing Committee initial review of the measures under consideration, concern was raised regarding the signal-to-noise reliability statistics for entities with low case volume. The Standing Committee acknowledged challenges with achieving reliability thresholds for measure score reliability while balancing the trade-off of including more facilities or providers within the measure to promote transparency across the health care system. The Standing Committee also considered the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)'s decision to pass the measure on reliability and their input on the reliability testing results when voting to recommend these measures for endorsement.

Developer Response

NQF #2431

In our testing attachment, we provide split-sample reliability. To calculate split-sample reliability, we randomly sampled half of patients within each hospital from a three-year measurement period, calculated the measure for each hospital, and repeated the calculation using the second half of patients. Thus, each hospital is measured twice, but each measurement is made using an entirely distinct set of patients. To the extent that the calculated measures of these two subsets agree, we have evidence that the measure is assessing an attribute of the hospital, not of the patients. As a metric of agreement, we calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). For this measure, the split-sample reliability for hospitals with at least 25 cases was 0.681 which falls within the thresholds currently under consideration by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP).

NQF #2436

In our testing attachment, we provided split-sample reliability. To calculate split-sample reliability, we randomly sampled half of patients within each hospital from a three-year measurement period, calculated the measure for each hospital, and repeated the calculation using the second half of patients. Thus, each hospital is measured twice, but each measurement is made using an entirely distinct set of patients. To the extent that the calculated measures of these two subsets agree, we have evidence that the measure is assessing an attribute of the hospital, not of the patients. As a metric of agreement, we calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). For this measure, the split-sample reliability was 0.781, which falls within the thresholds currently under consideration by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP).

Theme 2 – SOCIAL RISK AND RISK ADJUSTMENT

The AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors rather than assessing the combined clinical and social risk factor impact simultaneously. The AMA also questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measures #2579 (0.076), #2431 (0.078), and #2436 (0.031). Taking the R-squared results into consideration, the commenter expressed concern that measures #2579, #2431, and #2436 do not meet the scientific acceptability criteria.

Committee Response

Thank you for your comments. The Standing Committee acknowledges the commenter's concern that cost and resource use measure can be influenced by care received in a healthcare setting but also by clinical processes and social risk factors (SRF). While the developers did test for the impact of SRF in the risk models for these measures, some of the measures did not include SRF in the final model. While the Standing Committee notes that it is important to maximize the predictive value of a risk adjustment model, elements of a risk model should be included based on a conceptual and empirical rationale. In light of the SMP's input regarding the validity testing and the approach to the risk adjustment modeling, the majority of the Standing Committee voted to recommend endorsement of these measures.

Developer Response

NQF #2431

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity.

Quasi-R²: For a traditional linear model (i.e., ordinary least squares regression) R² is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R² that is akin to the R² of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a "quasi-R²" by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R² that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R² results are consistent with R²s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure.

Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model. The

payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program. We do not dispute that there can be differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the low AHRQ SES variable, mean observed payments are slightly higher for patients with the social risk factor compared with patients without the social risk factor; for the dual eligibility variable however, observed payments are lower for patients with the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). We also note that our results presented in the testing attachment show that payment ratios estimated with models that adjust for either social risk factor are significantly lower than one. The question we are trying to address with our analyses is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between risk-standardized payments for models with and without the social risk factors are near 1.

References:

Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010. Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

NQF #2436

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity. Quasi-R²: For a traditional linear model (i.e., ordinary least squares regression), R² is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R² that is akin to the R² of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a “quasi- R²” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R² that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R² results are consistent with R²s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure. Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model. The payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program.

We do not dispute that there are differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the dual eligibility variable, mean observed payments are higher for patients with the social risk factor

compared with patients without the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). The question we are trying to address with our analyses is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between adjusted and unadjusted risk-standardized payments are near 1.

In addition, adjusting for social risk factors would likely remove an important hospital-level effect. A 2019 study, described in the testing attachment and authored by the developer, showed that differences in hospital-level payments for heart failure and pneumonia were associated with hospital characteristics independently from patient characteristics (Krumholz et al, 2019). The study design held constant the social determinants of health that were not expected to change between the two admissions and compared the same people at two different hospitals so that behaviors, social context, and demographic characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were the same. The authors compared payments for the same Medicare patient for two admissions for the same condition – one admission to a low-payment hospital and one admission to a high-payment hospital – and found that patients who were admitted to hospitals with the highest payment profiles incurred higher costs than when they were admitted to hospitals with the lowest payment profiles. The findings suggest that variations in payments to hospitals are, at least in part, associated with the hospitals independently of non-time-varying patient characteristics.

References:

Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010.

Krumholz, H. M., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Lin, Z., Bernheim, S. M., Xu, X., Desai, N. R., & Normand, S.T. 2019. Association of Hospital Payment Profiles With Variation in 30-Day Medicare Cost for Inpatients With Heart Failure or Pneumonia. *JAMA network open*, 2(11), e1915604.

Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

NQF #2579

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity.

Quasi-R2: For a traditional linear model (i.e., ordinary least squares regression), R2 is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R2 that is akin to the R2 of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a “quasi-R2” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R2 that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R2 results are consistent with R2s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure.

Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model. The payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program. We do not dispute that there are differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the dual eligibility variable, mean observed payments are higher for patients with the social risk factor compared with patients without the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). The question we are trying to address with our analysis is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between adjusted and unadjusted risk-standardized payments are near 1. In addition, adjusting for social risk factors would likely remove an important hospital-level effect. A 2019 study, described in the testing attachment and authored by the developer, showed that differences in hospital-level payments for heart failure and pneumonia were associated with hospital characteristics independently from patient characteristics (Krumholz et al, 2019). The study design held constant the social determinants of health that were not expected to change between the two admissions and compared the same people at two different hospitals so that behaviors, social context, and demographic characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were the same. The authors compared payments for the same Medicare patient for two admissions for the same condition – one admission to a low-payment hospital and one admission to a high-payment hospital – and found that patients who were admitted to hospitals with the highest payment profiles incurred higher costs than when they were admitted to hospitals with the lowest payment profiles. The findings suggest that variations in payments to hospitals are, at least in part, associated with the hospitals independently of non-time-varying patient characteristics.

References:

Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010.

Krumholz, H. M., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Lin, Z., Bernheim, S. M., Xu, X., Desai, N. R., & Normand, S.T. 2019. Association of Hospital Payment Profiles With Variation in 30-Day Medicare Cost for Inpatients With Heart Failure or Pneumonia. *JAMA network open*, 2(11), e1915604.

Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

Theme 3 – COST AND QUALITY CORRELATION

The AMA voiced concern with how the developer was unable to demonstrate the correlation between the cost measures (#2431, #2436, and #2579) and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs. The commenter noted that the developer mentions that cost measures should not be evaluated alone in the measure specifications.

Committee Response

Thank you for your comments. The Standing Committee and NQF recognize that cost and resource use measures should be used in the context of and reported with quality measures.

The Standing Committee discussed the relationship between cost and quality measures, emphasizing the importance of reporting performance to demonstrate improvements in cost while ensuring similar or higher levels of care quality. Additionally, the current NQF cost and efficiency endorsement criteria do not require specifications or testing of a paired quality measure.

Developer Response

NQF #2431

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly, measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care.

Value of care

Looking at payment measures together with quality-of-care measures (such as death rates or complication rates) allows you to compare the value of care between hospitals. The payment measures add up the payments for care... [Read more](#)

Heart attack

Death rate for heart attack patients	16% Worse than the national rate National result: 12.3% Number of included patients: 226
Payment for heart attack patients	\$29,513 Greater than the national average payment National average payment: \$26,304 Number of included patients: 216

In addition, each spring, hospitals receive a detailed report of all the patients included in the measure, along with detailed breakdowns of post-acute care costs. Therefore, the payment measures provide an opportunity for hospitals to explore the drivers of costs for their patients and assess the payment measure results in the context of the quality of care they provide to patients.

NQF #2436

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly,

measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are less than the national average and quality that is better than the national rate, suggesting high-value care.

Heart failure

Death rate for heart failure patients	9.1% Better than the national rate National result: 11.2% Number of included patients: 972
Payment for heart failure patients	\$17,052 Less than the national average payment National average payment: \$18,060 Number of included patients: 949

In addition, each spring, hospitals receive a detailed report of all the patients included in the measure, along with detailed breakdowns of post-acute care costs. Therefore, the payment measures provide an opportunity for hospitals to explore the drivers of costs for their patients and assess the payment measure results in the context of the quality of care they provide to patients.

NQF #2579

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly, measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care.

Pneumonia

Death rate for pneumonia patients	18.4% Worse than the national rate National result: 15.3% Number of included patients: 537
Payment for pneumonia patients	\$19,915 Greater than the national average payment National average payment: \$18,776 Number of included patients: 495

In addition, each spring, hospitals receive a detailed report of all the patients included in the measure, along with detailed breakdowns of post-acute care costs. Therefore, the payment measures provide an opportunity for hospitals to explore the drivers of costs for their patients and assess the payment measure results in the context of the quality of care they provide to patients.

Member Expression of Support

Throughout the 16-week continuous public commenting period, NQF members had the opportunity to express their support (*'Support'* or *'Do Not Support'*) for each measure submitted for endorsement consideration to inform the Standing Committee's recommendations. One NQF member provided their expressions of nonsupport. [Appendix C](#) details the expression of support.

Appendix A: CSAC Checklist

The table below lists the key considerations to inform the CSAC's review of the measures submitted for endorsement consideration.

Key Consideration	Yes/No	Notes
Were there any process concerns raised during the CDP project? If so, briefly explain.	No	*
Did the Standing Committee receive requests for reconsideration? If so, briefly explain.	No	*
Did the Standing Committee overturn any of the Scientific Methods Panel's ratings of Scientific Acceptability? If so, state the measure and why the measure was overturned.	No	*
If a recommended measure is a related and/or competing measure, was a rationale provided for the Standing Committee's recommendation? If not, briefly explain.	N/A	*
Were any measurement gap areas addressed? If so, identify the areas.	No	*
Are there additional concerns that require CSAC discussion? If so, briefly explain.	No	*

* Cells left intentionally blank

Appendix B: Measures Not Recommended for Endorsement

The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee recommended all candidate measures for endorsement.

Appendix C: NQF Member Expression of Support Results

One NQF member provided their expressions of nonsupport for three of the five measures under review. Results for each measure are provided below.

NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE)

Member Council	Support	Do Not Support	Total
Health Professional	0	1	1

NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE)

Member Council	Support	Do Not Support	Total
Health Professional	0	1	1

NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE)

Member Council	Support	Do Not Support	Total
Health Professional	0	1	1

Appendix D: Details of Measure Evaluation

Rating Scale: H=High; M=Moderate; L=Low; I=Insufficient; NA=Not Applicable; Y=Yes; N=No

Vote totals may differ between measure criteria and between measures as Standing Committee members often have to join calls late or leave calls early. NQF ensures that quorum is maintained for all live voting. All voting outcomes are calculated using the number of Standing Committee members present during the meeting for that vote as the denominator. Denominator vote counts may vary throughout the criteria due to intermittent Standing Committee attendance fluctuation. The vote totals reflect members present and eligible to vote at the time of the vote. During all three meetings, the quorum (13 out of 19 active Standing Committee members) required for voting was not achieved. Therefore, the Standing Committee discussed all relevant criteria and voted after the meeting using an online voting tool.

Measures Recommended

NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index

Measure Worksheet

Description: The Resource Use Index (RUI) is a risk-adjusted measure of the frequency and intensity of services utilized to manage a provider group's patients. Resource use includes all resources associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Resource Use Index when viewed together with the Total Cost of Care measure (NQF #1604) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of healthcare costs.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model. Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

Level of Analysis: Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice

Setting of Care: Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims

Measure Steward: HealthPartners

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 9, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2017. They also noted the similarity between this submission and the previous submission in 2017 with regard to the data the developer cited. These data demonstrated that healthcare spending constitutes a high proportion (17%) of the United States (U.S.) gross domestic product (GDP), and high healthcare costs contribute to adults forgoing healthcare. The developers suggested that this measure can support a comprehensive measurement system to identify areas of overuse.
- Some Standing Committee members raised concerns with the scope of improvement for this measure. The Standing Committee emphasized that lower cost does not necessarily correlate to improved quality. The Standing Committee noted that if cost and quality aren't highly correlated then there may be a risk of potential unintended consequences, such as lowering the quality of care provided. The Standing Committee asked the developer how they would address this

challenge to prevent inadvertently reducing the quality of care. The developer explained that this measure is used to optimize health and patient experience while improving affordability. To that regard, when implementing the measures (both NQF #1598 and #1604), the goal is to use quality and resource together so that both improve. The developer emphasized that the impact on quality of care is the greatest when this resource use measure (NQF #1598) and NQF #1604, which is a cost measure, are implemented together.

- The Standing Committee reviewed the performance scores across measured provider groups of total resource use from 2017 – 2019 dates of service, which noted that out of the 65 provider groups measured in the Total Resource Use measure, 26 were better than average; 3 were 10% better than average; 12 were 10% higher than average; and 50 were within 10% of the average.
- The Standing Committee also acknowledged that the developers discovered that the insurance product also contributed with a \$133 difference in cost between commercial and Medicaid. The variation in resource use was much less; however, it was still significant, with Medicaid-covered members utilizing \$75 more of resources.
- One Standing Committee member asked for further understanding of the type of distribution represented by the improvement data provided by the developer, specifically the meaningful difference in performance data that noted 26 providers were better than average, three were 10 percent better than average, 12 were 10 percent higher than average, and 50 were within 10 percent of the average and the type of distribution. The developer clarified that the data demonstrated a normal distribution (i.e., slightly skewed towards the higher side) with variation in performance among the total providers included in the measure over time.
- A Standing Committee member raised concern that based on the measure submission document, the measure aims to make resources comparable across settings, which indicates that the location where the service was provided does not matter; however, the reimbursement differs based on where the service was provided, and the total care relative resource values (TCRRV) table does not allow one to ascertain where the service was provided. The developer explained that the difference in the setting will not show up in the current total resource use measure (NQF #1598); however, it will show up in the total cost measure (NQF #1604). Once again, they emphasized that the two measures should be used together for a comprehensive view on how cost, resource use, and price interact with one another.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure gives a top-line indication of resource use; as a result, the health systems and provider groups would need to get involved to determine which opportunity for improvement to focus on and put interventions in place for improvement. Ultimately, the Standing Committee agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-7; M-7; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-7; L-2; I-0** (denominator = 14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah's recusal)

Rationale

Reliability

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. The developer used two methods to demonstrate the repeatability of the results, using bootstrapped averages with full replacement and a 90 percent random sampling without replacement approach, which approximates controlling for case mix. The variances from Actual RUI ranged from -0.0037 to 0.0062 in the bootstrap to -0.0019 to 0.0016 in the 90 percent sample.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for reliability (**SMP total votes:9; H-4; M-3; L-0; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee noted the SMP's concerns with this measure's intended use for the HealthPartners data set, and the testing wouldn't be generalizable to other practices. The Standing Committee then asked the developers to clarify whether they have tested the measure on any other data set outside of the HealthPartners data set.

- The developers explained that HealthPartners has a network of providers, and they only have availability of those data. Therefore, they do not have access to the data for providers outside of their network. Other organizations have implemented and are using the measure nationally; however, they also do not have access to that data. The developers added that the testing is broad enough for the measure to be potentially used to infer its effectiveness in other markets, as seen with the other organizations using the measure, such as Network for Regional Healthcare Improvement (NRHI) in California, Minnesota Community Measurement, and other organizations. The developers elaborated that the Minnesota Community Measurement releases a report each year that combines data from four different plans across Minnesota, and in comparing the yearly trends, Minnesota Community Measurement has observed improvement each year.
- In reviewing the testing methods, both the SMP and the Standing Committee noted that the bootstrap and 90% random sampling theoretically work for large sample; however, it is unclear how the results would change when applied to smaller providers groups (providers with less than 600 members).
- The developers agreed that lower provider sizes indicate higher variation, but this measure can be used with lower provider sizes and can still produce reliable results due to the removal of outliers, which can drastically affect the average value.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions or concerns regarding reliability for this measure and passed the measure on this criterion.
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for reliability.

Validity

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for validity (**SMP Total votes: 9; H-4; M-2; L-1; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee observed that three approaches were used to assess validity: (1) critical data elements were correlated with each other and utilization; (2) performance measure score was validated against "known risk-adjusted utilization metrics"; and (3) high/low performing groups were compared on utilization and RUI (although this largely shows the validity of the risk adjustor). Face validity was determined through a 45-day comment period.
- The Standing Committee considered that the correlations between the non-risk adjusted Place of Service Metrics and non-risk-adjusted PMPMs & non-risk-adjusted TCRRVs range between 0.55 and 0.84; the non-risk-adjusted resource composite is correlated with ACGs, non-risk-adjusted PMPMs, and non-risk-adjusted TCRRVs ranging between 0.77 and 0.95.
- One Standing Committee member questioned whether the TCRRV incorporates pricing. The developer clarified that the TCRRVs are constructed in a way that removes price from the methodology so that average paid amount is standardized across all hospital providers.
- The Standing Committee considered that the Total Resource Use measure uses the proprietary Johns Hopkins Adjusted Clinical Grouper (ACG), which adjusts for variation in risk profile using age, gender, and diagnosis (clinical risk adjustment). The measure is also limited by insurance coverage to commercial only. The developer considered education and income for risk adjustment, but they did not include these social risk factors in the final model.
- Another Standing Committee member noted that presenting correlation coefficients with adjusted clinical groups (ACG) scores were appropriate; however, they raised concerns on how to interpret the correlation coefficient with non-risk-adjusted PMPMs because the model is, in fact, risk-adjusted. The developer explained that when the measure is not risk-adjusted, the correlations are high between the PMPMs and the TCRRVs. The developer is trying to draw a parallel between some known utilization markers, such as ACGs and TCRRVs, to demonstrate that TCRRVs are a good reflection of resource use. The developers further explained that they are comparing the non-risk-adjusted PMPM to the correlation coefficients of ACG because ACGs are a proven measure of resources, and by showing that TCRRVs align well with ACGs, it illustrates that TCRRVs are also a good metric for resource use.
- The Standing Committee also noted that the truncation level of 125,000 TCRRVs is used for the measure and TCRRVs per member above 125,000 are excluded (truncated). They raised

concerns about excluding patients over the age of 64 years and questioned the rationale for using the truncation level of 125,000 TCRRVs. The developer noted that members over the age of 64 are excluded due to potential incomplete claims data of Medicare eligible beneficiary. Sometimes, certain members have dual coverage, meaning they are in both Medicare and commercial plans; therefore, due to the difficulty in parsing out the costs that are paid for by Medicare versus the commercial plan, members over the age of 64 were excluded. In terms of truncation, the developer noted that truncation level was selected to stay aligned with healthcare costs and ensure stability of the measure. TCRRVs per member above \$125,000 are excluded (truncated).

- One of the Standing Committee members also expressed need for a different approach for looking at social risk factors because the testing data do not match the reality that race and income have an impact on the measured outcome. It was noted that testing the addition of just one or two socioeconomic status (SES) factors obscures the impact on the measured outcome due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities), and stratifying results by SES factors would likely reveal more disparities. The developer stated that as NQF's technical guidance on risk adjustment becomes finalized, the developer will take that into consideration when evolving their criteria for risk adjustment and including SES factors in the risk adjustment model.
- Without any further concerns, the Standing Committee passed the measure on the validity criterion.
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-6; M-9; L-0; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- Standing Committee members expressed concern that the implementation of the measure requires the use of ACGs, which must be licensed separately and maybe be cost-prohibitive for some entities.
- The developers noted that while ACG is proprietary, the developer has organized a public-facing website with several resources and technical documentation, including toolkits for external organizations to download the necessary tools to run the measure free of charge. The developer has created instructions and toolkits for both SAS and non-SAS users.
- The Standing Committee did not express any further concerns and voted the measure to be feasible.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0 4b. Usability: Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-13; L-0; I-0

Rationale

- Some Standing Committee members expressed general concerns about the specifications not being fully transparent and noted that it was unclear on how the measure was being reported and used.
- Standing Committee members also questioned how the feedback on quality improvement was being provided to the provider groups and asked the developers to clarify what type of feedback was being provided.
- The developer stated that they provide quarterly comprehensive reports and monthly patient applications to best support providers in identifying opportunities for improving affordability for their patients, while at the same time supporting patient outreach, pre-visit planning, and care coordination efforts. The developer also engages with its provider groups and network on an ongoing basis and organized a public-facing website with several resources and technical

documentation, including toolkits for external organizations to download the necessary tools to run the measure, free of charge.

- One Standing Committee member asked whether there are any data on whether this measure causes any harm to patients. The developer confirmed that they have not received any such feedback on any harm caused by this measure.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure has been used as a quality improvement tool within the HealthPartners network, and the developer has shown that it has been used by external organizations; they are collecting feedback on the measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional questions or concerns, passed the measure on usability and use, and recommended this measure for continued endorsement.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- No related or competing measures are noted.

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Y-15; N-0

7. Public and Member Comment

N/A

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index

Measure Worksheet

Description: The Total Cost of Care reflects a mix of complicated factors, such as patient illness burden, service utilization, and negotiated prices. The Total Cost Index (TCI) is a measure of a primary care provider's risk-adjusted cost effectiveness at managing the population they care for. TCI includes all costs associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Total Cost Index when viewed together with the Total Resource Use measure (NQF #1598) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of health care costs.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model. Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

Level of Analysis: Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice

Setting of Care: Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims

Measure Steward: HealthPartners

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 9, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was previously endorsed in 2017, in which the developer cited data demonstrating that healthcare spending constitutes a high proportion (17%) of the U.S. GDP, and high healthcare costs contribute to adults forgoing healthcare. The developers suggested that this measure can support a comprehensive measurement system to identify areas of overuse.
- The Standing Committee reviewed the performance scores across measured provider groups of total resource use from 2017–2019 dates of service, which noted that out of the 65 provider groups measured in Total Resource Use measure, 26 were better than average; 3 were 10% better than average; 12 were 10% higher than average; and 50 were within 10% of the average.

- The Standing Committee also acknowledged that the developers discovered that the insurance product also contributed significantly, with a \$207 difference in cost between commercial and Medicaid. The variation in resource use was much less; however, it was still significant, with Medicaid-covered members utilizing \$55 more of resources.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure is very similar to NQF #1598, and the concerns raised for that measure also apply to this measure (NQF #1604). The developer also noted the similarity in the two measures (NQF #1598 and NQF #1604) and added that the difference between the two measures is in the costing approach. NQF #1598 is measuring resource use for every service, while NQF #1604 utilizes an allowed amount, which reflects the plan liability and member liability.
- In comparing the two measures, one Standing Committee member questioned how the incorporation of reimbursements in this measure affects providers practicing in higher cost-of-living and higher geographic wage areas versus lower cost-of-living and lower geographic wage areas. The developer clarified that the cost differential is driven by price differential, and this measure can show the cost variation that is occurring across different states.
- One Standing Committee member further questioned whether the developer was conducting stratification to confirm that the differences in cost across providers is due to practice style and not the geographic differences in the labor wage rates. The developer confirmed the measure is applied in that manner so that the comparison is made among the providers in the same wage market.
- The Standing Committee noted that the other concerns discussed regarding the importance to measure and report criterion for NQF #1598 also apply to this measure and agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare and passed the measure on this criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-8; M-6; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-8; L-3; I-0** (denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee noted that this measure was evaluated by the SMP and was given a high rating for both reliability (**SMP total votes: 9; H-4; M-3; L-0; I-2**) and validity (**SMP Total votes: 9; H-4; M-2; L-1; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee once again emphasized that the concerns for reliability and validity of this measure are like those raised for NQF #1598.
- The Standing Committee requested additional documentation from the developers regarding the signal-to-noise analysis, which the developer offered to share with the Standing Committee after the meeting, for reference.
- One Standing Committee member asked how a patient is attributed to different clinical practices, specifically what the attribution rules are when there are multimorbid patients who are being handled by multiple providers. The developer explained that they used 12 months of claims data to identify the primary care provider that the member visited most frequently.
- The Standing Committee did not have any further questions or concerns and passed the measure on reliability and validity.
- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. The developer used two methods to demonstrate the repeatability of the results. To measure the reliability of the TCI measure, the actual results were compared to the results calculated by two sampling methods: bootstrapping and a 90 percent random sample. The differences between the actual total cost index (TCI) results and both the bootstrap and 90 percent sample results are very small, ranging from -0.0032 to 0.0066 in the bootstrap to -0.0026 to 0.0025 in the 90 percent sample.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for reliability
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred

offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for reliability.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-7; L-1; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee observed that barriers to access are present because the ACG system is proprietary; however, this has been addressed by the training, software, and data collection provided by the developer. Therefore, the Standing Committee passed the measure on feasibility without any additional concerns.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-5; M-8; L-2; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee questioned whether the performance results are available to outside organizations or practices whose performance is being measured. The developers once again emphasized that most of the external organizations publish performance reports publicly, while others do not.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the concerns for usability and use are like those for NQF #1598 and passed the measure on usability and use.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- No related or competing measures are noted.

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-14; N-1

7. Public and Member Comment

N/A

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

#NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Measure Worksheet

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-5; M-9; L-1; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2015.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited AMI as one of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. roughly \$84.9 billion in direct and indirect costs.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$25,561 with a range of \$17,488 – \$32,81 for a reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$25,422 (interquartile range of \$24,859 – \$26,165).
- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee discussed whether this measure is linked to quality. The developer mentioned that this measure is intended to be used in conjunction with other outcome measures, beyond mortality, which would be indicators of quality.
- The Standing Committee considered whether it would be up to the hospital to find the right quality score or would the measure results be presented in a manner that will help hospitals manage and reduce the variation.
- The developer confirmed that this measure is intended to be reported together with other quality measures, such as mortality. The measure results would be reported to the hospitals, including how hospitals compared to other hospitals, in this case for the mortality measure. The developer also mentioned that this measure is not in a pay-for-performance program. Rather, it is used in a pay-for-reporting program, in which the broader goal is to make hospitals health conscious. There is no penalty for being above or below the national average. Hospitals are rewarded if they report on this measure.
- CMS stated that the purpose of this measure, along with several other condition-specific cost measures, is to promote transparency, as well as target cost reductions. CMS has a Medicare Spending per Beneficiary measure that covers a much broader list of conditions and to which payments are made based on the performance of that measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-6; L-3; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-7; L-3; I-1** (denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.
- The developer conducted measure-score level reliability testing: calculating the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) using a split sample (i.e., test-retest) method for hospitals with 25 admissions or more.
- Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.681.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes:8; H-3, M-5, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked whether signal-to-noise tests were conducted. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the median signal-to-noise was 0.404 with an IQR of 0.298 to 0.594. One Standing Committee member raised concern that with some of the other measures, the Standing Committee has considered higher cutoffs rather than 0.4, such as 0.6 or 0.7.

- It was noted that the SMP is reviewing various thresholds of reliability to determine which ones are acceptable. In addition, CMS has looked at 0.4 as an acceptable threshold due to the trade-offs of trying to include more facilities or providers within the measure to promote more transparency across the system.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developer-convened Technical Expert Panel (TEP) members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing comparing this measure to the Medicare Spending per Beneficiary (MSPB) measure. The developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.281 ($p < .0001$), meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with AMI.
- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly increased up to 0.078, suggesting that about 8 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes: 8; H-1, M-5, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that testing the addition of just one or two social risk factors obscures the impact due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities). Stratifying results by social risk would likely reveal more disparities.
- The developer noted that it tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as social risk factors. The developer found that the two social risk factors did have slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these social risk factors had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated with hospitals with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated.
- NQF staff stated that NQF is currently developing technical guidance, which was out for public comment at the time of this review, that will provide more clarity for developers and NQF Standing Committees in conducting social risk factor adjustment within quality measurement. NQF staff further noted that this guidance will not change NQF evaluation criteria until the guidance is finalized at the end of next year (2022).
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-8; M-7; L-0; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-1; M-10; L-3; I-1**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted the very small differences in hospital-level RSPs for the AMI payment in 2018-2019 compared with the prior individual years

(2016/2017; 2017/2018). The median RSPs for each year were \$25,248, \$25,539, and \$25,542, for 2016/17, 2017/18, and 2018/19, respectively.

- The Standing Committee asked whether any longer-term harms of the measure's use have been identified. The developer stated that they did not identify any unintended consequences during measure development and test.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0230 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0505 Hospital 30-Day All-Cause Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization.
 - NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
 - NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)
 - NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)
 - NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Y-11; N-4

7. Public and Member Comment

- The American Medical Association (AMA) voiced concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2431 (median-0.404; 0.298-0.594).
- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2431 (r-squared=0.078).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)

[Measure Worksheet](#)

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement:

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-4; M-9; L-2; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2015.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited HF as one of the top three leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and is projected to cost the U.S. up to \$70 billion in direct and indirect costs by 2030.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$17,722 with a range of \$13,171 – \$27,996 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$17,607 (interquartile range of \$16,817 – \$18,513).
- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-6; M-8; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-2; M-9; L-3; I-0** (denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee achieved sufficient attendance and did not achieve quorum. Therefore, the Standing Committee voted offline on reliability and validity instead of voting to accept the SMP rating.
- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.
- The developer conducted measure-score level reliability testing: calculating the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) using a split sample (i.e., test-retest) method for hospitals with 25 admissions or more.
- Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.781.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes 8; H-5, M-3, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the HF payment signal-to-noise reliability values had a mean of 0.666, a median of 0.679, and an IQR of 0.528 – 0.801.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developer-convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. The developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.543, meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with HF.

- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly decreased to 0.031, suggesting that about 3 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes 8; H-2, M-4, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that testing the addition of just one or two social risk factors obscures the impact due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities). Stratifying results by social risk would likely reveal more disparities.
- The developer noted that it tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as social risk factors. The developer found that the two social risk factors did have slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these social risk factors had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated with hospitals both with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-6; M-9; L-0; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-8; L-4; I-1**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$17,607 for the HF payment measure for the 3-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 2.6 percent from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$17,781) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$17,310).
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 for usability apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0229 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0330 Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

- NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
- NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)
- NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)
- NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-14; N-1

7. Public and Member Comment

- The American Medical Association voiced concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2436 (median-0.679; 0.528-0.801).
- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2436 (r-squared=0.031).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)

Measure Worksheet

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia (PN) episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of PN or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) who have a secondary discharge diagnosis of PN coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-3; M-10; L-2; I-0**
(denominator=15)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2014.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited pneumonia (PN) as one of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. approximately \$13.4 billion annually.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$18,283 with a range of \$10,529 – \$29,861 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$18,200 (interquartile range \$17,015 – \$19,453).

- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-9; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-9; L-1; I-1** (denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.
- The Standing Committee reviewed the testing information, in which the developer conducted a split sample reliability to test agreement between two independent subsets of patients within hospitals. The developer calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient for hospitals with 25 admissions or more. Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.815.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes:8; H-5, M-3, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the mean signal-to-noise was 0.820, the median was 0.8554, and the interquartile range was 0.7472 to 0.919.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2436 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which 10 of the 16 developer-convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. The developer found a correlation between PN RSPs and the MSPB score of 0.588, suggesting that hospitals with higher performance on this measure are more likely to have higher MSPB measure performance scores.
- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the updated, calculated R-squared result was 0.076.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes: 8; H-2, M-4, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that the developer presents analyses that show a significant association between dual eligibility (but not low AHRQ SES) and higher payments, even after adjusting for other risk factors in a multivariable model. The addition of the social risk variables has little impact on model performance and produces little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated for hospitals both with and without dual eligibility are highly correlated (0.999). The developer noted that CMS ultimately decided to not adjust this measure for either dual eligibility or the AHRQ SES Index.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2579 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0 (denominator=15)

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-9; L-4; I-0**
(denominator=15)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that the developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$18,200 for the PN payment measure for the 3-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 1% from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$18,226) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$18,037).
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and NQF #2579 for usability apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0230 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0468 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Pneumonia hospitalization
 - NQF #0506 Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization
 - NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
 - NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)
 - NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-15; N-0

7. Public and Member Comment

- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2579 (r-squared=0.076).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals



**NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM**

Driving measurable health
improvements together

<https://www.qualityforum.org>

Cost and Efficiency Spring 2021 Review Cycle

CSAC Review

November 30 – December 1, 2021

*Funded by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services under
contract HHSM-500-2017-00060I Task Order HHSM-500-T0001*



Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee Recommendations

- **Five measures reviewed for Spring 2021**
 - ▣ **All Five measures were reviewed by the Scientific Methods Panel**
 - ▣ All five measures reviewed passed SMP on reliability and validity
- **Five measures recommended for endorsement:**
 - ▣ **#1598** Total Resource Use Population-based PMPM Index (HealthPartners) (Maintenance)
 - ▣ **#1604** Total Cost of Care Population-based PMPM Index (HealthPartners) (Maintenance)
 - ▣ **#2431** Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE) (Maintenance)
 - ▣ **#2436** Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE) (Maintenance)
 - ▣ **#2579** Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services/Yale CORE) (Maintenance)

Overarching Issues for Cost and Efficiency Measures

■ **Cost and Quality Correlations (measures #2431, #2436, #2579)**

- The Standing Committee questioned whether the developer was able to demonstrate that the hospitals being measured could demonstrate improvements in costs while ensuring similar or higher levels of quality. Specifically, the Standing Committee was interested in the relationship between performance on the cost and quality measures.
- Some Standing Committee members expressed concern about possible trade-offs between performing well on the cost measures at the expense of lower-quality performance.

■ **Reliability Thresholds (measures #2431, #2436)**

- The Standing Committee expressed concern that the signal-to-noise reliability statistics and the low reliability thresholds.
- For several review cycles, the Standing Committee has recognized the challenge of achieving acceptable thresholds for measure score reliability statistics.

■ **Social Risk Adjustment (measures #2431, #2436, #2579)**

- Concern with the way testing was conducted for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results.

Cost and Efficiency: Public and Member Comment and Member Expressions of Support

- 3 comments received
 - ▣ All three comments do not support the measures under review (#2431, #2436, #2579)
 - ▣ Two are not supportive due to concerns regarding the signal-to-noise reliability statistics and minimum reliability thresholds (measure #2431 and #2436).
 - ▣ All three comments were not in support of the risk adjustment model and cost and quality correlations (measure #2431, #2436, #2579).
- One NQF member provided expressions of support and non-support for three measures under review.
 - » No members expressed support of the recommend measures for endorsement.
 - » One member expressed non-support of measures #2431, #2436, and #2579.

Cost and Efficiency Contact Information

- NQF Project Team:
 - ▣ Matt Pickering, PharmD, Sr. Director
 - ▣ LeeAnn White, MS, BSN, Director
 - ▣ Monika Harvey, MBA, PMP, Project Manager
 - ▣ Isaac Sakyi, MSGH, Manager
 - ▣ Karri Albanese, BA, Analyst
 - ▣ Tristan Wind, BS, ACHE-SA, Coordinator
 - ▣ Taroon Amin, PhD, Consultant
- Project Webpage: [https://www.qualityforum.org/Cost and Efficiency.aspx](https://www.qualityforum.org/Cost_and_Efficiency.aspx)
- Project email address: efficiency@qualityforum.org



**NATIONAL
QUALITY FORUM**
Driving measurable health
improvements together

Cost and Efficiency, Spring 2021 Cycle: CDP Technical Report

**DRAFT REPORT FOR CSAC REVIEW
NOVEMBER 30, 2021**

This report is funded by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
under contract HHSM-500-2017-00060I Task Order HHSM-500-TO001.

<https://www.qualityforum.org>

Contents

Executive Summary	37
Introduction	38
NQF Portfolio of Performance Measures for Cost and Efficiency Conditions	38
Table 1. NQF Cost and Efficiency Portfolio of Measures	39
Cost and Efficiency Measure Evaluation	39
Table 2. Cost and Efficiency Measure Evaluation Summary	39
Comments Received Prior to Committee Evaluation	39
Comments Received After Standing Committee Evaluation	39
Overarching Issues	40
Summary of Measure Evaluation	41
References	52
Appendix A: Details of Measure Evaluation.....	53
Measures Recommended	53
NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index	53
NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index.....	57
NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode- of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)	59
NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode- of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)	63
Appendix B: Cost and Efficiency Portfolio—Use in Federal Programs.....	69
Appendix C: Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee and NQF Staff	71
Appendix D: Measure Specifications	74
1598 Total Resource Use Population-based PMPM Index.....	74
1604 Total Cost of Care Population-based PMPM Index.....	75
2431 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)	75
2436 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF).....	79
2579 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)	81
Appendix E: Related and Competing Measures	84
Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #0230	84
Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #0505	92
Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2158	101

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2436	107
Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2579	114
Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #3474	121
Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #0229	129
Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #0330	137
Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #2158	146
Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #2579	152
Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #3474	160
Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0230	167
Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0468	175
Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0506	184
Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #2158	192
Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #3474	198
Appendix F: Pre-Evaluation Comments	206
Appendix G: Post-Evaluation Comments	207
NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI), Comment #1	207
Comment.....	207
Developer Response	208
NQF Response:	210
NQF Committee Response:	210
NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF), Comment #2.....	211
Comment.....	211
Developer Response:	212
NQF Response:	214
NQF Committee Response:	214
NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN), Comment #3.....	215
Comment.....	216
Developer Response	216
NQF Response:	217
NQF Committee Response:	217

Executive Summary

In 2019, total Medicare expenditures were \$799.4 billion, representing 3.6 percent of the gross domestic product (GDP).¹ Current estimates suggest that Medicare spending will grow 7.6 percent per year between 2019 and 2028.¹ This growth in spending underscores the need to create incentives for high value care. Measuring costs in a way that is transparent to consumers and unbiased to providers is an important component of understanding and controlling costs of care and rewarding value. Measuring condition-specific costs of care is needed to identify high value care.

As reducing costs continues to be a focus of healthcare reform, it is important to understand the current use of resources in the healthcare system as it relates to quality—especially how resource use relates to health outcomes. The Improving Medicare Post-Acute Care Transformation Act (IMPACT) of 2014 and the Medicare Access and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Reauthorization Act of 2015 (MACRA) require the use of resource use measures to support payment reform efforts. The results of resource use measures will also be included on the Physician Compare website and will ultimately be included in the Merit-Based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) for physicians. Identifying and providing incentives for providers to deliver efficient care (i.e., high quality, lower cost) require quality measures as well as cost and resource use measures. Such measures position the healthcare system to evaluate the efficiency of care and stimulate changes in practice to improve value.

For this project, the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee evaluated five measures undergoing maintenance review against the National Quality Forum’s (NQF) standard evaluation criteria. The Standing Committee recommended all five measures for continued endorsement. The recommended measures are listed below:

- NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index (HealthPartners)
- NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index (HealthPartners)
- NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services [CMS]/Yale Centers for Outcomes Research and Evaluation [CORE])
- NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF) (CMS/Yale CORE)
- NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN) (CMS/Yale CORE)

Summaries of the spring 2021 measures and the Standing Committee’s discussion are included in the body of the report. Detailed summaries of the Standing Committee’s discussion and ratings of the criteria for each measure are in [Appendix A](#).

Introduction

From 1975 to 2020, healthcare spending as a share of GDP more than doubled, from 7.9 percent to 18.0 percent.² In addition, Medicare spending as a share of GDP nearly quadrupled, from 1.0 percent to 3.9 percent.² Driven by growth in the volume and intensity of services provided to beneficiaries and the number of beneficiaries aging into the program, Medicare's annual spending is projected to double from \$782 billion to \$1.5 trillion in the 10-year period between 2019 and 2029.²

These concerning trends can be attributed to many causes, including high costs for drugs, procedures, and administrative services, as well as poor coordination and overutilization of unnecessary health services. In 2019, payments under these hospital payment systems (e.g., inpatient prospective payment system [IPPS] and outpatient prospective payment system [OPPS]) totaled \$186 billion. In 2019, Medicare paid \$73.5 billion for clinician services, accounting for just under 18 percent of traditional fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare spending.² Some of these costs can be attributed to variations in practice patterns for common diseases and conditions. Pneumonia (PN), heart failure (HF), and acute myocardial infarctions (AMIs) are some of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and cost the United States (U.S.) around \$13.4 to \$84.9 billion in direct and indirect costs annually.³⁻⁵

This level of healthcare spending and growth has the potential to further increase federal deficits and debt or crowd out spending for other important national priorities.² Given this trend, healthcare cost measurement continues to be a critical component to assessing and improving the efficiency of the U.S. healthcare system. Improving U.S. health system efficiency has the potential to simultaneously reduce cost growth and improve the quality of care provided. Cost measures are the building blocks to efficiency and value. For nearly a decade, NQF has been working to advance cost and resource use measurement. NQF, with the guidance and support of the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee, continues to explore approaches and best practices for evaluating efficiency constructs.

During this spring 2021 cycle, the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee's evaluation was informed by inputs from the NQF Scientific Methods Panel (SMP), as well as other stakeholder comments. Five measures were submitted to the project for maintenance endorsement consideration and were reviewed by the SMP.

NQF Portfolio of Performance Measures for Cost and Efficiency Conditions

The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee ([Appendix C](#)) oversees NQF's portfolio of Cost and Efficiency measures ([Appendix B](#)), which includes both condition-specific and non-condition-specific measures. The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee's charge is to assess cost and resource use measures and efficiency more broadly, including measures that assess the efficiency of healthcare delivery. The Standing Committee seeks to take a more holistic view of drivers of healthcare spending and identify sources of inefficiency and waste across the system. This portfolio contains 13 cost/resource use measures (see Table 1 below).

Table 1. NQF Cost and Efficiency Portfolio of Measures

Sub-topic	Cost/Resource Use Measures
Condition-Specific	7
Non-Condition Specific	6
Total	13

Cost and Efficiency Measure Evaluation

On July 9, 13, and 27, 2021, the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee evaluated five measures undergoing maintenance review against NQF's [standard measure evaluation criteria](#).

Table 2. Cost and Efficiency Measure Evaluation Summary

Measure Summary	Maintenance	New	Total
Measures under review	5	0	5
Measures recommended for endorsement	5	0	5

Comments Received Prior to Committee Evaluation

NQF accepts comments on endorsed measures on an ongoing basis through the [Quality Positioning System \(QPS\)](#). In addition, NQF accepts comments for a continuous 16-week period during each evaluation cycle via an online tool located on the project webpage. For this evaluation cycle, the commenting period opened on May 6, 2021, and closed on September 27, 2021. As of June 17, 2017, no comments were submitted prior to the measure evaluation meeting (s).

Comments Received After Standing Committee Evaluation

The continuous 16-week public commenting period with NQF member support closed on September 27, 2021. Following the Committee's evaluation of the measures under review, NQF received three comments from one member organization pertaining to the draft report and to the measures under review ([Appendix G](#)). All comments for each measure under review have also been summarized in [Appendix A](#).

Throughout the 16-week continuous public commenting period, NQF members had the opportunity to express their support ('*Support*' or '*Do Not Support*') for each measure to inform the Standing Committee's recommendations during the commenting period. This expression of support (or not) during the commenting period replaces the member voting opportunity that was previously held subsequent to committee deliberations. One NQF member expressed that they are not in support of three measures.

Overarching Issues

During the Standing Committee's discussion of the measures, several overarching issues emerged that were factored into the Standing Committee's ratings and recommendations for multiple measures.

Linking Cost and Quality Measures

Cost measures are the building blocks to efficiency and value. When NQF launched its first effort to endorse cost and resource use measures in 2009, one of the foundational principles recognized that cost and resource use measures should be used in the context of and reported with quality measures. This remains an important principle guiding the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee. Reporting a cost or resource use measure in the absence of a quality signal does not provide patients or consumers with any indication as to what should be considered as either high or low cost and whether care was delivered efficiently.

During the spring 2021 measure evaluation proceedings, the Standing Committee questioned whether the developer was able to demonstrate that the hospitals being measured could demonstrate improvements in costs while ensuring similar or higher levels of quality. Specifically, the Standing Committee was interested in the relationship between performance on the cost and quality measures. Some Standing Committee members expressed concern about possible trade-offs between performing well on the cost measures at the expense of lower-quality performance. While the developers reported that they have performed some analysis in response to this question, it is not currently requested as part of the NQF submission process.

While NQF does aim to incorporate an evaluation of the link between cost and quality measures in future measure reviews, additional work is needed to establish criteria. Until this guidance can be established and implemented, the Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee will seek specifications and information on quality measures in the NQF portfolio that could be used in combination with the cost measures under review. Additionally, NQF will explore the feasibility of aligning the review of harmonized cost and quality measures as a precursor to assessing efficiency constructs. Efforts to facilitate the evaluation of efficiency constructs will focus on the nature of the information that should be solicited in the measure submission form to help the Standing Committee understand the link between the selected cost and quality measures and criteria upon which to base an evaluation.

Reliability Thresholds

The Standing Committee discussed variation in reliability due to the number of cases in practices or facilities, as greater variance can be inherent in practices with lower case volume. For several of the measures reviewed this cycle, the Standing Committee expressed concern that the signal-to-noise reliability statistics for hospitals with small case volumes may not be sufficient for the measure to be considered reliable. For several review cycles, the Standing Committee has recognized the challenge of achieving acceptable thresholds for measure score reliability statistics. Additionally, the Standing Committee considered that the SMP is reviewing various thresholds of reliability to determine which are acceptable. In addition, CMS has looked at 0.4 as an acceptable threshold due the trade-offs of trying to

include more facilities or providers within the measure to promote more transparency across the system.

Social Risk Adjustment

Cost and resource use measurement is influenced by the care received in a healthcare setting, clinical processes, and social risk factors (SRFs) (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, gender, social relationships, and residential and community context). While some of the measures this cycle did test for SRFs for the risk adjustment model, namely the Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) Index and dual eligibility, some of the measures under review did not include these SRFs in the final model. The Standing Committee recognized the need to ensure that providers who serve people with SRFs are not penalized unfairly by a lack of social risk adjustment. While the Standing Committee noted that it is important to maximize the predictive value of a risk adjustment model, understanding the role that SRFs play in clinical-cost episodes is critical. The impact of SRFs in cost and resource measures is unique in that these factors may ultimately increase overall costs through poor transitions and hand-offs or potentially lower resource use because of access-to-care challenges. Each cost and efficiency measure should be examined on a case-by-case basis to understand the role of patient SRFs in the measure.

The Standing Committee asked NQF staff whether any current work is being done at NQF to address the concerns regarding social risk factor adjustment within quality measurement. In response, Dr. Matt Pickering stated that NQF is currently developing [technical guidance](#) for social and/or functional status-related risk adjustment within quality measurement. This guidance will help to evolve NQF's current criteria, which will occur after 2022. Therefore, measures under review for the spring 2021 cycle must be evaluated under NQF's current criteria.

Summary of Measure Evaluation

The following summaries of the measure evaluation highlight the major issues that the Standing Committee considered. Details of the Standing Committee's discussion and ratings of the criteria for each measure are included in [Appendix A](#).

NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index (HealthPartners): Recommended

Description: The Resource Use Index (RUI) is a risk-adjusted measure of the frequency and intensity of services utilized to manage a provider group's patients. Resource use includes all resources associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

An RUI when viewed together with the Total Cost of Care measure (NQF #1604) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of health care costs. **Measure Type:** Cost/Resource Use; **Level of Analysis:** Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice; **Setting of Care:** Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care; **Data Source:** Claims

This measure was discussed during the initial measure evaluation web meeting on July 9, 2021. Originally endorsed in 2017, NQF #1598 is a risk-adjusted measure that focuses on the frequency and intensity of services utilized to manage a provider group's patients. In discussing the importance to measure and report criterion, some Standing Committee members raised concerns with the scope of improvement with this measure. The Standing Committee emphasized that lower cost does not necessarily correlate to improved quality. The Standing Committee noted that if cost and quality aren't highly correlated then there may be a risk of potential unintended consequences, such as lowering the quality of care provided. The Standing Committee asked the developer how they would address this challenge to prevent inadvertently reducing the quality of care. The developer explained that this measure is used to optimize health and patient experience while improving affordability. To that regard, when implementing the measures (both NQF #1598 and NQF #1604), the goal is to use quality and resource together so that both improve. The developer emphasized that the impact on quality of care is the greatest when NQF #1598, [which is] a resource use measure, and NQF #1604, [which is] a cost measure, are implemented together.

One Standing Committee member asked for further understanding of the type of distribution represented by the improvement data provided by the developer, specifically the meaningful difference in performance data that noted 26 providers were better than average, three were 10 percent better than average, 12 were 10 percent higher than average, and 50 were within 10 percent of the average. The developer clarified that the data demonstrated a normal distribution (i.e., slightly skewed towards the higher side) with variation in performance among the total providers being included in the measure over time. A Standing Committee member raised the following concern: Based on the measure submission document, the measure aims to make resources comparable across settings, which indicates that the location where the service was provided does not matter; however, the reimbursement differs based on where the service was provided, and the total care relative resource values (TCRRV) table does not allow one to ascertain where the service was provided. The developer explained that the difference in the setting will not show up in the current total resource use measure (NQF #1598); however, it will show up in the total cost measure (NQF #1604) and once again emphasized that the two measures should be used together for a comprehensive view on how cost, resource use, and price interact with one another. The Standing Committee observed that this measure gives a top-line indication of resource use; as a result, the health systems and provider groups would need to get involved to determine which opportunity for improvement to focus on and put interventions in place for improvement. Ultimately, the Standing Committee agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare.

The Standing Committee noted that the SMP evaluated and rated this measure as high for both reliability and validity. In evaluating reliability, the Standing Committee noted the SMP's concerns regarding the intended testing of this measure on the HealthPartners data set; as a result, the testing would not be generalizable to other practices. The Standing Committee then asked the developers to clarify whether they have tested the measure on any other data set outside of the HealthPartners data set. The developers explained that HealthPartners has a network of providers, and they only have access to those data. Therefore, they do not have access to the data for providers outside of their network.

Other organizations have implemented and are using the measure nationally; however, they also do not have access to those data. The developers added that the testing is broad enough for the measure to be potentially used to infer its effectiveness in other markets, as seen with the other organizations using the measure, such as the Network for Regional Healthcare Improvement (NRHI) in California, Minnesota (MN) Community Measurement, and other organizations. The developers elaborated that the MN Community Measurement releases a report each year that combines data from four different plans across Minnesota, and in comparing the yearly trends, MN Community Measurement has observed improvement each year. In reviewing the testing methods, both the SMP and the Standing Committee noted that both the bootstrap and the 90 percent random sampling theoretically work for a large sample; however, it is unclear how the results would change when applied to smaller providers' groups (i.e., providers with less than 600 members). The developers agreed that lower provider sizes indicate higher variation; nonetheless, this measure can be used with lower provider sizes and can still produce reliable results due to the removal of outliers, which can drastically have an impact on the average value. The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions or concerns regarding reliability and passed the measure on this criterion.

Regarding validity, one Standing Committee member questioned whether the TCRRV incorporates pricing. The developer clarified that the TCRRVs are constructed in a way that removes price from the methodology so that average paid amount is standardized across all hospital providers. Another Standing Committee member noted the appropriateness of presenting correlation coefficients with adjusted clinical groups (ACGs) scores; however, they raised concern on how to interpret the correlation coefficient with non-risk-adjusted per member per month (PMPM) because the model is, in fact, risk-adjusted. The developer explained that when the measure is not risk-adjusted, the correlations are high between the PMPMs and TCRRVs. The developer is trying to draw a parallel between some known healthcare utilization markers to demonstrate that TCRRVs are a good reflection of resource use. The developers further explained that they are comparing the non-risk-adjusted PMPM to the correlation coefficients of ACGs because ACGs are a proven measure of resources; in addition, by showing that TCRRVs align well with ACGs, it illustrates that TCRRVs are also good metrics for resource use. Some Standing Committee members also raised concern about excluding patients over the age of 64 and questioned the rationale for using the truncation level of 125,000 TCRRVs. The developer noted that members over the age of 64 are excluded due to potential incomplete claims data of Medicare eligible beneficiary. Sometimes, certain members have dual coverage, meaning they are in both Medicare and commercial plans; therefore, due to the difficulty in parsing out the costs that are paid for by Medicare versus the commercial plan, members over the age of 64 were excluded.

In terms of truncation, the developer noted that the truncation level was selected to stay aligned with healthcare costs and ensure stability of the measure. TCRRVs per member above \$125,000 are excluded (truncated). One of the Standing Committee members also expressed a need for a different approach for looking at SRFs because the testing data do not match the reality of the impact that race and income have on the measured outcome. It was noted that testing the addition of just one or two SES factors obscures the impact on the measured outcome due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities), and stratifying results by SES factors would likely reveal more disparities. As NQF's

technical guidance on risk adjustment becomes finalized, the developer will take that into consideration when evolving their criteria for risk adjustment and including SES factors in the risk adjustment model. Without any further concerns, the Standing Committee passed the measure on the validity criterion.

Moving to feasibility, some Standing Committee members expressed concern that the implementation of the measure requires the use of ACGs, which must be licensed separately and may be cost-prohibitive for some entities. The developers noted that while ACG is proprietary, the developer has organized a public-facing website with several resources and technical documentation, including tool kits for external organizations to download the necessary tools to run the measure, free of charge. The developer has also created instructions and tool kits. The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and voted to pass the measure on the feasibility criterion. While discussing the usability and use criteria, some Standing Committee members expressed general concerns about the specifications not being fully transparent and noted that it was unclear as to how the measure was being reported and used. These Standing Committee members also questioned how the feedback on quality improvement was being provided to the provider groups and asked the developers to clarify what type of feedback was being provided. The developer stated that they provide quarterly comprehensive reports and monthly patient applications to best support providers in identifying opportunities for improving affordability for their patients while simultaneously supporting patient outreach, pre-visit planning, and care coordination efforts. The developer also engages with its provider groups and network on an ongoing basis. One Standing Committee member asked whether there are any data on whether this measure causes any harm to patients. The developer confirmed that they have not received any feedback on any harm caused by this measure. The Standing Committee observed that this measure has been used as a quality improvement tool within the HealthPartners network, and the developer has shown that it has been used by external organizations. The developer is collecting feedback on the measure. The Standing Committee did not raise any additional questions or concerns, passed the measure on usability and use, and recommended this measure for continued endorsement. No public or member comments were received during the commenting period.

NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index (HealthPartners): Recommended

Description: The Total Cost of Care reflects a mix of complicated factors, such as patient illness burden, service utilization, and negotiated prices. The Total Cost Index (TCI) is a measure of a primary care provider's risk-adjusted cost effectiveness at managing their patient population. TCI includes all costs associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

A TCI when viewed together with the Total Resource Use measure (NQF-endorsed #1598) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of health care costs. **Measure Type:** Cost/Resource Use; **Level of Analysis:** Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice; **Setting of Care:** Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care; **Data Source:** Claims

This measure was discussed during the initial measure evaluation web meeting on July 9, 2021. It was originally endorsed in 2017 and captures the primary care provider's risk-adjusted cost of managing their patient population. The Standing Committee observed the similarity between this measure and NQF #1598, and the concerns raised for NQF #1598 also apply to this measure (NQF #1604). The developer also noted the similarity between the two measures and added that the difference between the two measures is in the costing approach. NQF #1598 is measuring resource use measure for every service, while NQF #1604 utilizes an allowed amount, which reflects the plan and member liability. In comparing the two measures, one Standing Committee member questioned how the incorporation of reimbursements in NQF #1604 affects providers who are practicing in higher cost-of-living and higher geographic wage areas versus lower cost-of-living and lower geographic wage areas. The developer clarified that the cost differential is driven by price differential, and this measure is able to show the cost variation that is occurring across different states. One Standing Committee member further questioned whether the developer was conducting stratification to confirm that the differences in cost across providers is due to practice style and not the geographic differences in the labor wage rates. The developer confirmed the measure is applied in that manner so that the comparison is made among the providers in the same wage market. The Standing Committee noted that the other concerns discussed regarding the importance to measure and report criterion for NQF #1598 also apply to this measure; they agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare and passed the measure on this criterion.

The Standing Committee noted that the SMP evaluated and rated this measure as high for both reliability and validity. The Standing Committee once again emphasized the similarity between the concerns for reliability and validity of this measure and those raised for NQF #1598. The Standing Committee requested additional documentation from the developers regarding the signal-to-noise analysis, which the developer offered to share after the meeting for the Standing Committee's reference. One Standing Committee member asked how a patient is attributed to different clinical practices, specifically what the attribution rules are when multimorbid patients are being handled by multiple providers. The developer explained that they used 12 months of claims data to identify the primary care provider the member visited most frequently. The Standing Committee did not have any further questions or concerns and passed the measure on reliability and validity.

Regarding feasibility, the Standing Committee observed that barriers to access are present because the ACG system is proprietary; however, this has been addressed by the training, software, and data collection the developer provided. Therefore, the Standing Committee passed the measure on feasibility. In discussing usability and use, the Standing Committee questioned whether the performance results are available to outside organizations or practices whose performance is being measured. The developers once again emphasized that most of the external organizations publish performance reports publicly, while others do not. The Standing Committee acknowledged the similarity between the concerns for usability and use and those for NQF #1598 and passed the measure on both criteria. Ultimately, the Standing Committee recommended the measure for continued endorsement. No public or member comments were received during the commenting period.

NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) (Yale CORE): Recommended

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an acute myocardial infarction (AMI) episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI. **Measure Type:** Cost/Resource Use; **Level of Analysis:** Facility; **Setting of Care:** Inpatient/Hospital; **Data Source:** Claims, Enrollment Data

This measure was previously endorsed in 2015. The Standing Committee acknowledged that AMI is one of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. roughly \$84.9 billion in direct and indirect costs. The Standing Committee considered the performance data that the developer reported. These data consisted of a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$25,561 with a range of \$17,488 – \$32,810 for a reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. In addition, the median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$25,422 (interquartile range [IQR] of \$24,859 – \$26,165). The Standing Committee discussed whether this measure is linked to quality. The developer mentioned that this measure is intended to be used in conjunction with other outcome measures beyond mortality, which would be indicators of quality. The Standing Committee considered whether the hospital would have to find the right quality score or whether the measure results would be presented in a manner that will help hospitals manage and reduce the variation. The developer confirmed that this measure is intended to be reported together with other quality measures, such as mortality. The measure results would be reported to the hospitals, including how hospitals compared to other hospitals, in this case for the mortality measure. The developer also mentioned that this measure is not in a pay-for-performance program. Rather, it is used in a pay-for-reporting program, in which the broader goal is to make hospitals health conscious; there is no penalty for being above or below the national average. Hospitals are rewarded if they report on this measure. CMS stated that the purpose of this measure, along with several other condition-specific cost measures, is to promote transparency, as well as target cost reductions. CMS has a Medicare Spending per Beneficiary (MSPB) measure that covers a much broader list of conditions and to which payments are made based on the performance of that measure. The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

Moving to scientific acceptability (i.e., reliability and validity), the Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.681. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed this measure on reliability. The Standing Committee asked whether signal-to-noise tests were conducted. The developer explained that hospitals with at least 25 admissions possessed a median signal-to-noise value of 0.404 with an IQR of 0.298 to 0.594. One Standing Committee member raised concern that the Standing Committee has considered higher cutoffs for some of the other measures rather than 0.4, such as 0.6 or 0.7. It was noted that the SMP is reviewing various thresholds of reliability to determine which ones are acceptable. In addition, CMS has looked at 0.4 as an acceptable threshold due the trade-offs of trying to include more facilities or

providers within the measure to promote more transparency across the system. The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.

Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developer-convened Technical Expert Panel (TEP) members agreed that the measure can discern good versus poor quality of care. The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. The developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.281 ($p < 0.0001$), meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with AMI. The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly increased to 0.078, which suggests that approximately 8 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors. The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that testing the addition of just one or two SRFs obscures the impact due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities). In addition, stratifying results by social risk would likely reveal more disparities. The developer noted that it tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as SRFs. The developer found that the two SRFs did have a slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these SRFs had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. In addition, the measure scores estimated with hospitals both with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated.

According to NQF staff, NQF is currently developing [technical guidance](#), which was out for public comment at the time of this review, that will provide more clarity for developers and NQF Standing Committees in conducting SRF adjustment within quality measurement. NQF staff further noted that this guidance will not change NQF's evaluation criteria until the guidance is finalized at the end of next year (2022). The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on validity.

The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns with feasibility and passed the measure on this criterion. For use and usability, the Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program. In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted the very small differences in hospital-level RSPs for the AMI payment in 2018–2019 compared with the prior individual years (2016/2017 and 2017/2018). The median RSPs for each year were \$25,248, \$25,539, and \$25,542 for 2016/2017, 2017/2018, and 2018/2019, respectively. The Standing Committee asked whether any longer-term harms of the measure's use have been identified. The developer stated that they did not identify any unintended consequences during measure development and testing. The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns, passed the measure on use and usability, and ultimately recommended the measure for continued endorsement. The Standing Committee will review related and competing measures during the post-comment call on October 22, 2021.

NQF received no NQF-member or public comments prior to the evaluation meeting. Comments received after the measure evaluation meeting focused on reliability and minimum reliability thresholds, testing methodology for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors, the risk model's adequacy due to the R-squared results, and concern around the correlation between cost and quality. The developer provided feedback on the reliability concerns, stating that in calculating split-sample reliability, half of the patients within each hospital were randomly sampled from a three-year measurement period, with the intra-class correlation coefficient calculated as a metric for agreement. The developer responded to the concerns related to social risk factors and the R-squared results, noting that it is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model. The developer explains that they produced a “quasi- R2” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome. The developer also acknowledged that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and shared an example of a hospital with payments greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care. The Standing Committee had no further concerns with the developer’s response and accepted NQF’s proposed response to the commenter. The Standing Committee took no further action.

NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF) (Yale CORE): Recommended

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a heart failure (HF) episode of care, starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF. **Measure Type:** Cost/Resource Use; **Level of Analysis:** Facility; **Setting of Care:** Inpatient/Hospital; **Data Source:** Claims, Enrollment Data

This measure was previously endorsed in 2015. The Standing Committee acknowledged that HF is one of the top three leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and is projected to cost the U.S. up to \$70 billion in direct and indirect costs by 2030.

The Standing Committee considered the performance data that the developer reported. These data consisted of a mean RSP of \$17,722 with a range of \$13,171 – \$27,996 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. In addition, the median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$17,607 (IQR: \$16,817 – \$18,513). The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

Moving to scientific acceptability, the Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the RSP for each hospital was 0.781. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed this measure on reliability. The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. In response, the developer stated that hospitals with at least 25 admissions possessed the following values for HF payment signal-to-noise reliability: a mean of 0.666, a median of 0.679, and an IQR of

0.528–0.801. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.

Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developers convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good versus poor quality of care. The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. Moreover, the developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.543, meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with HF.

The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly decreased to 0.031, which suggests that approximately 3 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors. The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that the developer tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as SRFs. The developer found that the two SRFs did have a slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these SRFs had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. In addition, the measure scores estimated with hospitals both with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns with feasibility and passed the measure on this criterion. For use and usability, the Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital IQR Program. In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$17,607 for the HF payment measure for the three-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 2.6 percent from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$17,781) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$17,310). The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 for usability apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns, passed the measure on the use and usability criteria, and ultimately recommended the measure for continued endorsement. The Standing Committee will review related and competing measures during the post-comment call on October 22, 2021.

Comments received during the public commenting period expressed concern about reliability results, testing methodology for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors, the risk model's adequacy due to the R-squared results, and concern around the correlation between cost and quality. The developer provided feedback on the reliability concerns, stating that in calculating split-sample reliability, half of the patients within each hospital were randomly sampled from a three-year measurement period, with the intra-class correlation coefficient calculated as a metric for agreement. The developer responded to the concerns related to social risk factors and the R-squared results. The developer noted that it is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk

factors within a clinical risk model. They continue to explain how they produced a “quasi- R2” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome. The developer also acknowledged that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and shared an example of a hospital with payments greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care. The Standing Committee had no further concerns with the developer’s response and accepted NQF’s proposed response to the commenter. The Standing Committee took no further action.

NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN) (Yale CORE): Recommended

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia (PN) episode of care, starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of PN or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) who have a secondary discharge diagnosis of PN coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA. **Measure Type:** Cost/Resource Use; **Level of Analysis:** Facility; **Setting of Care:** Inpatient/Hospital; **Data Source:** Claims, Enrollment Data

This measure was previously endorsed in 2014. The Standing Committee acknowledged that HF is one of the top three leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. around \$13.4 billion annually.

The Standing Committee considered the performance data that the developer reported. These data consisted of a mean RSP of \$18,283 with a range of \$10,529 – \$29,861 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. In addition, the median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$18,200 (IQR: \$17,015 – \$19,453). The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

Moving to scientific acceptability, the Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the agreement between the two independent assessments of the RSP for each hospital was 0.815. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed this measure on reliability. The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. In response, the developer stated that hospitals with at least 25 admissions possessed a mean signal-to-noise value of 0.820, a median of 0.8554, and an IQR of 0.7472 to 0.919. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and NQF #2436 apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.

Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which 10 of the 16 developer convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good versus poor quality of care. The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. In addition, the developer found a correlation between PN RSPs and the

MSPB score of 0.588, which suggests that hospitals with higher performance on this measure are more likely to have higher MSPB measure performance scores.

The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the updated, calculated R-squared result was 0.076. The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that the developer presents analyses that show the significant association between dual eligibility (but not low AHRQ SES) and higher payments, even after adjusting for other risk factors in a multivariable model. The addition of the social risk variables has little impact on model performance and produces little change in measure scores. In addition, the measure scores estimated for hospitals both with and without dual eligibility are highly correlated (0.999). The developer noted that CMS ultimately decided to not adjust this measure for either dual eligibility or the AHRQ SES Index. The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2436 apply to this measure as well. They did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns with feasibility and passed the measure on this criterion. For use and usability, the Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital IQR Program. In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$18,200 for the PN payment measure for the three-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 1 percent from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$18,226) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$18,037). The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2436 for usability apply to this measure as well. The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns, passed the measure on the use and usability criteria, and ultimately recommended the measure for continued endorsement. The Standing Committee will review related and competing measures during the post-comment call on October 22, 2021.

Comments received during the public commenting period expressed concern about the testing methodology for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results, and concern around the correlation between cost and quality. The developer provided feedback on the reliability concerns, stating that in calculating split-sample reliability, half of the patients within each hospital were randomly sampled from a three-year measurement period with the intra-class correlation coefficient calculated as a metric for agreement. Responding to concerns on social risk factors and the R-squared results, the developer noted that it is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model; and that they produced a “quasi- R²” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome. The developer also acknowledged that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and shared an example of a hospital with payments that are greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care. The Standing Committee had no further concerns with the developer's response and accepted NQF's proposed response to the commenter. No further action was taken by the Standing Committee.

References

- 1 *National Health Expenditure Fact Sheet*. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
<https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Statistics-Trends-and-Reports/NationalHealthExpendData/NHE-Fact-Sheet>.
- 2 *Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy*. Medicare Payment Advisory Commission; 2021.
http://medpac.gov/docs/default-source/reports/mar21_medpac_report_to_the_congress_sec.pdf.
- 3 S. Tong, Amand, C, Kieffer A. Trends in healthcare utilization and costs associated with pneumonia in the United States during 2008-2014. *BMC Health Serv Res* 18. 2018;(715).
- 4 Heidenreich PA, Albert NM, Allen LA, et al. Forecasting the Impact of heart failure in the United States: A Policy Statement from the American Heart Association. *Heart Fail*. 2013;6(3):606-619.
- 5 Bishu KG, Lekoubou A, Kirkland E, et al. Estimating the Economic Burden of Acute Myocardial Infarction in the US: 12 Year National Data. *Am J Med Sci*. 2020;359(5):257-265.

Appendix A: Details of Measure Evaluation

Rating Scale: H=High; M=Moderate; L=Low; I=Insufficient; NA=Not Applicable; Y=Yes; N=No

Vote totals may differ between measure criteria and between measures as Standing Committee members often must join calls late or leave calls early. NQF ensures that quorum is maintained for all live voting. All voting outcomes are calculated using the number of Standing Committee members present during the meeting for that vote as the denominator. Denominator vote counts may vary throughout the criteria due to intermittent Standing Committee attendance fluctuation. The vote totals reflect members present and eligible to vote at the time of the vote. If quorum is not achieved or maintained during the meeting, the Standing Committee receives a recording of the meeting and a link to submit online votes. Voting closes after 48 hours with at least the number of votes required for quorum. Quorum (a minimum of 15 out of 22 active Standing Committee members present) was reached and maintained for the duration of all measure evaluation meetings.

Measures Recommended

NQF #1598 Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index

[Measure Worksheet](#) | [Specifications](#)

Description: The Resource Use Index (RUI) is a risk-adjusted measure of the frequency and intensity of services utilized to manage a provider group's patients. Resource use includes all resources associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Resource Use Index when viewed together with the Total Cost of Care measure (NQF #1604) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of healthcare costs.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model. Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

Level of Analysis: Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice

Setting of Care: Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims

Measure Steward: HealthPartners

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 9, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2017. They also noted the similarity between this submission and the previous submission in 2017 with regard to the data the developer cited. These data demonstrated that healthcare spending constitutes a high proportion (17%) of the United States (U.S.) gross domestic product (GDP), and high healthcare costs contribute to adults forgoing healthcare. The developers suggested that this measure can support a comprehensive measurement system to identify areas of overuse.

- Some Standing Committee members raised concerns with the scope of improvement for this measure. The Standing Committee emphasized that lower cost does not necessarily correlate to improved quality. The Standing Committee noted that if cost and quality aren't highly correlated then there may be a risk of potential unintended consequences, such as lowering the quality of care provided. The Standing Committee asked the developer how they would address this challenge to prevent inadvertently reducing the quality of care. The developer explained that this measure is used to optimize health and patient experience while improving affordability. To that regard, when implementing the measures (both NQF #1598 and #1604), the goal is to use quality and resource together so that both improve. The developer emphasized that the impact on quality of care is the greatest when this resource use measure (NQF #1598) and NQF #1604, which is a cost measure, are implemented together.
- The Standing Committee reviewed the performance scores across measured provider groups of total resource use from 2017 – 2019 dates of service, which noted that out of the 65 provider groups measured in the Total Resource Use measure, 26 were better than average; 3 were 10% better than average; 12 were 10% higher than average; and 50 were within 10% of the average.
- The Standing Committee also acknowledged that the developers discovered that the insurance product also contributed with a \$133 difference in cost between commercial and Medicaid. The variation in resource use was much less; however, it was still significant, with Medicaid-covered members utilizing \$75 more of resources.
- One Standing Committee member asked for further understanding of the type of distribution represented by the improvement data provided by the developer, specifically the meaningful difference in performance data that noted 26 providers were better than average, three were 10 percent better than average, 12 were 10 percent higher than average, and 50 were within 10 percent of the average and the type of distribution. The developer clarified that the data demonstrated a normal distribution (i.e., slightly skewed towards the higher side) with variation in performance among the total providers included in the measure over time.
- A Standing Committee member raised concern that based on the measure submission document, the measure aims to make resources comparable across settings, which indicates that the location where the service was provided does not matter; however, the reimbursement differs based on where the service was provided, and the total care relative resource values (TCRRV) table does not allow one to ascertain where the service was provided. The developer explained that the difference in the setting will not show up in the current total resource use measure (NQF #1598); however, it will show up in the total cost measure (NQF #1604). Once again, they emphasized that the two measures should be used together for a comprehensive view on how cost, resource use, and price interact with one another.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure gives a top-line indication of resource use; as a result, the health systems and provider groups would need to get involved to determine which opportunity for improvement to focus on and put interventions in place for improvement. Ultimately, the Standing Committee agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-7; M-7; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-7; L-2; I-0** (denominator = 14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah's recusal)

Rationale

Reliability

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. The developer used two methods to demonstrate the repeatability of the results, using bootstrapped averages with full replacement and a 90 percent random sampling without replacement approach, which approximates controlling for case mix. The variances from Actual RUI ranged from -0.0037 to 0.0062 in the bootstrap to -0.0019 to 0.0016 in the 90 percent sample.

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for reliability (**SMP total votes:9; H-4; M-3; L-0; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee noted the SMP's concerns with this measure's intended use for the HealthPartners data set, and the testing wouldn't be generalizable to other practices. The Standing Committee then asked the developers to clarify whether they have tested the measure on any other data set outside of the HealthPartners data set.
- The developers explained that HealthPartners has a network of providers, and they only have availability of those data. Therefore, they do not have access to the data for providers outside of their network. Other organizations have implemented and are using the measure nationally; however, they also do not have access to that data. The developers added that the testing is broad enough for the measure to be potentially used to infer its effectiveness in other markets, as seen with the other organizations using the measure, such as Network for Regional Healthcare Improvement (NRHI) in California, Minnesota Community Measurement, and other organizations. The developers elaborated that the Minnesota Community Measurement releases a report each year that combines data from four different plans across Minnesota, and in comparing the yearly trends, Minnesota Community Measurement has observed improvement each year.
- In reviewing the testing methods, both the SMP and the Standing Committee noted that the bootstrap and 90% random sampling theoretically work for large sample; however, it is unclear how the results would change when applied to smaller providers groups (providers with less than 600 members).
- The developers agreed that lower provider sizes indicate higher variation, but this measure can be used with lower provider sizes and can still produce reliable results due to the removal of outliers, which can drastically affect the average value.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions or concerns regarding reliability for this measure and passed the measure on this criterion.
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for reliability.

Validity

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for validity (**SMP Total votes: 9; H-4; M-2; L-1; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee observed that three approaches were used to assess validity: (1) critical data elements were correlated with each other and utilization; (2) performance measure score was validated against "known risk-adjusted utilization metrics"; and (3) high/low performing groups were compared on utilization and RUI (although this largely shows the validity of the risk adjustor). Face validity was determined through a 45-day comment period.
- The Standing Committee considered that the correlations between the non-risk adjusted Place of Service Metrics and non-risk-adjusted PMPMs & non-risk-adjusted TCRRVs range between 0.55 and 0.84; the non-risk-adjusted resource composite is correlated with ACGs, non-risk-adjusted PMPMs, and non-risk-adjusted TCRRVs ranging between 0.77 and 0.95.
- One Standing Committee member questioned whether the TCRRV incorporates pricing. The developer clarified that the TCRRVs are constructed in a way that removes price from the methodology so that average paid amount is standardized across all hospital providers.
- The Standing Committee considered that the Total Resource Use measure uses the proprietary Johns Hopkins Adjusted Clinical Grouper (ACG), which adjusts for variation in risk profile using age, gender, and diagnosis (clinical risk adjustment). The measure is also limited by insurance coverage to commercial only. The developer considered education and income for risk adjustment, but they did not include these social risk factors in the final model.
- Another Standing Committee member noted that presenting correlation coefficients with adjusted clinical groups (ACG) scores were appropriate; however, they raised concerns on how to interpret the correlation coefficient with non-risk-adjusted PMPMs because the model is, in

fact, risk-adjusted. The developer explained that when the measure is not risk-adjusted, the correlations are high between the PMPMs and the TCRRVs. The developer is trying to draw a parallel between some known utilization markers, such as ACGs and TCRRVs, to demonstrate that TCRRVs are a good reflection of resource use. The developers further explained that they are comparing the non-risk-adjusted PMPM to the correlation coefficients of ACG because ACGs are a proven measure of resources, and by showing that TCRRVs align well with ACGs, it illustrates that TCRRVs are also a good metric for resource use.

- The Standing Committee also noted that the truncation level of 125,000 TCRRVs is used for the measure and TCRRVs per member above 125,000 are excluded (truncated). They raised concerns about excluding patients over the age of 64 years and questioned the rationale for using the truncation level of 125,000 TCRRVs. The developer noted that members over the age of 64 are excluded due to potential incomplete claims data of Medicare eligible beneficiary. Sometimes, certain members have dual coverage, meaning they are in both Medicare and commercial plans; therefore, due to the difficulty in parsing out the costs that are paid for by Medicare versus the commercial plan, members over the age of 64 were excluded. In terms of truncation, the developer noted that truncation level was selected to stay aligned with healthcare costs and ensure stability of the measure. TCRRVs per member above \$125,000 are excluded (truncated).
- One of the Standing Committee members also expressed need for a different approach for looking at social risk factors because the testing data do not match the reality that race and income have an impact on the measured outcome. It was noted that testing the addition of just one or two socioeconomic status (SES) factors obscures the impact on the measured outcome due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities), and stratifying results by SES factors would likely reveal more disparities. The developer stated that as NQF's technical guidance on risk adjustment becomes finalized, the developer will take that into consideration when evolving their criteria for risk adjustment and including SES factors in the risk adjustment model.
- Without any further concerns, the Standing Committee passed the measure on the validity criterion.
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-6; M-9; L-0; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- Standing Committee members expressed concern that the implementation of the measure requires the use of ACGs, which must be licensed separately and maybe be cost-prohibitive for some entities.
- The developers noted that while ACG is proprietary, the developer has organized a public-facing website with several resources and technical documentation, including toolkits for external organizations to download the necessary tools to run the measure free of charge. The developer has created instructions and toolkits for both SAS and non-SAS users.
- The Standing Committee did not express any further concerns and voted the measure to be feasible.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0 4b. Usability: Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-13; L-0; I-0

Rationale

- Some Standing Committee members expressed general concerns about the specifications not being fully transparent and noted that it was unclear on how the measure was being reported and used.
- Standing Committee members also questioned how the feedback on quality improvement was being provided to the provider groups and asked the developers to clarify what type of feedback was being provided.
- The developer stated that they provide quarterly comprehensive reports and monthly patient applications to best support providers in identifying opportunities for improving affordability for their patients, while at the same time supporting patient outreach, pre-visit planning, and care coordination efforts. The developer also engages with its provider groups and network on an ongoing basis and organized a public-facing website with several resources and technical documentation, including toolkits for external organizations to download the necessary tools to run the measure, free of charge.
- One Standing Committee member asked whether there are any data on whether this measure causes any harm to patients. The developer confirmed that they have not received any such feedback on any harm caused by this measure.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure has been used as a quality improvement tool within the HealthPartners network, and the developer has shown that it has been used by external organizations; they are collecting feedback on the measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional questions or concerns, passed the measure on usability and use, and recommended this measure for continued endorsement.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- No related or competing measures are noted.

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Y-15; N-0

7. Public and Member Comment

N/A

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #1604 Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index

[Measure Worksheet](#) | [Specifications](#)

Description: The Total Cost of Care reflects a mix of complicated factors, such as patient illness burden, service utilization, and negotiated prices. The Total Cost Index (TCI) is a measure of a primary care provider's risk-adjusted cost effectiveness at managing the population they care for. TCI includes all costs associated with treating members, including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, and ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Total Cost Index when viewed together with the Total Resource Use measure (NQF #1598) provides a more complete picture of population-based drivers of health care costs.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model. Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

Level of Analysis: Population: Community, County or City, Clinician: Group/Practice

Setting of Care: Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims

Measure Steward: HealthPartners

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 9, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was previously endorsed in 2017, in which the developer cited data demonstrating that healthcare spending constitutes a high proportion (17%) of the U.S. GDP, and high healthcare costs contribute to adults forgoing healthcare. The developers suggested that this measure can support a comprehensive measurement system to identify areas of overuse.
- The Standing Committee reviewed the performance scores across measured provider groups of total resource use from 2017–2019 dates of service, which noted that out of the 65 provider groups measured in Total Resource Use measure, 26 were better than average; 3 were 10% better than average; 12 were 10% higher than average; and 50 were within 10% of the average.
- The Standing Committee also acknowledged that the developers discovered that the insurance product also contributed significantly, with a \$207 difference in cost between commercial and Medicaid. The variation in resource use was much less; however, it was still significant, with Medicaid-covered members utilizing \$55 more of resources.
- The Standing Committee observed that this measure is very similar to NQF #1598, and the concerns raised for that measure also apply to this measure (NQF #1604). The developer also noted the similarity in the two measures (NQF #1598 and NQF #1604) and added that the difference between the two measures is in the costing approach. NQF #1598 is measuring resource use for every service, while NQF #1604 utilizes an allowed amount, which reflects the plan liability and member liability.
- In comparing the two measures, one Standing Committee member questioned how the incorporation of reimbursements in this measure affects providers practicing in higher cost-of-living and higher geographic wage areas versus lower cost-of-living and lower geographic wage areas. The developer clarified that the cost differential is driven by price differential, and this measure can show the cost variation that is occurring across different states.
- One Standing Committee member further questioned whether the developer was conducting stratification to confirm that the differences in cost across providers is due to practice style and not the geographic differences in the labor wage rates. The developer confirmed the measure is applied in that manner so that the comparison is made among the providers in the same wage market.
- The Standing Committee noted that the other concerns discussed regarding the importance to measure and report criterion for NQF #1598 also apply to this measure and agreed that this measure addresses a high-impact/high-resource use area of healthcare and passed the measure on this criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-8; M-6; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-8; L-3; I-0**

(denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee noted that this measure was evaluated by the SMP and was given a high rating for both reliability (**SMP total votes: 9; H-4; M-3; L-0; I-2**) and validity (**SMP Total votes: 9; H-4; M-2; L-1; I-2**).
- The Standing Committee once again emphasized that the concerns for reliability and validity of this measure are like those raised for NQF #1598.
- The Standing Committee requested additional documentation from the developers regarding the signal-to-noise analysis, which the developer offered to share with the Standing Committee after the meeting, for reference.

- One Standing Committee member asked how a patient is attributed to different clinical practices, specifically what the attribution rules are when there are multimorbid patients who are being handled by multiple providers. The developer explained that they used 12 months of claims data to identify the primary care provider that the member visited most frequently.
- The Standing Committee did not have any further questions or concerns and passed the measure on reliability and validity.
- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level. The developer used two methods to demonstrate the repeatability of the results. To measure the reliability of the TCI measure, the actual results were compared to the results calculated by two sampling methods: bootstrapping and a 90 percent random sample. The differences between the actual total cost index (TCI) results and both the bootstrap and 90 percent sample results are very small, ranging from -0.0032 to 0.0066 in the bootstrap to -0.0026 to 0.0025 in the 90 percent sample.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure with a high rating for reliability
- Since quorum was not achieved during the measure evaluation meetings, the Standing Committee was not asked whether they would like to uphold the SMP's rating. Voting occurred offline through a web-based tool, and the Standing Committee was asked to provide their own vote for reliability.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-7; L-1; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee observed that barriers to access are present because the ACG system is proprietary; however, this has been addressed by the training, software, and data collection provided by the developer. Therefore, the Standing Committee passed the measure on feasibility without any additional concerns.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-5; M-8; L-2; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee questioned whether the performance results are available to outside organizations or practices whose performance is being measured. The developers once again emphasized that most of the external organizations publish performance reports publicly, while others do not.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the concerns for usability and use are like those for NQF #1598 and passed the measure on usability and use.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- No related or competing measures are noted.

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-14; N-1

7. Public and Member Comment

N/A

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

[Measure Worksheet](#) | [Specifications](#)

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-5; M-9; L-1; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2015.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited AMI as one of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. roughly \$84.9 billion in direct and indirect costs.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$25,561 with a range of \$17,488 – \$32,81 for a reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$25,422 (interquartile range of \$24,859 – \$26,165).
- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee discussed whether this measure is linked to quality. The developer mentioned that this measure is intended to be used in conjunction with other outcome measures, beyond mortality, which would be indicators of quality.
- The Standing Committee considered whether it would be up to the hospital to find the right quality score or would the measure results be presented in a manner that will help hospitals manage and reduce the variation.
- The developer confirmed that this measure is intended to be reported together with other quality measures, such as mortality. The measure results would be reported to the hospitals, including how hospitals compared to other hospitals, in this case for the mortality measure. The developer also mentioned that this measure is not in a pay-for-performance program. Rather, it is used in a pay-for-reporting program, in which the broader goal is to make hospitals health conscious. There is no penalty for being above or below the national average. Hospitals are rewarded if they report on this measure.
- CMS stated that the purpose of this measure, along with several other condition-specific cost measures, is to promote transparency, as well as target cost reductions. CMS has a Medicare Spending per Beneficiary measure that covers a much broader list of conditions and to which payments are made based on the performance of that measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-6; L-3; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-7; L-3; I-1** (denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.
- The developer conducted measure-score level reliability testing: calculating the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) using a split sample (i.e., test-retest) method for hospitals with 25 admissions or more.
- Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.681.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes:8; H-3, M-5, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked whether signal-to-noise tests were conducted. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the median signal-to-noise was 0.404 with an IQR of 0.298 to 0.594. One Standing Committee member raised concern that with some of the other measures, the Standing Committee has considered higher cutoffs rather than 0.4, such as 0.6 or 0.7.
- It was noted that the SMP is reviewing various thresholds of reliability to determine which ones are acceptable. In addition, CMS has looked at 0.4 as an acceptable threshold due the trade-offs of trying to include more facilities or providers within the measure to promote more transparency across the system.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developer-convened Technical Expert Panel (TEP) members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing comparing this measure to the Medicare Spending per Beneficiary (MSPB) measure. The developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.281 ($p < .0001$), meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with AMI.
- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly increased up to 0.078, suggesting that about 8 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes: 8; H-1, M-5, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that testing the addition of just one or two social risk factors obscures the impact due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities). Stratifying results by social risk would likely reveal more disparities.
- The developer noted that it tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as social risk factors. The developer found that the two social risk factors did have slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these social risk factors had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated with hospitals with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated.
- NQF staff stated that NQF is currently developing technical guidance, which was out for public comment at the time of this review, that will provide more clarity for developers and NQF Standing Committees in conducting social risk factor adjustment within quality measurement.

NQF staff further noted that this guidance will not change NQF evaluation criteria until the guidance is finalized at the end of next year (2022).

- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-8; M-7; L-0; I-0

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0 4b. Usability: Total Votes: 15; H-1; M-10; L-3; I-1

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted the very small differences in hospital-level RSPs for the AMI payment in 2018-2019 compared with the prior individual years (2016/2017; 2017/2018). The median RSPs for each year were \$25,248, \$25,539, and \$25,542, for 2016/17, 2017/18, and 2018/19, respectively.
- The Standing Committee asked whether any longer-term harms of the measure's use have been identified. The developer stated that they did not identify any unintended consequences during measure development and test.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0230 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0505 Hospital 30-Day All-Cause Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization.
 - NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
 - NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)
 - NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)
 - NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Y-11; N-4

7. Public and Member Comment

- The American Medical Association (AMA) voiced concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2431 (median-0.404; 0.298-0.594).

- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2431 (r-squared=0.078).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)

[Measure Worksheet](#) | [Specifications](#)

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement:

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-4; M-9; L-2; I-0**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2015.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited HF as one of the top three leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and is projected to cost the U.S. up to \$70 billion in direct and indirect costs by 2030.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$17,722 with a range of \$13,171 – \$27,996 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$17,607 (interquartile range of \$16,817 – \$18,513).
- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-6; M-8; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-2; M-9; L-3; I-0**
(denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee achieved sufficient attendance and did not achieve quorum. Therefore, the Standing Committee voted offline on reliability and validity instead of voting to accept the SMP rating.
- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.
- The developer conducted measure-score level reliability testing: calculating the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) using a split sample (i.e., test-retest) method for hospitals with 25 admissions or more.
- Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the developer found that the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.781.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes 8; H-5, M-3, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the HF payment signal-to-noise reliability values had a mean of 0.666, a median of 0.679, and an IQR of 0.528 – 0.801.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which eight of the 16 developer-convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. The developer found a correlation coefficient of 0.543, meaning that hospitals with higher spending across all Medicare FFS beneficiaries correlated with hospitals with higher spending on patients hospitalized with HF.
- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the R-squared value slightly decreased to 0.031, suggesting that about 3 percent of the variation in payment could be explained by patient-level risk factors.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes 8; H-2, M-4, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that testing the addition of just one or two social risk factors obscures the impact due to partial effects for other variables in the model (e.g., comorbidities). Stratifying results by social risk would likely reveal more disparities.
- The developer noted that it tested the impact of dual-eligible status and the AHRQ SES index as social risk factors. The developer found that the two social risk factors did have slightly lower payment after adjustment for other risk factors in the multivariate model; nonetheless, the addition of these social risk factors had limited impact on model performance and produced little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated with hospitals both with and without dual eligibility were highly correlated.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: **Total Votes: 15; H-6; M-9; L-0; I-0**

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: **Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0** 4b. Usability: **Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-8; L-4; I-1**

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$17,607 for the HF payment measure for the 3-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 2.6 percent from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$17,781) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$17,310).
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 for usability apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0229 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0330 Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization
 - NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
 - NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)
 - NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)
 - NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-14; N-1

7. Public and Member Comment

- The American Medical Association voiced concern with the signal-to-noise ratio value ranges specified in measure #2436 (median-0.679; 0.528-0.801).
- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2436 (r-squared=0.031).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN)

Measure Worksheet

Description: This measure estimates the hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia (PN) episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short-term, acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of PN or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) who have a secondary discharge diagnosis of PN coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

Numerator Statement: N/A

Denominator Statement: N/A

Exclusions: N/A

Adjustment/Stratification: Statistical risk model

Level of Analysis: Facility

Setting of Care: Inpatient/Hospital

Type of Measure: Cost/Resource Use

Data Source: Claims, Enrollment Data

Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING July 27, 2021

1. Importance to Measure and Report: The measure meets the Importance criteria.

(1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement)

1a. High Impact and 1b. Opportunity for Improvement: **Total Votes: 15; H-3; M-10; L-2; I-0**
(denominator=15)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure has been submitted for maintenance review and was previously endorsed in 2014.
- The Standing Committee noted that the developer cited pneumonia (PN) as one of the leading causes of hospitalization for Americans over 65 years of age and costs the U.S. approximately \$13.4 billion annually.
- The Standing Committee considered the performance data, in which the developer reported a mean risk-standardized payment (RSP) of \$18,283 with a range of \$10,529 – \$29,861 during the reporting period of July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019. The median hospital RSP in the combined three-year data set was \$18,200 (interquartile range \$17,015 – \$19,453).
- The Standing Committee also considered the distribution of hospital-level measure scores stratified by the proportion of patients with social risk factors (dual eligibility and low Agency of Healthcare Research and Quality [AHRQ] Socioeconomic Status [SES]). The Standing Committee noted that the measure scores do not vary significantly as a function of facilities' proportion of patients with social risk factors.
- The Standing Committee noted that the same concerns raised during the discussion of NQF #2431 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further questions and passed the measure on the importance to measure and report criterion.

2. Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties: The measure meets the Scientific Acceptability criteria.

(2a. Reliability - precise specifications, testing; 2b. Validity - testing, threats to validity)

2a. Reliability: **Total Votes: 14; H-5; M-9; L-0; I-0**; 2b. Validity: **Total Votes: 14; H-3; M-9; L-1; I-1**
(denominator=14; due to SMP member, Bijan Borah, recusal)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered the reliability testing, which was conducted at the performance measure score level.

- The Standing Committee reviewed the testing information, in which the developer conducted a split sample reliability to test agreement between two independent subsets of patients within hospitals. The developer calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient for hospitals with 25 admissions or more. Using the Spearman-Brown prediction formula, the agreement between the two independent assessments of the risk-standardized payment for each hospital was 0.815.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that this measure was reviewed by the SMP, which passed the measure on reliability (**SMP total votes:8; H-5, M-3, L-0, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee asked about the signal-to-noise results for this measure. The developer explained that for hospitals with at least 25 admissions, the mean signal-to-noise was 0.820, the median was 0.8554, and the interquartile range was 0.7472 to 0.919.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2436 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on reliability.
- Moving to validity, the Standing Committee considered that the developer conducted face validity testing, in which 10 of the 16 developer-convened TEP members agreed that the measure can discern good vs. poor quality of care.
- The developer also conducted empirical validity testing, comparing this measure to the MSPB measure. The developer found a correlation between PN RSPs and the MSPB score of 0.588, suggesting that hospitals with higher performance on this measure are more likely to have higher MSPB measure performance scores.
- The Standing Committee considered the risk adjustment model, noting that the updated, calculated R-squared result was 0.076.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the SMP reviewed and passed the measure on validity (**SMP total votes: 8; H-2, M-4, L-2, I-0**).
- The Standing Committee discussed the approach to social risk adjustment, noting that the developer presents analyses that show a significant association between dual eligibility (but not low AHRQ SES) and higher payments, even after adjusting for other risk factors in a multivariable model. The addition of the social risk variables has little impact on model performance and produces little change in measure scores. The measure scores estimated for hospitals both with and without dual eligibility are highly correlated (0.999). The developer noted that CMS ultimately decided to not adjust this measure for either dual eligibility or the AHRQ SES Index.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and #2579 apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any additional concerns and passed the measure on validity.

3. Feasibility: Total Votes: 15; H-7; M-8; L-0; I-0 (denominator=15)

(3a. Clinical data generated during care delivery; 3b. Electronic sources; 3c. Susceptibility to inaccuracies/unintended consequences identified 3d. Data collection strategy can be implemented)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure uses administrative claims data and that all data elements for this measure are in defined fields in electronic claims.
- The developer also indicated that no fees are associated with the use of this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any concerns and passed the measure on feasibility.

4. Use and Usability

(4a. Use; 4a1. Accountability and transparency; 4a2. Feedback on the measure by those being measured and others; 4b. Usability; 4b1. Improvement; 4b2. The benefits to patients outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to patients)

4a. Use: Total Votes: 15; Pass-15; No Pass-0 **4b. Usability: Total Votes: 15; H-2; M-9; L-4; I-0**
(denominator=15)

Rationale

- The Standing Committee considered that this measure is currently publicly reported within CMS' Care Compare and used within the Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (IQR) Program.
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the developer reported that no questions or issues were raised by stakeholders requiring additional analysis or changes to the measure since the last endorsement maintenance cycle.
- In reviewing the usability criterion, the Standing Committee noted that the developer reported a median hospital 30-day RSP of \$18,200 for the PN payment measure for the 3-year period between July 1, 2016, and June 30, 2019. The median RSP decreased by 1% from July 2017 – June 2018 (median RSP: \$18,226) to July 2018 – June 2019 (median RSP: \$18,037).
- The Standing Committee acknowledged that the same concerns with NQF #2431 and NQF #2579 for usability apply to this measure.
- The Standing Committee did not raise any further concerns and passed the measure on use and usability.

5. Related and Competing Measures

- The Standing Committee observed that there are several related measures to this metric, but it did not consider these measures to be competing.
- The developer identified the following related measures:
 - NQF #0230 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Hospitalization
 - NQF #0468 Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Pneumonia hospitalization
 - NQF #0506 Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization
 - NQF #2158 Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital
 - NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)
 - NQF #3474 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated with a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

6. Standing Committee Recommendation for Endorsement: Total Votes: 15; Y-15; N-0

7. Public and Member Comment

- AMA raised concern with testing for social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors and questioned the adequacy of the risk model due to the R-squared results specified in measure #2579 (r-squared=0.076).
- AMA voiced concern related to the lack of demonstrated correlation between cost measures and any one quality measure within the hospital's quality programs.

8. Consensus Standards Approval Committee (CSAC) Vote: Y-X; N-X

9. Appeals

Appendix B: Cost and Efficiency Portfolio—Use in Federal Programs¹

NQF #	Title	Federal Programs: Finalized or Implemented as of June 30, 2021
1598	Total Resource Use Population-Based PMPM Index	None
1604	Total Cost of Care Population-Based PMPM Index	None
2158	Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB)	Hospital Compare (Active) Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (Inactive) Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (Active)
2431	Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)	Hospital Compare (Active) Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (Active) Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (Inactive)
2436	Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF)	Hospital Compare (Active) Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (Active) Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (Inactive)
2579	Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Pneumonia	Hospital Compare (Active) Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (Active) Hospital Value-Based Purchasing (Inactive)
3474	Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 90-Day Episode of Care for Elective Primary Total Hip and/or Total Knee Arthroplasty (THA/TKA)	Hospital Compare (Active) Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting (Active)
3509	Routine Cataract Removal with Intraocular Lens (IOL) Implantation	None
3510	Screening/Surveillance Colonoscopy	None

NQF #	Title	Federal Programs: Finalized or Implemented as of June 30, 2021
3512	Knee Arthroplasty	None
3561	Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary – Post Acute Care Measure for Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities	Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Quality Reporting (Active) Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Compare (Active)
3562	Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary – Post Acute Care Measure for Long-Term Care Hospitals	Long-Term Care Hospital Quality Reporting (Active) Long-Term Care Hospital Compare (Active)
3575	Total Per Capita Cost (TPCC)	None

Appendix C: Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee and NQF Staff

STANDING COMMITTEE

Kristine Martin Anderson, MBA (Co-Chair)

Booz Allen Hamilton
Rockville, MD

Sunny Jhamnani, MD (Co-Chair)

Dignity Health & Banner Health
Phoenix, AZ

Robert Bailey, MD

Johnson & Johnson Health Care Systems, Inc.
Titusville, NJ

Bijan Borah, MSc, PhD

Mayo Clinic, College of Medicine
Rochester, MN

John Brooks, PhD (*inactive*)

University of South Carolina
South Carolina

Cory Byrd

Humana, Inc.
Louisville, KY

Amy Chin, MS

Greater New York Hospital Association
New York, New York

Cheryl Damberg, PhD

RAND Corporation
Santa Monica, CA

Lindsay Erickson, MPH

Integrated Healthcare Association
Oakland, CA

Risha Gidwani, DrPH

RAND Corporation, UCLA School of Public Health
Santa Monica, CA

Emma Hoo

Pacific Business Group
San Francisco, CA

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Sean Hopkins

New Jersey Hospital Association
Princeton, NJ

Jonathan Jaffrey

University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health
Madison, WI

Dinesh Kalra, MD (*inactive*)

Rush University
Chicago, Illinois

Donald Klitgaard, MD

MedLink Advantage
Avoca, IA

Suman Majumdar, PhD (*inactive*)

Washington State Health Care Authority
Olympia, Washington

Alefiyah Mesiwala, MD, MPH

UPMC Health Plan
Pittsburgh, PA

Pamela Roberts, PhD, OTR/L, SCFES, FAOTA, FNAP, FACRM

Cedars-Sinai Medical Center
Value Village, MD

Mahil Senathirajah, MBA

IBM Watson Health
Santa Barbara, CA

Matthew Titmuss, DPT

Hospital for Special Surgery
New York, New York

Sophia Tripoli, MPH

Families USA
Washington, DC

Danny van Leeuwen, RN, MPH

Health Hats
Arlington, VA

NQF STAFF

Kathleen Giblin, RN

Acting Senior Vice President, Quality Measurement

Tricia Elliott, MBA, CPHA, FNAHQ

Senior Managing Director, Quality Measurement

Matthew Pickering, PharmD

Senior Director, Quality Measurement

LeeAnn White, MS, BNS

Director, Quality Measurement

Monika Harvey, MBA, PMP

Project Manager, Quality Measurement

Janaki Panchal, MSPH

Manager, Quality Measurement (Former)

Isaac Sakyi, MSGH

Manager, Quality Measurement

Karri Albanese, BA

Analyst, Quality Measurement

Yemsrach Kidane, MA, PMP

Project Manager, Quality Measurement

Taroon Amin, PhD

Consultant, Quality Measurement

Sean Sullivan, MA

Administrative Assistant, Quality Measurement

Tristan Wind, BS, ACHE-SA

Coordinator, Quality Measurement

Appendix D: Measure Specifications

1598 Total Resource Use Population-based PMPM Index

STEWARD

HealthPartners

DESCRIPTION

The Resource Use Index (RUI) is a risk adjusted measure of the frequency and intensity of services utilized to manage a provider group's patients. Resource use includes all resources associated with treating members including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Resource Use Index when viewed together with the Total Cost of Care measure (NQF-endorsed #1604) provides a more complete picture of population based drivers of health care costs.

TYPE

Cost/Resource Use

DATA SOURCE

- Claims
- Users administrative claims data base
- Risk Adjustment Tool, Johns Hopkins ACG System
- Standardized costing code table
- Total Care Relative Resource Values (TCRRV); specification provided

LEVEL

Population : Community, County or City, Clinician : Group/Practice

SETTING

Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care All care settings included

NUMERATOR STATEMENT

120754 | 141015 | 135810

NUMERATOR DETAILS

120754 | 141015 | 135810

DENOMINATOR STATEMENT

120754 | 141015 | 135810

DENOMINATOR DETAILS

120754 | 141015 | 135810

EXCLUSIONS

120754 | 141015 | 135810

EXCLUSION DETAILS

120754 | 141015 | 135810

RISK ADJUSTMENT

Statistical risk model

STRATIFICATION

Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

TYPE SCORE

Ratio; Other (specify): <https://www.healthpartners.com/content/dam/brand-identity/pdfs/plan/tcoc-sample-medical-group.pdf> page 9

A provider Total Resource Use Index (RUI) of 1.10 equates to 10% higher risk adjusted resource use. Similarly, a provider RUI score of 0.90 equates to 10% less paid risk adjusted resource use.

A score of 1.0 is equivalent to the peer group average.

ALGORITHM

120754 | 141015 | 135810 120754 | 141015 | 135810

120754 | 141015 | 135810

1604 Total Cost of Care Population-based PMPM Index

STEWARD

HealthPartners

DESCRIPTION

Total Cost of Care reflects a mix of complicated factors such as patient illness burden, service utilization and negotiated prices. Total Cost Index (TCI) is a measure of a primary care provider's risk adjusted cost effectiveness at managing the population they care for. TCI includes all costs associated with treating members including professional, facility inpatient and outpatient, pharmacy, lab, radiology, ancillary and behavioral health services.

A Total Cost Index when viewed together with the Total Resource Use measure (NQF-endorsed #1598) provides a more complete picture of population based drivers of health care costs.

TYPE

Cost/Resource Use

DATA SOURCE

Claims Use administrative claims data base

Risk Adjustment Tool, Johns Hopkins ACG System

LEVEL

Population : Community, County or City, Clinician : Group/Practice

SETTING

Emergency Department and Services, Home Care, Inpatient/Hospital, Other, Outpatient Services, Post-Acute Care All care settings

NUMERATOR STATEMENT

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

NUMERATOR DETAILS

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

DENOMINATOR STATEMENT

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

DENOMINATOR DETAILS

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

EXCLUSIONS

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

EXCLUSION DETAILS

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

RISK ADJUSTMENT

Statistical risk model

STRATIFICATION

Measures are adjusted for clinical risk and limited to the commercial population.

Type Score

Ratio; Other (specify): <https://www.healthpartners.com/content/dam/brand-identity/pdfs/plan/tcoc-sample-medical-group.pdf> see page 9 A provider Total Cost Index (TCI) of 1.10 equates to 10% higher paid risk adjusted PMPM. Similarly, a provider TCI score of 0.90 equates to 10% less paid risk adjusted PMPM.

A score of 1.0 is equivalent to the peer group average.

Algorithm

120754 | 117446 | 109921 | 135810

2431 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

STEWARD

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

DESCRIPTION

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

TYPE

Cost/Resource Use

DATA SOURCE

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period

for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

LEVEL

Facility

SETTING

Inpatient/Hospital

NUMERATOR STATEMENT

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

NUMERATOR DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

DENOMINATOR STATEMENT

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

DENOMINATOR DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

EXCLUSIONS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

EXCLUSION DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

RISK ADJUSTMENT

Statistical risk model

STRATIFICATION

N/A

TYPE SCORE

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

ALGORITHM

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

STEWARD

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

DESCRIPTION

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

TYPE

Cost/Resource Use

DATA SOURCE

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable

medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

LEVEL

Facility

SETTING

Inpatient/Hospital

NUMERATOR STATEMENT

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

NUMERATOR DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

DENOMINATOR STATEMENT

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

DENOMINATOR DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

EXCLUSIONS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

EXCLUSION DETAILS

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

RISK ADJUSTMENT

Statistical risk model

STRATIFICATION

N/A

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

TYPE SCORE

Continuous variable. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

Algorithm

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579 Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

STEWARD

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

DESCRIPTION

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

TYPE

Cost/Resource Use

DATA SOURCE

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical

equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

LEVEL

Facility

SETTING

Inpatient/Hospital

NUMERATOR STATEMENT

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

NUMERATOR DETAILS

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

DENOMINATOR STATEMENT

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

DENOMINATOR DETAILS

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

EXCLUSIONS

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

EXCLUSION DETAILS

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

RISK ADJUSTMENT

Statistical risk model

STRATIFICATION

N/A

TYPE SCORE

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

ALGORITHM

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 14631

Appendix E: Related and Competing Measures

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #0230

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) for patients discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of AMI. Mortality is defined as death for any cause within 30 days after the date of admission for the index admission. CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and are either Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) beneficiaries and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or are hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Outcome

*Data Source***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

The American Community Survey (2013-2017): The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data were used to calculate the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) composite index score.

References:

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_AMImortality_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Facility

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Inpatient/Hospital

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day all-cause mortality. We define mortality as death from any cause within 30 days from the date of admission for patients hospitalized with a principal diagnosis of AMI.

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure counts all deaths (including in-hospital deaths) for any cause to any acute care hospital within 30 days of the date of the index AMI hospitalization.

Identifying deaths in the FFS measure

As currently reported, we identify deaths for FFS Medicare patients 65 years and older in the Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB) and for VA patients in the VA data.

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

This claims-based measure is used for patients aged 65 years or older.

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission. The measure is publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years and older who are Medicare FFS or VA beneficiaries admitted to non-federal or VA hospitals, respectively.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Having a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of the index admission and Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries;
3. Aged 65 or over; and
4. Not transferred from another acute care facility.

We have explicitly tested the measure for those aged 65+ years (see Testing Attachment for details).

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The mortality measures exclude index admissions for patients:

1. Discharged alive on the day of admission or the following day who were not transferred to another acute care facility;
2. With inconsistent or unknown vital status or other unreliable demographic (age and gender) data;
3. Enrolled in the Medicare hospice program or used VA hospice services any time in the 12 months prior to the index admission, including the first day of the index admission; or
4. Discharged against medical advice (AMA).

For patients with more than one admission for a given condition in a given year, only one index admission for that condition is randomly selected for inclusion in the cohort.

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

1. The discharge disposition indicator is used to identify patients alive at discharge. Transfers are identified in the claims when a patient with a qualifying admission is discharged from an acute care hospital and admitted to another acute care hospital on the same day or next day. Patient length of stay and condition is identified from the admission claim.

Rationale: This exclusion prevents inclusion of patients who likely did not have clinically significant AMI.

2. Inconsistent vital status or unreliable data are identified if any of the following conditions are met 1) the patient's age is greater than 115 years; 2) if the discharge date for a hospitalization is before the admission date; and 3) if the patient has a sex other than 'male' or 'female'.

Rationale: Reliable and consistent data are necessary for valid calculation of the measure.

3. Hospice enrollment in the 12 months prior to or on the index admission is identified using hospice data. This exclusion applies when the measure is used in Medicare FFS patients only.

Rationale: These patients are likely continuing to seek comfort measures only; thus, mortality is not necessarily an adverse outcome or signal of poor quality care.

4. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

Risk Adjustment

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

Stratification

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

N/A

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day all-cause RSMRs following hospitalization for AMI using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals [Normand and Shahian, 2007]. At the patient level, it models the log-odds of mortality within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a mortality at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSMR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” deaths at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed mortality rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of deaths within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator is the number of deaths expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected mortality rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected mortality rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of deaths (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of mortality. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of deaths (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet [<https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/mortality/methodology>].

References:

1. Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. *Stat Sci* 22(2): 206-226.
2. Krumholz H, Normand S, Galusha D, et al. Risk-Adjustment Models for AMI and HF 30-Day Mortality Methodology. 2005. 118210 | 112469 | 146637 | 150289

Submission items

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0730 : Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Mortality Rate

0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

1893 : Hospital 30-Day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

3502 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

3504 : Claims-Only Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: We did not include in our list of related measures any non-outcome (e.g., process) measures with the same target population as our measure. Our measure cohort was heavily vetted by clinical experts, a technical expert panel, and a public comment period. Additionally, the measure, with the specified cohort, has been publicly reported since 2008. Because this is an outcome measure, clinical coherence of the cohort takes precedence over alignment with related non-outcome measures. Furthermore, non-outcome measures are limited due to broader patient exclusions. This is because they typically only include a specific subset of patients who are eligible for that measure (for example, patients who receive a specific medication or undergo a specific procedure).

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #0505

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) for patients age 65 and older discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction (AMI). Readmission is defined as unplanned readmission for any cause within 30 days of the discharge date for the index admission. Readmissions are classified as planned and unplanned by applying the planned readmission algorithm. CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and enrolled in fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or are patients hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Outcome

Data Source

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare

administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains administrative data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

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

References

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_AMIreadmission_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Facility

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Facility

Setting

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Inpatient/Hospital

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The outcome for this measure is 30-day all-cause readmissions. We define readmission as an inpatient acute care admission for any cause, with the exception of certain planned readmissions, within 30 days from the date of discharge from the index for patients 65 and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI. If a patient has more than one unplanned admission (for any reason) within 30 days after discharge from the index admission, only the first one is counted as a readmission. The measure looks for a dichotomous yes or no outcome of whether each admitted patient has an unplanned readmission within 30 days. However, if the first readmission after discharge is considered planned, any subsequent unplanned readmission is not counted as an outcome for that index admission because the unplanned readmission could be related to care provided during the intervening planned readmission rather than during the index admission.

Additional details are provided in S.5 Numerator Details.

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The measure counts readmissions to any acute care hospital for any cause within 30 days of the date of discharge of the index AMI admission, excluding planned readmissions as defined below.

Planned Readmission Algorithm (Version 4.0)

The planned readmission algorithm is a set of criteria for classifying readmissions as planned using Medicare and VA administrative claims data. The algorithm identifies admissions that are typically planned and may occur within 30 days of discharge from the hospital.

The planned readmission algorithm has three fundamental principles:

1. A few specific, limited types of care are always considered planned (transplant surgery, maintenance chemotherapy/ immunotherapy, rehabilitation);
2. Otherwise, a planned readmission is defined as a non-acute readmission for a scheduled procedure; and,
3. Admissions for acute illness or for complications of care are never planned.

The algorithm was developed in 2011 as part of the Hospital-Wide Readmission measure. In 2013, CMS applied the algorithm to its other readmission measures.

In applying the algorithm to condition- and procedure-specific measures, teams of clinical experts reviewed the algorithm in the context of each measure-specific patient cohort and, where clinically indicated, adapted the content of the algorithm to better reflect the likely clinical experience of each measure's patient cohort. The planned readmission algorithm is applied to the AMI measure without modifications.

The planned readmission algorithm and associated code tables are attached in data field S.2b (Data Dictionary or Code Table).

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of AMI; and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Principal discharge diagnosis of AMI;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and B for the 12 months prior to the date of admission, and enrolled in Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries;
3. Aged 65 or over;
4. Discharged alive from a non-federal short-term acute care hospital or VA hospital; and,
5. Not transferred to another acute care facility.

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The 30-day AMI readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

- 1) Without at least 30 days of post-discharge enrollment in Medicare FFS (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries);
- 2) Discharged against medical advice (AMA);
- 3) Same-day discharges; or
- 4) Admitted within 30 days of a prior index admission for AMI.

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The AMI readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Without at least 30 days of post-discharge enrollment in Medicare FFS (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries), which is identified with enrollment data from the Medicare Enrollment Database.

Rationale: The 30-day readmission outcome cannot be assessed in this group since claims data are used to determine whether a patient was readmitted.

2. Discharged against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

3. Same-day discharges. This information is identified in claims data.

Rationale: Patients admitted and then discharged on the same day are not included as an index admission because it is unlikely that these patients had clinically significant AMIs.

4. AMI admissions within 30 days of discharge from a qualifying AMI index admission are identified by comparing the discharge date from the index admission with subsequent admission dates.

Rationale: Additional AMI admissions within 30 days are excluded as index admissions because they are part of the outcome. A single admission does not count as both an index admission and a readmission for another index admission.

Risk Adjustment

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Statistical risk model

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 146637

118210| 112469| 146637

Stratification

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

N/A

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

N/A

Type Score

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day, all-cause, RSRRs following hospitalization for AMI using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals (Normand and Shahian, 2007). At the patient level, it models the log-odds of readmission within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the

hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a readmission at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSRR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” readmissions at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed readmission rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of readmissions within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix; and the denominator is the number of readmissions expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected readmission rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected readmission rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of readmissions (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of readmission. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added to the sum of the estimated regression coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of readmissions (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully and in the original methodology reports posted on QualityNet (<https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/readmission/methodology>)

References

Normand S-LT, Shahian D, M,. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Statistical Science. 2007;22(2):206-226 118210| 112469| 146637

Submission items

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0505: Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

5.1 Identified measures: 0730 : Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Mortality Rate

0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

1789 : Hospital-Wide All-Cause Unplanned Readmission Measure (HWR)

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2473 : Hybrid hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI)

2879 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide Readmission (HWR) Measure with Claims and Electronic Health Record Data

2881 : Excess days in acute care (EDAC) after hospitalization for acute myocardial infarction (AMI)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

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

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2158

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure evaluates hospitals' risk-adjusted episode costs relative to the risk-adjusted episode costs of the national median hospital. Specifically, the MSPB Hospital measure assesses the cost to Medicare for Part A and Part B services performed by hospitals and other healthcare providers during an MSPB Hospital episode, which is comprised of the periods 3-days prior to, during, and 30-days following a patient's hospital stay. The MSPB Hospital measure is not condition specific and uses standardized prices when measuring costs. Beneficiary populations eligible for the MSPB Hospital calculation include Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B who were discharged between January 1 and December 1 in a calendar year from short-term acute hospitals paid under the Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS).

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used

for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Assessment Data, Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Medicare Part A and Part B claims data: Part A and B claims data are used to build MSPB Hospital episodes, calculate episode costs, and construct risk adjusters. CMS Office of Information Systems (OIS) maintains a detailed Medicare Claims Processing Manual available at the following URL:

<https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Internet-Only-Manuals-IOMs-Items/CMS018912>.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB): This is used to determine beneficiary-level exclusions and supplemental risk adjusters, specifically Medicare Parts A, B, and C enrollment; primary payer; disability status; end-stage renal disease (ESRD); beneficiary birth dates; and beneficiary death dates.

Minimum Data Set (MDS): The MDS is used to create the Long Term Care Indicator variable in risk adjustment. Data documentation for the MDS is available at the following URL: <https://www.resdac.org/cms-data/files/mds-3.0>.

We used additional data sources for measure testing purposes:

- American Community Survey (ACS): This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/technical-documentation/summary-file-documentation.html>.
- Common Medicare Environment (CME) database: This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.ccwdata.org/documents/10280/19002256/medicare-enrollment-impact-of-conversion-from-edb-to-cme.pdf>.
- Area Deprivation Index (ADI): University of Wisconsin School of Medicine Public Health. 2015 Area Deprivation Index v2.0. Downloaded from <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu> February 24, 2020.

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 Data dictionary URL; Data dictionary attachment; Code table attachment 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Level***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Facility

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Facility

*Setting***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Inpatient/Hospital

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Risk Adjustment***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Stratification by risk category/subgroup

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Stratification***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure is stratified by Major Diagnostic Category (MDC), which are mutually exclusive groups of MS-DRGs that correspond to an organ system (e.g., diseases and disorders of the digestive system) or cause (e.g., burns). There are 25 MDCs

*Type Score***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Ratio; Attachment An MSPB Hospital measure that is less than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is less than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period. An MSPB Hospital measure that is greater than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is greater than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period.

*Algorithm***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Submission items***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

5.1 Identified measures:

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: H.2.1 Response: The MSPB Hospital measure has been harmonized with MSPB Clinician and MSPB-PAC in the following ways: (i) change in risk adjusted ratio calculation, and (ii) allowing readmissions to trigger an episode (specific to MSPB Clinician).

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2436

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used

for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Level

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Facility

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Facility

Setting

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Inpatient/Hospital

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Stratification

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

N/A

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

N/A

Type Score

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

Algorithm

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

Submission items

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #2579

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used

for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Level

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Facility

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

Setting

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Inpatient/Hospital

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Stratification

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

N/A

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

Type Score

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

Algorithm

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Submission items

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2431 and NQF #3474

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Steward

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an AMI episode-of-care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI.

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payments for an elective primary total THA/TKA episode of care, starting with an inpatient admission to a short-term acute care facility and extending 90 days post admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older.

Type

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Cost/Resource Use

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims. The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data sources

Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW)

We used the Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW) to develop our measure. The CCW contains existing CMS beneficiary claims data from multiple care settings that can be linked by a unique patient identifier, allowing researchers to analyze individual patient data across the continuum of care. We used a 100% sample of all FFS Medicare beneficiaries from July 2010 - June 2012 who underwent elective hip or knee replacement and met all cohort inclusion criteria.

The measure was developed using claims data from seven standard analytic files contained in the CCW data (inpatient, outpatient, skilled nursing facility, home health agency, hospice, carrier [physician/supplier Part B items], and durable medical equipment).

Medicare Administrative Claims

The data sources for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between April 1, 2012 and March 31, 2015 (2016 reporting period). The period for public reporting of the THA/TKA measure aligns with the 90-day THA/TKA complication measure. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2006 through 2016 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, post-discharge mortality status, and dual-eligibility. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al., 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

The American Community Survey (2008-2012)

The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data was used to calculate the AHRQ socioeconomic status (SES) composite index score.

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

146637| 135548| 146313 Attachment1 146637| 135548| 146313

Level

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Facility

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Facility

Setting

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Inpatient/Hospital

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Numerator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Statement

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusions

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusion Details

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Statistical risk model

146637| 135548| 146313

146637| 135548| 146313

*Stratification***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

The measure is not stratified.

*Type Score***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The AMI risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an AMI outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The THA/TKA risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of a THA/TKA outcome measure, such as the publicly reported THA/TKA complication measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

*Algorithm***2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313 146637| 135548| 146313

Submission items

2431: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5.1 Identified measures: 1550 : Hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1551 : Hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1609 : ETG Based HIP/KNEE REPLACEMENT cost of care measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 146637 | 135548 | 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #0229

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Steward

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate for patients discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of HF. Mortality is defined as death for any cause within 30 days after the date of admission for the index admission. CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and enrolled in fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or are patients hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Outcome

Data Source

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

We used the American Community Survey (2013-2017) to derive an updated Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) index score at the

patient nine-digit zip code level for use in studying the association between our measure and social risk factors (SRFs).

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

The American Community Survey (2013-2017): The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data were used to calculate the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) composite index score.

References:

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_HFmortality_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Facility

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Inpatient/Hospital

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day all-cause mortality. We define mortality as death from any cause within 30 days from the date of admission for patients 65 and older hospitalized with a principal diagnosis of HF.

Numerator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

The measure counts all deaths (including in-hospital deaths) for any cause within 30 days of the date of the index HF admission.

Identifying deaths in the FFS measure

As currently reported, we identify deaths for FFS Medicare patients 65 years and older in the Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB) and for VA patients in the VA data.

Denominator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

This claims-based measure is used for a cohort of patients aged 65 years or older.

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF and with a complete claims history for

the 12 months prior to admission. The measure is publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years and older who are Medicare FFS or VA beneficiaries admitted to non-federal or VA hospitals, respectively.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

Denominator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Principal discharge diagnosis of heart failure
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of the index admission and Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries
3. Aged 65 or over
4. Not transferred from another acute care facility

We have explicitly tested the measure for those aged 65+ years and those aged 65+ years (see Testing Attachment for details).

Exclusions

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

The mortality measures exclude index admissions for patients:

1. Discharged alive on the day of admission or the following day who were not transferred to another acute care facility;
2. With inconsistent or unknown vital status or other unreliable demographic (age and gender) data;
3. Enrolled in the Medicare hospice program or used VA hospice services any time in the 12 months prior to the index admission, including the first day of the index admission;
4. Discharged against medical advice (AMA); or
5. Patients undergoing left ventricular assist device (LVAD) implantation or heart transplantation during an index admission or who have a history of LVAD or heart transplant in the preceding year.

For patients with more than one admission for a given condition in a given year, only one index admission for that condition is randomly selected for inclusion in the cohort for each year.

*Exclusion Details***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

1. The discharge disposition indicator is used to identify patients alive at discharge. Transfers are identified in the claims when a patient with a qualifying admission is discharged from an acute care hospital and admitted to another acute care hospital on the same day or next day. Patient length of stay and condition is identified from the admission claim.

Rationale: This exclusion prevents inclusion of patients who likely did not have clinically significant HF.

2. Inconsistent vital status or unreliable data are identified if any of the following conditions are met 1) the patient's age is greater than 115 years; 2) if the discharge date for a hospitalization is before the admission date; 3) if the patient has a sex other than 'male' or 'female'.

Rationale: Reliable and consistent data are necessary for valid calculation of the measure.

3. Hospice enrollment in the 12 months prior to or on the index admission is identified using hospice data and the Inpatient standard analytic file (SAF).

Rationale: These patients are likely continuing to seek comfort measures only; thus, mortality is not necessarily an adverse outcome or signal of poor quality care.

4. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

5. Patients with LVAD implantation or heart transplantation during an index admission or in the previous 12 months are identified by the corresponding codes for these procedures included in claims data.

Rationale: Patients undergoing implantation of an LVAD designed to offer intermediate to long-term support (weeks to years) as a bridge to heart transplant or destination therapy represent a clinically distinct, highly-selected group of patients cared for at highly specialized medical centers.

*Risk Adjustment***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 146637| 141015| 150289

118210| 112469| 146637| 141015| 150289

Stratification

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

N/A

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day all-cause RSMRs following hospitalization for HF using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals [Normand and Shahian, 2007]. At the patient level, it models the log-odds of mortality within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a mortality at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among

hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSMR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” deaths at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed mortality rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of deaths within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator is the number of deaths expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected mortality rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected mortality rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of deaths (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of mortality. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of deaths (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet [<https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/mortality/methodology>].

References:

1. Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Stat Sci 22(2): 206-226. 118210 | 112469 | 146637 | 141015 | 150289

Submission items

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0229: Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0358 : Heart Failure Mortality Rate (IQI 16)

0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

1789 : Hospital-Wide All-Cause Unplanned Readmission Measure (HWR)

1893 : Hospital 30-Day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

3502 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

3504 : Claims-Only Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: We did not include in our list of related measures any non-outcome (e.g., process) measures with the same target population as our measure. Our measure cohort was heavily vetted by clinical experts, a technical expert panel, and a public comment period. Additionally, the measure, with the specified cohort, has been publicly reported since 2008. Because this is an outcome measure, clinical coherence of the cohort takes precedence over alignment with related non-outcome measures. Furthermore, non-outcome measures are limited due to broader patient exclusions. This is because they typically only include a specific subset of patients who are eligible for that measure (for example, patients who receive a specific medication or undergo a specific procedure).

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #0330

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Steward

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) for patients discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of heart failure (HF). Readmission is defined as unplanned readmission for any cause within 30 days of the discharge date for the index admission. Readmissions are classified as planned and unplanned by applying the planned readmission algorithm. The target population is patients age 65 and over. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and are enrolled in fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or are patients hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Outcome

Data Source

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

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

References

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_HFreadmission_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Facility

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Inpatient/Hospital

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day readmissions. We define readmissions as any inpatient acute care admission, with the exception of certain planned readmissions, within 30 days from the date of discharge from an index admission with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF in patients 65 and older. If a patient has more than one unplanned admission (for any reason) within 30 days after discharge from the index admission, only one is counted as a readmission. The measure looks for a dichotomous yes or no outcome of whether each admitted patient has an unplanned readmission within 30 days. However, if the first readmission after discharge is considered planned, any subsequent unplanned readmission is not counted as an outcome for that index admission, because the unplanned readmission could be related to care provided during the intervening planned readmission rather than during the index admission.

Additional details are provided in S.5 Numerator Details.

Numerator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The measure counts readmissions to any acute care hospital for any cause within 30 days of the date of discharge of the index HF admission, excluding planned readmissions as defined below.

Planned Readmission Algorithm (Version 4.0)

The planned readmission algorithm is a set of criteria for classifying readmissions as planned using Medicare claims and VA administrative data. The algorithm identifies admissions that are typically planned and may occur within 30 days of discharge from the hospital.

The Planned Readmission Algorithm has three fundamental principles:

1. A few specific, limited types of care are always considered planned (obstetric delivery, transplant surgery, maintenance chemotherapy/radiotherapy/ immunotherapy, rehabilitation);
2. Otherwise, a planned readmission is defined as a non-acute readmission for a scheduled procedure; and,
3. Admissions for acute illness or for complications of care are never planned.

The algorithm was developed in 2011 as part of the Hospital-Wide Readmission measure. In 2013, CMS applied the algorithm to its other readmission measures.

In applying the algorithm to condition- and procedure-specific measures, teams of clinical experts reviewed the algorithm in the context of each measure-specific patient cohort and, where clinically indicated, adapted the content of the algorithm to better reflect the likely clinical experience of each measure's patient cohort. For the HF readmission measure, CMS used the Planned Readmission Algorithm without modifications.

The planned readmission algorithm and associated code tables are attached in data field S.2b (Data Dictionary or Code Table).

Denominator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF, and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission. The measure is publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years and older who are Medicare FFS or VA beneficiaries admitted to non-federal or VA hospitals, respectively.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details

Denominator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following additional inclusion criteria:

1. Principal discharge diagnosis of HF;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of admission, and enrolled in Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries;
3. Aged 65 or over;
4. Discharged alive from a non-federal short-term acute care hospital or VA hospital; and,
5. Not transferred to another acute care facility.

Exclusions

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The 30-day HF readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Without at least 30 days of post-discharge enrollment in Medicare FFS (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries);
2. Discharged against medical advice (AMA);
3. Admitted within 30 days of a prior index admission for HF; and
4. With a procedure code for LVAD implantation or heart transplantation either during the index admission or in the 12 months prior to the index admission.

Exclusion Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The HF readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Without at least 30 days of post-discharge enrollment in Medicare FFS (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries), which is identified with enrollment data from the Medicare Enrollment Database.

Rationale: The 30-day readmission outcome cannot be assessed in this group since claims data are used to determine whether a patient was readmitted.

2. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

3. HF admissions within 30 days of discharge from a qualifying HF index admission are identified by comparing the discharge date from the index admission with subsequent admission dates.

Rationale: Additional HF admissions within 30 days are excluded as index admissions because they are part of the outcome. A single admission does not count as both an index admission and a readmission for another index admission.

4. With a procedure code for LVAD implantation or heart transplantation either during the index admission or in the 12 months prior to the index admission, which are identified by the corresponding codes included in claims data (codes can be found in attached Data Dictionary).

Rationale: Patients with these procedures are a clinically distinct group with a different risk of the readmission outcome.

Risk Adjustment

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Statistical risk model

117446| 141973| 137977| 112469| 146637| 150289

117446| 141973| 137977| 112469| 146637| 150289

Stratification

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

N/A

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day all-cause RSRRs following hospitalization for HF using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient- and hospital-levels to account for variance in patient outcomes

within and between hospitals (Normand and Shahian, 2007). At the patient-level, it models the log-odds of readmission within 30 days of discharge using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of readmission at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSRR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” readmissions to the number of “expected” readmissions, multiplied by the national unadjusted readmission rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio (“predicted”) is the number of readmissions within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator (“expected”) is the number of readmissions expected on the basis of the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected readmission, or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected readmission, or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of readmissions (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of readmission. The estimated hospital-specific effect is added to the sum of the estimated regression coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are log transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of readmissions (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital specific intercept. The results are log transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report (Krumholz et al., 2005).

References:

1. Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. *Stat Sci* 22(2): 206-226.
2. Krumholz H, Normand S, Galusha D, et al. Risk-Adjustment Models for HF and HF 30-Day Readmission Methodology. 2005. 117446 | 141973 | 137977 | 112469 | 146637 | 150289

Submission items

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0330: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

1789 : Hospital-Wide All-Cause Unplanned Readmission Measure (HWR)

1891 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

2879 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide Readmission (HWR) Measure with Claims and Electronic Health Record Data

2880 : Excess days in acute care (EDAC) after hospitalization for heart failure (HF)

2886 : Risk-Standardized Acute Admission Rates for Patients with Heart Failure

2888 : Accountable Care Organization Risk-Standardized Acute Hospital Admission Rate for Patients with Multiple Chronic Conditions

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

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

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #2158

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Steward

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure evaluates hospitals' risk-adjusted episode costs relative to the risk-adjusted episode costs of the national median hospital. Specifically, the MSPB Hospital measure assesses the cost to Medicare for Part A and Part B services performed by hospitals and other healthcare providers during an MSPB Hospital episode, which is comprised of the periods 3-days prior to, during, and 30-days following a patient's hospital stay. The MSPB Hospital measure is not condition specific and uses standardized prices when measuring costs. Beneficiary populations eligible for the MSPB Hospital calculation include Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B who were discharged between January 1 and December 1 in a calendar year from short-term acute hospitals paid under the Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS).

Type

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index

admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Assessment Data, Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Medicare Part A and Part B claims data: Part A and B claims data are used to build MSPB Hospital episodes, calculate episode costs, and construct risk adjusters. CMS Office of Information Systems (OIS) maintains a detailed Medicare Claims Processing Manual available at the following URL: <https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Internet-Only-Manuals-IOMs-Items/CMS018912>.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB): This is used to determine beneficiary-level exclusions and supplemental risk adjusters, specifically Medicare Parts A, B, and C enrollment; primary payer; disability status; end-stage renal disease (ESRD); beneficiary birth dates; and beneficiary death dates.

Minimum Data Set (MDS): The MDS is used to create the Long Term Care Indicator variable in risk adjustment. Data documentation for the MDS is available at the following URL: <https://www.resdac.org/cms-data/files/mds-3.0>.

We used additional data sources for measure testing purposes:

- American Community Survey (ACS): This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/technical-documentation/summary-file-documentation.html>.
- Common Medicare Environment (CME) database: This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.ccwdata.org/documents/10280/19002256/medicare-enrollment-impact-of-conversion-from-edb-to-cme.pdf>.
- Area Deprivation Index (ADI): University of Wisconsin School of Medicine Public Health. 2015 Area Deprivation Index v2.0. Downloaded from <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu> February 24, 2020.

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 Data dictionary URL; Data dictionary attachment; Code table attachment 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Level

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Facility

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Facility

Setting

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Inpatient/Hospital

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Numerator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusions

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusion Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Risk Adjustment***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Stratification by risk category/subgroup

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Stratification***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure is stratified by Major Diagnostic Category (MDC), which are mutually exclusive groups of MS-DRGs that correspond to an organ system (e.g., diseases and disorders of the digestive system) or cause (e.g., burns). There are 25 MDCs

*Type Score***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Ratio; Attachment An MSPB Hospital measure that is less than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is less than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period. An MSPB Hospital measure that is greater than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is greater than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period.

Algorithm

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Submission items

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

5.1 Identified measures:

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: H.2.1 Response: The MSPB Hospital measure has been harmonized with MSPB Clinician and MSPB-PAC in the following ways: (i) change in risk adjusted ratio calculation, and (ii) allowing readmissions to trigger an episode (specific to MSPB Clinician).

Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #2579

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Steward

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

Type

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

*Level***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Facility

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

*Setting***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Inpatient/Hospital

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

*Numerator Statement***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

*Numerator Details***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Denominator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Denominator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Exclusions

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Exclusion Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

*Stratification***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

N/A

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

*Type Score***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

*Algorithm***2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)**

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

Submission items

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2436 and NQF #3474

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Steward

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for a HF episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of HF.

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payments for an elective primary total THA/TKA episode of care, starting with an inpatient admission to a short-term acute care facility and extending 90 days post admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older.

Type

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Cost/Resource Use

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Cost/Resource Use

Data Source

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care,

outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the AMI payment measure aligns with the 30-day AMI mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

Price standardization methodology:

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 Attachment1 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data sources

Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW)

We used the Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW) to develop our measure. The CCW contains existing CMS beneficiary claims data from multiple care settings that can be linked by a unique patient identifier, allowing researchers to analyze individual patient data across the continuum of care. We used a 100% sample of all FFS Medicare beneficiaries from July 2010 - June 2012 who underwent elective hip or knee replacement and met all cohort inclusion criteria.

The measure was developed using claims data from seven standard analytic files contained in the CCW data (inpatient, outpatient, skilled nursing facility, home health agency, hospice, carrier [physician/supplier Part B items], and durable medical equipment).

Medicare Administrative Claims

The data sources for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between April 1, 2012 and March 31, 2015 (2016 reporting period). The period for public reporting of the THA/TKA measure aligns with the 90-day THA/TKA complication measure. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2006 through 2016 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, post-discharge mortality status, and dual-eligibility. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al., 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

The American Community Survey (2008-2012)

The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data was used to calculate the AHRQ socioeconomic status (SES) composite index score.

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

146637 | 135548 | 146313 Attachment1 146637 | 135548 | 146313

Level

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Facility

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Facility

Setting

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Inpatient/Hospital

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210 | 112469 | 135810 | 146637 | 141015 | 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637 | 135548 | 146313

Numerator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Statement

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusions

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusion Details

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Statistical risk model

146637| 135548| 146313

146637| 135548| 146313

Stratification

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

The measure is not stratified.

Type Score

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The HF risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an HF outcome measure, such as the publicly reported HF mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The THA/TKA risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of a THA/TKA outcome measure, such as the publicly reported THA/TKA

complication measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

Algorithm

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313 146637| 135548| 146313

Submission items

2436: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

5.1 Identified measures: 0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 112469| 135810| 146637| 141015| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5.1 Identified measures: 1550 : Hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1551 : Hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1609 : ETG Based HIP/KNEE REPLACEMENT cost of care measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 146637| 135548| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0230

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Steward

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) for patients discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of AMI. Mortality is defined as death for any cause within 30 days after the date of admission for the index admission. CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and are either Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) beneficiaries and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or are hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Cost/Resource Use

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Outcome

Data Source

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

The American Community Survey (2013-2017): The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data were used to calculate the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) composite index score.

References:

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_AMImortality_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day all-cause mortality. We define mortality as death from any cause within 30 days from the date of admission for patients hospitalized with a principal diagnosis of AMI.

Numerator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure counts all deaths (including in-hospital deaths) for any cause to any acute care hospital within 30 days of the date of the index AMI hospitalization.

Identifying deaths in the FFS measure

As currently reported, we identify deaths for FFS Medicare patients 65 years and older in the Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB) and for VA patients in the VA data.

Denominator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

This claims-based measure is used for patients aged 65 years or older.

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission. The measure is publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years and older who are Medicare FFS or VA beneficiaries admitted to non-federal or VA hospitals, respectively.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

*Denominator Details***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Having a principal discharge diagnosis of AMI;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of the index admission and Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries;
3. Aged 65 or over; and
4. Not transferred from another acute care facility.

We have explicitly tested the measure for those aged 65+ years (see Testing Attachment for details).

*Exclusions***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The mortality measures exclude index admissions for patients:

1. Discharged alive on the day of admission or the following day who were not transferred to another acute care facility;
2. With inconsistent or unknown vital status or other unreliable demographic (age and gender) data;
3. Enrolled in the Medicare hospice program or used VA hospice services any time in the 12 months prior to the index admission, including the first day of the index admission; or
4. Discharged against medical advice (AMA).

For patients with more than one admission for a given condition in a given year, only one index admission for that condition is randomly selected for inclusion in the cohort.

*Exclusion Details***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

1. The discharge disposition indicator is used to identify patients alive at discharge. Transfers are identified in the claims when a patient with a qualifying admission is discharged from an acute care hospital and admitted to another acute care hospital on the same day or next day. Patient length of stay and condition is identified from the admission claim.

Rationale: This exclusion prevents inclusion of patients who likely did not have clinically significant AMI.

2. Inconsistent vital status or unreliable data are identified if any of the following conditions are met 1) the patient's age is greater than 115 years; 2) if the discharge date for a hospitalization is before the admission date; and 3) if the patient has a sex other than 'male' or 'female'.

Rationale: Reliable and consistent data are necessary for valid calculation of the measure.

3. Hospice enrollment in the 12 months prior to or on the index admission is identified using hospice data. This exclusion applies when the measure is used in Medicare FFS patients only.

Rationale: These patients are likely continuing to seek comfort measures only; thus, mortality is not necessarily an adverse outcome or signal of poor quality care.

4. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

Risk Adjustment

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Statistical risk model

118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

Stratification

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The

PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day all-cause RSMRs following hospitalization for AMI using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals [Normand and Shahian, 2007]. At the patient level, it models the log-odds of mortality within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a mortality at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSMR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” deaths at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed mortality rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of deaths within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator is the number of deaths expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected mortality rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected mortality rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of deaths (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of mortality. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of deaths (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet [<https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/mortality/methodology>].

References:

1. Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Stat Sci 22(2): 206-226.
2. Krumholz H, Normand S, Galusha D, et al. Risk-Adjustment Models for AMI and HF 30-Day Mortality Methodology. 2005. 118210 | 112469 | 146637 | 150289

Submission items

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0230: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0730 : Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) Mortality Rate

0330 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following heart failure (HF) hospitalization

0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0505 : Hospital 30-day all-cause risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization.

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0229 : Hospital 30-Day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Mortality Rate (RSMR) Following Heart Failure (HF) Hospitalization

1893 : Hospital 30-Day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

2431 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI)

3502 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

3504 : Claims-Only Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: We did not include in our list of related measures any non-outcome (e.g., process) measures with the same target population as our measure. Our measure cohort was heavily vetted by clinical experts, a technical expert panel, and a public comment period. Additionally, the measure, with the specified cohort, has been publicly reported since 2008. Because this is an outcome measure, clinical coherence of the cohort takes precedence over alignment with related non-outcome measures. Furthermore, non-outcome measures are limited due to broader patient exclusions. This is because they typically only include a specific subset of patients who are eligible for that measure (for example, patients who receive a specific medication or undergo a specific procedure).

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0468

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Steward

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR). Mortality is defined as death for any cause within 30 days after the date of admission for the index admission, discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia or a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis

(not severe sepsis) with a secondary diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as present on admission (POA). CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and are either Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) beneficiaries and hospitalized in non-federal hospitals or patients hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Cost/Resource Use

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Outcome

Data Source

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers.

We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

The American Community Survey (2013-2017): The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data were used to calculate the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) composite index score.

Reference:

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_PNmortality_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day all-cause mortality (including in-hospital deaths). We define mortality as death from any cause within 30 days of the index admission date from the date of admission for patients hospitalized with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia or a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not severe sepsis) with a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA and no secondary discharge diagnosis of severe sepsis.

Numerator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

The measure counts all deaths (including in-hospital deaths) for any cause within 30 days of the date of admission of the index pneumonia hospitalization.

Identifying deaths in the FFS measure

As currently reported, we identify deaths for FFS Medicare patients 65 years or over in the Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB) and for VA patients in the VA data.

Denominator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

This claims-based measure is used for a cohort of patients aged 65 years or over older.

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia or a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not severe sepsis) with a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA but no secondary discharge diagnosis of severe sepsis; and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission. The measure will be publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years or older who are Medicare FFS beneficiaries admitted to non-federal hospitals or patients admitted to VA hospitals.

Additional details are provided in S.9 Denominator Details.

Denominator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia; or Principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis), with a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA but no secondary discharge diagnosis of severe sepsis;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS);
3. Aged 65 or over;
4. Not transferred from another acute care facility; and
5. Enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission and enrolled in Part A during the index admission.

We have explicitly tested the measure for those aged 65 years or over (see Testing Attachment for details).

Exclusions

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

The mortality measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Discharged alive on the day of admission or the following day who were not transferred to another acute care facility;
2. With inconsistent or unknown vital status or other unreliable demographic (age and gender) data;
3. Enrolled in the Medicare hospice program or used VA hospice services any time in the 12 months prior to the index admission, including the first day of the index admission; or
4. Discharged against medical advice (AMA).

For patients with more than one admission for a given condition in a given year, only one index admission for that condition is randomly selected for inclusion in the cohort.

Exclusion Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

1. The discharge disposition indicator is used to identify patients alive at discharge. Transfers are identified in the claims when a patient with a qualifying admission is discharged from an acute care hospital and admitted to another acute care hospital on the same day or next day. Patient length of stay and condition is identified from the admission claim.

Rationale: This exclusion prevents inclusion of patients who likely did not have clinically significant pneumonia.

2. Inconsistent vital status or unreliable data are identified if any of the following conditions are met 1) the patient's age is greater than 115 years; 2) if the discharge date for a hospitalization is before the admission date; or 3) if the patient has a sex other than 'male' or 'female'.

Rationale: Reliable and consistent data are necessary for valid calculation of the measure.

3. Hospice enrollment in the 12 months prior to or on the index admission is identified using hospice enrollment data.

Rationale: These patients are likely continuing to seek comfort measures only; thus, mortality is not necessarily an adverse outcome or signal of poor quality care.

4. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

After all exclusions are applied, the measure randomly selects one index admission per patient per year for inclusion in the cohort so that each episode of care is mutually independent with the similar probability of the outcome. For each patient, the probability of death may increase with each subsequent admission, and therefore, the episodes of care are not mutually independent. Also, for the three-year combined data, when index admissions occur during the transition between measure reporting periods (June and July of each year) and both are randomly selected for inclusion in the measure, the measure

includes only the June admission. The July admissions are excluded to avoid assigning a single death to two admissions.

Risk Adjustment

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Statistical risk model

107491| 118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

107491| 118210| 112469| 146637| 150289

Stratification

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

Algorithm

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day all-cause RSMRs following hospitalization for pneumonia using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals (Normand and Shahian, 2007). At the patient level, it models the log-odds of mortality within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a mortality at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSMR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” deaths at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed mortality rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of deaths within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix, and the denominator is the number of deaths expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected mortality rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected mortality rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of deaths (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of mortality. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added to the sum of the estimated regression coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of deaths (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed mortality rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet: <https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/mortality/methodology>.

References:

Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Stat Sci 22(2): 206-226. 107491 | 118210 | 112469 | 146637 | 150289

Submission items

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0468: Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0231 : Pneumonia Mortality Rate (IQI #20)

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0279 : Community Acquired Pneumonia Admission Rate (PQI 11)

1891 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

1893 : Hospital 30-Day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) hospitalization

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3502 : Hybrid Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

3504 : Claims-Only Hospital-Wide (All-Condition, All-Procedure) Risk-Standardized Mortality Measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? No

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: We did not include in our list of related measures any non-outcome (for example, process) measures with the same target population as our measure. Because this is an outcome measure, clinical coherence of the cohort takes precedence over alignment with related non-outcome measures. Furthermore, non-outcome measures are limited due to broader patient exclusions. This is because they typically only include a specific subset of patients who are eligible for that measure (for example, patients who receive a specific medication or undergo a specific procedure). Lastly, this measure and the NQF Inpatient Pneumonia Mortality (AHRQ) Measure #0231 are complementary rather than competing measures. Although they both assess mortality for patients admitted to acute care hospitals with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, the specified outcomes are different. This measure assesses 30-day mortality while #0231 assesses inpatient mortality. Assessment of 30-day and inpatient mortality outcomes have distinct advantages and uses which make them complementary as opposed to competing. For example, the 30-day period provides a broader perspective on hospital care and utilizes standard time period to examine hospital performance to avoid bias by differences in length of stay among hospitals. However, in

some settings it may not be feasible to capture post-discharge mortality making the inpatient measure more useable. We have previously consulted with AHRQ to examine harmonization of complementary measures of mortality for patients with AMI and stroke. We have found that the measures are harmonized to the extent possible given that small differences in cohort inclusion and exclusion criteria are warranted on the basis of the use of different outcomes. However, this current measure includes patients with a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis and a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia that is present on admission. The cohort was also expanded to include patients with a principal discharge diagnosis of aspiration pneumonia. Thus, the current measure cohort is still not harmonized with measure #0231.

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #0506

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Steward

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Description

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The measure estimates a hospital-level 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) for patients age 65 and older discharged from the hospital with either a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) or a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not severe sepsis) with a secondary diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as present on admission (POA). Readmission is defined as an unplanned readmission for any cause within 30 days of the discharge date for the index admission. Readmissions are classified as planned and unplanned by applying the planned readmission algorithm. CMS annually reports the measure for patients who are 65 years or older and enrolled in fee-for-service (FFS) Medicare and hospitalized in

non-federal hospitals or are patients hospitalized in Veterans Health Administration (VA) facilities.

Type

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Cost/Resource Use

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Outcome

Data Source

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Data sources for the Medicare FFS measure:

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

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

Veterans Health Administration (VA) Data: This data source contains data for VA inpatient and outpatient services including: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician data for the 12 months prior to and including each index admission. Unlike Medicare FFS patients, VA patients are not required to have been enrolled in Part A and Part B Medicare for the 12 months prior to the date of admission.

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

References

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

No data collection instrument provided Attachment
NQF_datadictionary_PNreadmission_Fall2020_final_7.22.20.xlsx

Level

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Facility

Setting

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The outcome for this measure is 30-day readmissions. We define readmission as an inpatient acute care admission for any cause, with the exception of certain planned readmissions, within 30 days from the date of discharge from the index admission for patients 65 and older discharged from the hospital with a principal diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia or a principal diagnosis of sepsis (not severe sepsis) with a secondary diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis. If a patient has more than one unplanned admission (for any reason) within 30 days after discharge from the index admission, only the first one is counted as a readmission. The measure looks for a dichotomous yes or no outcome of whether each admitted patient has an unplanned readmission within 30 days. However, if the first readmission after discharge is considered planned, any subsequent unplanned readmission is not counted as an outcome for that index admission because the unplanned readmission could be related to care provided during the intervening planned readmission rather than during the index admission.

Numerator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The measure counts readmissions to any acute care hospital for any cause within 30 days of the date of discharge of the index pneumonia admission, excluding planned readmissions as defined below.

Planned Readmission Algorithm (Version 4.0)

The planned readmission algorithm is a set of criteria for classifying readmissions as planned using Medicare claims and VA administrative data. The algorithm identifies admissions that are typically planned and may occur within 30 days of discharge from the hospital.

The planned readmission algorithm has three fundamental principles:

1. A few specific, limited types of care are always considered planned (transplant surgery, maintenance chemotherapy/immunotherapy, rehabilitation);
2. Otherwise, a planned readmission is defined as a non-acute readmission for a scheduled procedure; and,
3. Admissions for acute illness or for complications of care are never planned.

The algorithm was developed in 2011 as part of the Hospital-Wide Readmission measure. In 2013, CMS applied the algorithm to its other readmission measures.

In applying the algorithm to condition- and procedure-specific measures, teams of clinical experts reviewed the algorithm in the context of each measure-specific patient cohort and, where clinically indicated, adapted the content of the algorithm to better reflect the likely clinical experience of each measure's patient cohort. The planned readmission algorithm is applied to the pneumonia measure without modifications.

The planned readmission algorithm and associated code tables are attached in data field S.2b (Data Dictionary or Code Table).

Denominator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The cohort includes admissions for patients aged 65 years and older discharged from the hospital with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia or a principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not severe sepsis) with a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA and no secondary discharge diagnosis of severe sepsis; and with a complete claims history for the 12 months prior to admission. The measure is publicly reported by CMS for those patients 65 years and older who are Medicare FFS or VA beneficiaries admitted to non-federal or VA hospitals, respectively.

Additional details are provided in S.7 Denominator Details.

Denominator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

To be included in the measure cohort used in public reporting, patients must meet the following inclusion criteria:

1. Principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia, including aspiration pneumonia; or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis), with a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia (including aspiration pneumonia) coded as POA but no secondary discharge diagnosis of severe sepsis;
2. Enrolled in Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) in Part A and Part B for the 12 months prior to the date of admission, and enrolled in Part A during the index admission, or those who are VA beneficiaries;
3. Aged 65 or over;
4. Discharged alive from a non-federal short-term acute care hospital or VA hospital; and,
5. Not transferred from another acute care facility.

Exclusions

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The 30-day pneumonia (PN) readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Discharged against medical advice (AMA);
2. Without at least 30 days post-discharge enrollment in FFS Medicare (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries);
3. Admitted within 30 days of a prior index admission for pneumonia.

Exclusion Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The pneumonia readmission measure excludes index admissions for patients:

1. Discharges against medical advice (AMA) are identified using the discharge disposition indicator in claims data.

Rationale: Providers did not have the opportunity to deliver full care and prepare the patient for discharge.

2. Without at least 30 days of post-discharge enrollment in Medicare FFS (in the case of patients who are not VA beneficiaries), which is identified with enrollment data from the Medicare Enrollment Database.

Rationale: The 30-day readmission outcome cannot be assessed in this group since claims data are used to determine whether a patient was readmitted.

3. Pneumonia admissions within 30 days of discharge from a qualifying pneumonia index admission are identified by comparing the discharge date from the index admission with subsequent admission dates.

Rationale: Additional pneumonia admissions within 30 days are excluded as index admissions because they are part of the outcome. A single admission does not count as both an index admission and a readmission for another index admission.

Risk Adjustment

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Statistical risk model

141973| 112469| 146637

141973| 112469| 146637

Stratification

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

N/A

Type Score

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

Rate/proportion better quality = lower score

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

The measure estimates hospital-level 30-day, all-cause, RSRRs following hospitalization for pneumonia using hierarchical logistic regression models. In brief, the approach simultaneously models data at the patient and hospital levels to account for variance in patient outcomes within and between hospitals (Normand and Shahian, 2007). At the patient level, it models the log-odds of readmission within 30 days of index admission using age, sex, selected clinical covariates, and a hospital-specific intercept. At the hospital level, it models the hospital-specific intercepts as arising from a normal distribution. The hospital intercept represents the underlying risk of a readmission at the hospital, after accounting for patient risk. The hospital-specific intercepts are given a distribution to account for the clustering (non-independence) of patients within the same hospital. If there were no differences among hospitals, then after adjusting for patient risk, the hospital intercepts should be identical across all hospitals.

The RSRR is calculated as the ratio of the number of “predicted” to the number of “expected” readmissions at a given hospital, multiplied by the national observed readmission rate. For each hospital, the numerator of the ratio is the number of readmissions within 30 days predicted on the basis of the hospital’s performance with its observed case mix; and the denominator is the number of readmissions expected based on the nation’s performance with that hospital’s case mix. This approach is analogous to a ratio of “observed” to “expected” used in other types of statistical analyses. It conceptually allows for a comparison of a particular hospital’s performance given its case mix to an average hospital’s performance with the same case mix. Thus, a lower ratio indicates lower-than-expected readmission rates or better quality, and a higher ratio indicates higher-than-expected readmission rates or worse quality.

The “predicted” number of readmissions (the numerator) is calculated by using the coefficients estimated by regressing the risk factors and the hospital-specific intercept on the risk of readmission. The estimated hospital-specific intercept is added to the sum of the estimated regression coefficients multiplied by the patient characteristics. The results are transformed and summed over all patients attributed to a hospital to get a predicted value. The “expected” number of readmissions (the denominator) is obtained in the same manner, but a common intercept using all hospitals in our sample is added in place of the hospital-specific intercept. The results are transformed and summed over all patients in the hospital to get an expected value. To assess hospital performance for each reporting period, we re-estimate the model coefficients using the years of data in that period.

This calculation transforms the ratio of predicted over expected into a rate that is compared to the national observed readmission rate. The hierarchical logistic regression models are described fully in the original methodology report posted on QualityNet (<https://qualitynet.org/inpatient/measures/readmission/methodology>).

References:

Normand S-LT, Shahian DM. 2007. Statistical and Clinical Aspects of Hospital Outcomes Profiling. Stat Sci 22(2): 206-226. 141973| 112469| 146637

Submission items

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

0506: Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

5.1 Identified measures: 0231 : Pneumonia Mortality Rate (IQI #20)

0279 : Community Acquired Pneumonia Admission Rate (PQI 11)

1789 : Hospital-Wide All-Cause Unplanned Readmission Measure (HWR)

2579 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

2882 : Excess days in acute care (EDAC) after hospitalization for pneumonia

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? No

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

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #2158

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

*Steward***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

*Description***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure evaluates hospitals' risk-adjusted episode costs relative to the risk-adjusted episode costs of the national median hospital. Specifically, the MSPB Hospital measure assesses the cost to Medicare for Part A and Part B services performed by hospitals and other healthcare providers during an MSPB Hospital episode, which is comprised of the periods 3-days prior to, during, and 30-days following a patient's hospital stay. The MSPB Hospital measure is not condition specific and uses standardized prices when measuring costs. Beneficiary populations eligible for the MSPB Hospital calculation include Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B who were discharged between January 1 and December 1 in a calendar year from short-term acute hospitals paid under the Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS).

*Type***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Cost/Resource Use

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Cost/Resource Use

*Data Source***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June

30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210 | 135560 | 109921 | 135810 | 141015 | 146637 | 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Assessment Data, Claims, Enrollment Data, Other Medicare Part A and Part B claims data: Part A and B claims data are used to build MSPB Hospital episodes, calculate episode costs, and construct risk adjusters. CMS Office of Information Systems (OIS) maintains a detailed Medicare Claims Processing Manual available at the following URL:

<https://www.cms.gov/Regulations-and-Guidance/Guidance/Manuals/Internet-Only-Manuals-IOMs-Items/CMS018912>.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB): This is used to determine beneficiary-level exclusions and supplemental risk adjusters, specifically Medicare Parts A, B, and C enrollment; primary payer; disability status; end-stage renal disease (ESRD); beneficiary birth dates; and beneficiary death dates.

Minimum Data Set (MDS): The MDS is used to create the Long Term Care Indicator variable in risk adjustment. Data documentation for the MDS is available at the following URL: <https://www.resdac.org/cms-data/files/mds-3.0>.

We used additional data sources for measure testing purposes:

- American Community Survey (ACS): This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/technical-documentation/summary-file-documentation.html>.
 - Common Medicare Environment (CME) database: This is used for evaluating social risk factors. <https://www.ccwdata.org/documents/10280/19002256/medicare-enrollment-impact-of-conversion-from-edb-to-cme.pdf>.
 - Area Deprivation Index (ADI): University of Wisconsin School of Medicine Public Health. 2015 Area Deprivation Index v2.0. Downloaded from <https://www.neighborhoodatlas.medicine.wisc.edu> February 24, 2020.
- 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 Data dictionary URL; Data dictionary attachment; Code table attachment 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Level***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Facility

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Facility

*Setting***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Inpatient/Hospital

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Inpatient/Hospital

*Numerator Statement***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Numerator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Denominator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusions

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Exclusion Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Risk Adjustment

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Stratification by risk category/subgroup

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

*Stratification***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

The MSPB Hospital measure is stratified by Major Diagnostic Category (MDC), which are mutually exclusive groups of MS-DRGs that correspond to an organ system (e.g., diseases and disorders of the digestive system) or cause (e.g., burns). There are 25 MDCs

*Type Score***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

Ratio; Attachment An MSPB Hospital measure that is less than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is less than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period. An MSPB Hospital measure that is greater than 1 indicates that a hospital's MSPB Hospital Amount (i.e. risk-adjusted spending) is greater than the national episode-weighted median MSPB Hospital Amount across all hospitals during a given performance period.

*Algorithm***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

Submission items

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

2158: Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

5.1 Identified measures:

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 131107| 135246| 109921| 135810| 148384| 150289

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: H.2.1 Response: The MSPB Hospital measure has been harmonized with MSPB Clinician and MSPB-PAC in the following ways: (i) change in risk adjusted ratio calculation, and (ii) allowing readmissions to trigger an episode (specific to MSPB Clinician).

The M

Comparison of NQF #2579 and NQF #3474

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Steward

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

*Description***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payment for an eligible pneumonia episode of care starting with inpatient admission to a short term acute-care facility and extending 30 days post-admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years or older with a principal discharge diagnosis of pneumonia or principal discharge diagnosis of sepsis (not including severe sepsis) that have a secondary discharge diagnosis of pneumonia coded as present on admission (POA) and no secondary diagnosis of severe sepsis coded as POA.

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

This measure estimates hospital-level, risk-standardized payments for an elective primary total THA/TKA episode of care, starting with an inpatient admission to a short-term acute care facility and extending 90 days post admission for Medicare fee-for-service (FFS) patients who are 65 years of age or older.

*Type***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Cost/Resource Use

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Cost/Resource Use

*Data Source***2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)**

Claims, Enrollment Data Data Sources

Medicare Inpatient and Outpatient Administrative Claims: This data source contains claims data for FFS inpatient and outpatient services including: Medicare inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital services, skilled nursing facility care, some home health agency services, as well as inpatient and outpatient physician claims.

The 2020 reporting period for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between July 1, 2016 and June 30, 2019. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment. The period for public reporting of the PN payment measure aligns with the 30-day PN mortality and readmission measures for harmonization purposes.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2009 through 2019 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures. Price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment,

prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies) were calculated using standardized methodology specific to services reimbursed through Medicare parts A and B (for specific values see <https://www.resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview>).

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, and post-discharge mortality status. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al. 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

American Community Survey (2013-2017)

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

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 Data dictionary attachment
118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Claims, Enrollment Data Data sources

Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW)

We used the Chronic Condition Data Warehouse (CCW) to develop our measure. The CCW contains existing CMS beneficiary claims data from multiple care settings that can be linked by a unique patient identifier, allowing researchers to analyze individual patient data across the continuum of care. We used a 100% sample of all FFS Medicare beneficiaries from July 2010 - June 2012 who underwent elective hip or knee replacement and met all cohort inclusion criteria.

The measure was developed using claims data from seven standard analytic files contained in the CCW data (inpatient, outpatient, skilled nursing facility, home health agency, hospice, carrier [physician/supplier Part B items], and durable medical equipment).

Medicare Administrative Claims

The data sources for these analyses include Medicare administrative claims and enrollment information for patients with hospitalizations between April 1, 2012 and March 31, 2015 (2016 reporting period). The period for public reporting of the THA/TKA measure aligns with the 90-day THA/TKA complication measure. Medicare administrative claims for the 12 months prior to and during the index admission are used for risk adjustment.

The datasets also contain price-standardized payments for Medicare patients across all Medicare settings, services, and supplies (that is, inpatient, outpatient, SNF, home health agency, hospice, physician/clinical laboratory/ambulance services, and durable medical equipment, prosthetics/orthotics, and supplies). The CMS Standardization Methodology for Allowed Amount for 2006 through 2016 was applied to the claims to calculate the measures.

Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB)

This database contains Medicare beneficiary demographic, benefit/coverage, and vital status information. This dataset was used to obtain information on enrollment, date of birth, post-discharge mortality status, and dual-eligibility. These data have previously been shown to accurately reflect patient vital status (Fleming et al., 1992).

Medicare Fee Schedules

Fee schedules are lists of pre-determined reimbursement amounts for certain services and supplies (e.g. physician services, independent clinical labs, ambulance services, durable medical equipment) and are used by Medicare in the calculation of payment to providers. We used the applicable fee schedules when calculating payments for claims that occurred in each care setting.

Federal Register Final Rules for Medicare Prospective Payment Systems and Payment Policies

Certain data necessary to calculate payments (e.g. annual base payments and conversion factors, DRG weights, wage indexes, and average length of stay) were taken from applicable Federal Register Final Rules.

CMS-published Wage Index Data

Wage index data not published in Federal Register Final Rules (such as the wage index data for Renal Dialysis Facilities) were obtained through the CMS website.

The American Community Survey (2008-2012)

The American Community Survey data is collected annually and an aggregated 5-years data was used to calculate the AHRQ socioeconomic status (SES) composite index score.

Reference

Fleming, C., Fisher, E., Chang, C., Bubolz, T., & Malenka, D. (1992). Studying Outcomes and Hospital Utilization in the Elderly: The Advantages of a Merged Data Base for Medicare and Veterans Affairs Hospitals. *Medical Care*, 30(5), 377-391.

146637| 135548| 146313 Attachment1 146637| 135548| 146313

Level

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Facility

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Facility

Setting

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Inpatient/Hospital

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Inpatient/Hospital

Numerator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Numerator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Statement

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Denominator Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusions

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Exclusion Details

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313

Risk Adjustment

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Statistical risk model

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Statistical risk model

146637| 135548| 146313

146637| 135548| 146313

Stratification

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

The measure is not stratified.

Type Score

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The

PN risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of an PN outcome measure, such as the publicly reported AMI mortality measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

Continuous variable Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Hospitals are classified as having a less than average, no different than average, or greater than average payment as compared to national average payment for an episode. Accordingly, a classification of lower than average payment should not be interpreted as better care. The THA/TKA risk-standardized payment (RSP) is most meaningful when presented in the context of a THA/TKA outcome measure, such as the publicly reported THA/TKA complication measure. This is because a measure of payments to hospitals that is aligned with a quality measure facilitates profiling hospital value (payments and quality).

Algorithm

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

146637| 135548| 146313 146637| 135548| 146313

Submission items

2579: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode of care for pneumonia (PN)

5.1 Identified measures: 0468 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following pneumonia hospitalization

0506 : Hospital 30-day, All-Cause, Risk-Standardized Readmission Rate (RSRR) Following Pneumonia Hospitalization

0230 : Hospital 30-day, all-cause, risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) following acute myocardial infarction (AMI) hospitalization

2158 : Medicare Spending Per Beneficiary (MSPB) Hospital

2436 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 30-day episode-of-care for heart failure (HF)

3474 : Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 118210| 135560| 109921| 135810| 141015| 146637| 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

3474: Hospital-level, risk-standardized payment associated with a 90-day episode of care for elective primary total hip and/or total knee arthroplasty (THA/TKA)

5.1 Identified measures: 1550 : Hospital-level risk-standardized complication rate (RSCR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1551 : Hospital-level 30-day risk-standardized readmission rate (RSRR) following elective primary total hip arthroplasty (THA) and/or total knee arthroplasty (TKA)

1609 : ETG Based HIP/KNEE REPLACEMENT cost of care measure

5a.1 Are specs completely harmonized? Yes

5a.2 If not completely harmonized, identify difference, rationale, impact: 146637 | 135548 | 146313

5b.1 If competing, why superior or rationale for additive value: N/A

Appendix F: Pre-Evaluation Comments

No comments received as of June 17, 2021.

Appendix G: Post-Evaluation Comments

Comments received as of September 27, 2021.

NQF #2431 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI), Comment #1

Standing Committee Recommendation: Recommended for Endorsement

Comment ID#: 7803

Commenter: Koryn Rubin, American Medical Association (AMA)

Council / Public: Health Professionals Council

Comment Period: Post-Evaluation Commenting Period

Date Comment was Submitted: 9/24/2021

Developer Response Required? Yes ☒ No ☐

Level of Support: Member Does Not Support

Themes: Reliability/Minimum Reliability Thresholds, Social Risk and Risk Adjustment, Cost and Quality Correlation

Comment

The American Medical Association (AMA) is concerned that this measure does not meet the scientific acceptability criteria and asks that the Standing Committee reconsider the current recommendation to continue endorsement of this measure. Specifically, the testing results, particularly for measure score reliability, empirical validity and the risk adjustment approach, do not provide the information needed to ensure that the measure produces the desired results.

Regarding the measure score reliability, we are concerned that the signal-to-noise value ranged from 0.298 to 0.594 and we do not support the current threshold of 0.4 used by CMS. The AMA believes that the minimum acceptable threshold should be 0.7 and the measure as specified does not meet this expectation.

The AMA strongly supports the tenet that cost must be assessed within the context of the quality of care provided; yet, the developer was unable to demonstrate that this measure correlates to any one quality measure within the hospital quality programs. This is particularly concerning since the submission clearly states that cost should not be evaluated alone and specific references are made to quality measures (e.g., mortality, readmissions) on which comparisons could be made. We are very troubled that this testing was not provided and we do not believe that cost measures against which no quality measure can be empirically assessed should achieve endorsement.

The AMA does not believe that the current risk adjustment model is adequate due to R-squared result of 0.078 nor is the measure adequately tested and adjusted for social risk factors. It is unclear to us why the developer would test social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors rather than assessing the impact of both clinical and social risk factors in the model at the same time. These variations in how risk adjustment factors are examined could also impact how each variable (clinical or social) perform in the model and remain unanswered questions.

The AMA requests that these gaps in testing be addressed prior to endorsement of this measure. We appreciate the Committee's consideration of our comments.

Developer Response

CORE's NQF submission fully satisfies NQF criteria for endorsement. NQF's Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) determined the measure is scientifically sound and passed the measure on both validity and reliability. The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee voted in favor of re-endorsement of this measure. The developer notes that each of these issues were already addressed by the Standing Committee during the measure's review.

In our testing attachment, we provide split-sample reliability. To calculate split-sample reliability, we randomly sampled half of patients within each hospital from a three-year measurement period, calculated the measure for each hospital, and repeated the calculation using the second half of patients. Thus, each hospital is measured twice, but each measurement is made using an entirely distinct set of patients. To the extent that the calculated measures of these two subsets agree, we have evidence that the measure is assessing an attribute of the hospital, not of the patients. As a metric of agreement, we calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). For this measure, the split-sample reliability for hospitals with at least 25 cases was 0.681 which falls within the thresholds currently under consideration by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP).

References:

Shrout P, Fleiss J. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1979, 86, 420-3428.

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly, measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care.

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity.

Quasi-R²: For a traditional linear model (i.e., ordinary least squares regression) R² is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R² that is akin to the R² of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a “quasi- R²” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R² that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R² results are consistent with R²s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure.

Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model.

The payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do

not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program.

We do not dispute that there can be differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the low AHRQ SES variable, mean observed payments are slightly higher for patients with the social risk factor compared with patients without the social risk factor; for the dual eligibility variable however, observed payments are lower for patients with the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). We also note that our results presented in the testing attachment show that payment ratios estimated with models that adjust for either social risk factor are significantly lower than one. The question we are trying to address with our analyses is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between risk-standardized payments for models with and without the social risk factors are near 1.

References:

Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010.

Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

NQF Response:

Not Applicable

NQF Committee Response:

Thank you for your comments. During the Standing Committee initial review of the measures under consideration, concern was raised regarding the signal-to-noise reliability statistics for entities with low case volume. The Committee acknowledged challenges with achieving reliability thresholds for measure score reliability while balancing the trade-off of including more facilities or providers within the measure to promote transparency across the health care system. The Standing Committee also considered the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)'s decision to pass the measure on reliability and their input on the reliability testing results when voting to recommend these measures for endorsement.

The Standing Committee also acknowledges the commenter's concern that cost, and resource use measure can be influenced by care received in a healthcare setting but also by clinical processes and social risk factors (SRF). While the developers did test for the impact of SRF in the risk models for these measures, some of the measures did not include SRF in the final model. While the Standing Committee notes that it is important to maximize the predictive value of a risk adjustment model, elements of a risk model should be included based on a conceptual and empirical rationale. In light of the SMP's input regarding the validity testing and the approach to the risk adjustment modeling, the majority of the Standing Committee voted to recommend endorsement of these measures.

Lastly, the Standing Committee and NQF recognize that cost and resource use measures should be used in the context of and reported with quality measures. The Standing Committee discussed the relationship between cost and quality measures, emphasizing the importance of reporting performance to demonstrate improvements in cost while ensuring similar or higher levels of care quality. Additionally, the current NQF cost and efficiency endorsement criteria do not require specifications or testing of a paired quality measure.

NQF #2436 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode-of-Care for Heart Failure (HF), Comment #2

Standing Committee Recommendation: Recommended for Endorsement

Comment ID#: 7804

Commenter: Koryn Rubin, American Medical Association (AMA)

Council / Public: Health Professionals Council

Comment Period: Post-Evaluation Commenting Period

Date Comment was Submitted: 9/24/2021

Developer Response Required? Yes ☒ No ☐

Level of Support: Member Does Not Support

Themes: Reliability/Minimum Reliability Thresholds, Social Risk and Risk Adjustment, Cost and Quality Correlation

Comment

The American Medical Association (AMA) is concerned that this measure does not meet the scientific acceptability criteria and asks that the Standing Committee reconsider the current recommendation to continue endorsement of this measure. Specifically, the testing results, particularly for measure score reliability, empirical validity and the risk adjustment approach, do not provide the information needed to ensure that the measure produces the desired results.

Regarding the measure score reliability, we are concerned that the signal-to-noise value ranged from 0.528 & 0.801 and we do not support the current threshold of 0.4 used by CMS. The AMA believes that the minimum acceptable threshold should be 0.7 and the measure as specified does not meet this expectation.

The AMA strongly supports the tenet that cost must be assessed within the context of the quality of care provided; yet, the developer was unable to demonstrate that this measure correlates to any one quality measure within the hospital quality programs. This is particularly concerning since the submission clearly states that cost should not be evaluated alone and specific references are made to quality measures

(e.g., mortality, readmissions) on which comparisons could be made. We are very troubled that this testing was not provided and we do not believe that cost measures against which no quality measure can be empirically assessed should achieve endorsement.

The AMA does not believe that the current risk adjustment model is adequate due to R-squared result of 0.031 nor is the measure adequately tested and adjusted for social risk factors. It is unclear to us why the developer would test social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors rather than assessing the impact of both clinical and social risk factors in the model at the same time. These variations in how risk adjustment factors are examined could also impact how each variable (clinical or social) perform in the model and remain unanswered questions.

The AMA requests that these gaps in testing be addressed prior to endorsement of this measure. We appreciate the Committee's consideration of our comments.

Developer Response:

CORE's NQF submission fully satisfies NQF criteria for endorsement. NQF's Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) determined the measure is scientifically sound and passed the measure on both validity and reliability. The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee voted in favor of re-endorsement of this measure (14 voted yes, out of 15 members). The developer notes that each of these issues were already addressed by the Standing Committee during the measure's review.

In our testing attachment, we provided split-sample reliability. To calculate split-sample reliability, we randomly sampled half of patients within each hospital from a three-year measurement period, calculated the measure for each hospital, and repeated the calculation using the second half of patients. Thus, each hospital is measured twice, but each measurement is made using an entirely distinct set of patients. To the extent that the calculated measures of these two subsets agree, we have evidence that the measure is assessing an attribute of the hospital, not of the patients. As a metric of agreement, we calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). For this measure, the split-sample reliability was 0.781, which falls within the thresholds currently under consideration by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP).

References:

Shrout P, Fleiss J. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1979, 86, 420-3428.

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly, measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are

less than the national average and quality that is better than the national rate, suggesting high-value care.

Heart failure

Death rate for heart failure patients	9.1% Better than the national rate National result: 11.2% Number of included patients: 972
Payment for heart failure patients	\$17,052 Less than the national average payment National average payment: \$18,060 Number of included patients: 949

In addition, each spring, hospitals receive a detailed report of all the patients included in the measure, along with detailed breakdowns of post-acute care costs. Therefore, the payment measures provide an opportunity for hospitals to explore the drivers of costs for their patients and assess the payment measure results in the context of the quality of care they provide to patients.

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity.

Quasi-R2: For a traditional linear model (i.e. ordinary least squares regression), R2 is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R2 that is akin to the R2 of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a “quasi- R2” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R2 that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R2 results are consistent with R2s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure.

Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model.

The payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do

not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program.

We do not dispute that there are differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the dual eligibility variable, mean observed payments are higher for patients with the social risk factor compared with patients without the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). The question we are trying to address with our analyses is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between adjusted and unadjusted risk-standardized payments are near 1.

In addition, adjusting for social risk factors would likely remove an important hospital-level effect. A 2019 study, described in the testing attachment and authored by the developer, showed that differences in hospital-level payments for heart failure and pneumonia were associated with hospital characteristics independently from patient characteristics (Krumholz et al, 2019). The study design held constant the social determinants of health that were not expected to change between the two admissions and compared the same people at two different hospitals so that behaviors, social context, and demographic characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were the same. The authors compared payments for the same Medicare patient for two admissions for the same condition – one admission to a low-payment hospital and one admission to a high-payment hospital – and found that patients who were admitted to hospitals with the highest payment profiles incurred higher costs than when they were admitted to hospitals with the lowest payment profiles. The findings suggest that variations in payments to hospitals are, at least in part, associated with the hospitals independently of non-time-varying patient characteristics.

References:

Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010.

Krumholz, H. M., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Lin, Z., Bernheim, S. M., Xu, X., Desai, N. R., & Normand, S.T. 2019.

Association of Hospital Payment Profiles With Variation in 30-Day Medicare Cost for Inpatients With Heart Failure or Pneumonia. JAMA network open, 2(11), e1915604.

Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

NQF Response:

Not Applicable.

NQF Committee Response:

Thank you for your comments. During the Standing Committee initial review of the measures under consideration, concern was raised regarding the signal-to-noise reliability statistics for entities with low

case volume. The Committee acknowledged challenges with achieving reliability thresholds for measure score reliability while balancing the trade-off of including more facilities or providers within the measure to promote transparency across the health care system. The Standing Committee also considered the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)'s decision to pass the measure on reliability and their input on the reliability testing results when voting to recommend these measures for endorsement.

The Standing Committee also acknowledges the commenter's concern that cost, and resource use measure can be influenced by care received in a healthcare setting but also by clinical processes and social risk factors (SRF). While the developers did test for the impact of SRF in the risk models for these measures, some of the measures did not include SRF in the final model. While the Standing Committee notes that it is important to maximize the predictive value of a risk adjustment model, elements of a risk model should be included based on a conceptual and empirical rationale. In light of the SMP's input regarding the validity testing and the approach to the risk adjustment modeling, the majority of the Standing Committee voted to recommend endorsement of these measures. Lastly, the Standing Committee and NQF recognize that cost and resource use measures should be used in the context of and reported with quality measures. The Standing Committee discussed the relationship between cost and quality measures, emphasizing the importance of reporting performance to demonstrate improvements in cost while ensuring similar or higher levels of care quality. Additionally, the current NQF cost and efficiency endorsement criteria do not require specifications or testing of a paired quality measure.

NQF #2579 Hospital-Level, Risk-Standardized Payment Associated With a 30-Day Episode of Care for Pneumonia (PN), Comment #3

Standing Committee Recommendation: Recommended for Endorsement

Comment ID#: 7805

Commenter: Koryn Rubin, American Medical Association (AMA)

Council / Public: Health Professionals Council

Comment Period: Post-Evaluation Commenting Period

Date Comment was Submitted: 9/24/2021

Developer Response Required? Yes ☒ No ☐

Level of Support: Member Does Not Support

Themes: Reliability/Minimum Reliability Thresholds, Social Risk and Risk Adjustment, Cost and Quality Correlation

Comment

The American Medical Association (AMA) is concerned that this measure does not meet the scientific acceptability criteria and asks that the Standing Committee reconsider the current recommendation to continue endorsement of this measure. Specifically, the testing results, particularly for empirical validity and the risk adjustment approach, do not provide the information needed to ensure that the measure produces the desired results.

The AMA does not believe that the current risk adjustment model is adequate due to R-squared result of 0.076 nor is the measure adequately tested and adjusted for social risk factors. It is unclear to us why the developer would test social risk factors after adjusting for clinical risk factors rather than assessing the impact of both clinical and social risk factors in the model at the same time. These variations in how risk adjustment factors are examined could also impact how each variable (clinical or social) perform in the model and remain unanswered questions.

The AMA strongly supports the tenet that cost must be assessed within the context of the quality of care provided; yet, the developer was unable to demonstrate that this measure correlates to any one quality measure within the hospital quality programs. This is particularly concerning since the submission clearly states that cost should not be evaluated alone and specific references are made to quality measures (e.g., mortality, readmissions) on which comparisons could be made. We are very troubled that this testing was not provided, and we do not believe that cost measures against which no quality measure can be empirically assessed should achieve endorsement.

The AMA requests that these gaps in testing be addressed prior to endorsement of this measure. We appreciate the Committee's consideration of our comments.

Developer Response

CORE's NQF submission fully satisfies NQF criteria for endorsement. NQF's Scientific Methods Panel (SMP) determined the measure is scientifically sound and passed the measure on both validity and reliability. The Cost and Efficiency Standing Committee voted in favor of re-endorsement of this measure (15 voted yes, out of 15 members). The developer notes that each of these issues were already addressed by the Standing Committee during the measure's review.

In our testing attachment, we provided split-sample reliability. To calculate split-sample reliability, we randomly sampled half of patients within each hospital from a three-year measurement period, calculated the measure for each hospital, and repeated the calculation using the second half of patients. Thus, each hospital is measured twice, but each measurement is made using an entirely distinct set of patients. To the extent that the calculated measures of these two subsets agree, we have evidence that the measure is assessing an attribute of the hospital, not of the patients. As a metric of agreement, we calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). For the pneumonia measure, the split-sample reliability was 0.815, which falls within the thresholds currently under consideration by the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP).

References: Shrout P, Fleiss J. Intraclass correlations: uses in assessing rater reliability. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86, 420-3428.

We agree with the AMA that costs need to be assessed within the context of quality of care and have stated so in our submission. Results of the measure alone do not necessarily reflect the quality of care provided by hospitals but simply whether the total episode payments are greater than or less than would be expected for an average hospital with a similar case mix. Accordingly, measure scores are reported together with a quality signal (in this case mortality for the same condition) as an indication of the value of care. (CMS' mortality measures for these conditions were recently re-endorsed by NQF in the Fall 2020 cycle.) An example for one hospital is shown below; this hospital has payments that are greater than the national average and quality that is worse than the national rate, suggesting low-value care.

Pneumonia

Death rate for pneumonia patients	18.4% Worse than the national rate National result: 15.3% Number of included patients: 537
Payment for pneumonia patients	\$19,915 Greater than the national average payment National average payment: \$18,776 Number of included patients: 495

In addition, each spring, hospitals receive a detailed report of all the patients included in the measure, along with detailed breakdowns of post-acute care costs. Therefore, the payment measures provide an opportunity for hospitals to explore the drivers of costs for their patients and assess the payment measure results in the context of the quality of care they provide to patients.

As noted earlier, the SMP reviewed this measure, including an assessment of the risk model, and rated it high for validity.

Quasi-R2: For a traditional linear model (i.e., ordinary least squares regression), R2 is interpreted as the amount of variation in the observed outcome that is explained by the predictor variables (patient-level risk factors). Generalized linear models (GLMs), however, do not output an R2 that is akin to the R2 of a traditional linear model. In order to provide the NQF Committee with a statistic that is conceptually similar, we produced a “quasi- R2” by regressing the total payment outcome on the predicted outcome (Jones et al, 2010). Specifically, we regressed the total payment on the payment predicted by the

patient-level risk factors. This regression produces a quasi-R² that indicates the percent of the variation in payment can be explained by patient-level risk factors. The quasi-R² results are consistent with R²s from other patient-level risk adjustment models for health care payment (Pope et al., 2011). Additional model performance results (predictive ratios, calibration) support the validity of the risk model for this measure.

Social Risk Factors: It is a standard and acceptable practice to test the incremental effects of social risk factors within a clinical risk model, as increased risk from a single social risk factor may be in part or completely explained by a clinical risk factor already in the model.

The payment measures are meant to be reported along with readmission and mortality measures for the same conditions, and those measures, which were recently recommended for re-endorsement, do not include adjustment for social risk factors. Note that the payment measures are not used in a pay-for-performance program.

We do not dispute that there are differences in unadjusted, observed outcomes based on social risk – our own results presented in the testing attachment show, for example, that for the dual eligibility variable, mean observed payments are higher for patients with the social risk factor compared with patients without the social risk factor (note that due to past feedback from NQF, we did not test any race-related variables). The question we are trying to address with our analysis is the impact of adjusting for social risk factor on this particular measure score (risk-standardized payment). Our results show that differences in mean payments are very small, and the correlations between adjusted and unadjusted risk-standardized payments are near 1.

In addition, adjusting for social risk factors would likely remove an important hospital-level effect. A 2019 study, described in the testing attachment and authored by the developer, showed that differences in hospital-level payments for heart failure and pneumonia were associated with hospital characteristics independently from patient characteristics (Krumholz et al, 2019). The study design held constant the social determinants of health that were not expected to change between the two admissions and compared the same people at two different hospitals so that behaviors, social context, and demographic characteristics, including race/ethnicity, were the same. The authors compared payments for the same Medicare patient for two admissions for the same condition – one admission to a low-payment hospital and one admission to a high-payment hospital – and found that patients who were admitted to hospitals with the highest payment profiles incurred higher costs than when they were admitted to hospitals with the lowest payment profiles. The findings suggest that variations in payments to hospitals are, at least in part, associated with the hospitals independently of non-time-varying patient characteristics.

References:

- Jones AM. Models for Health Care. Health, Econometrics and Data Group (HEDG) Working Papers. 2010.
- Krumholz, H. M., Wang, Y., Wang, K., Lin, Z., Bernheim, S. M., Xu, X., Desai, N. R., & Normand, S.T. 2019.

Association of Hospital Payment Profiles With Variation in 30-Day Medicare Cost for Inpatients With Heart Failure or Pneumonia. JAMA network open, 2(11), e1915604.

Pope, G. C., Kautter, J., Ingber, M. J., Freeman, S., Sekar, R., & Newhart, C. RTI International, (2011). Evaluation of the CMS-HCC risk adjustment model (Final Report). pp.6.

NQF Response:

Not Applicable.

NQF Committee Response:

Thank you for your comments. During the Standing Committee initial review of the measures under consideration, concern was raised regarding the signal-to-noise reliability statistics for entities with low case volume. The Committee acknowledged challenges with achieving reliability thresholds for measure score reliability while balancing the trade-off of including more facilities or providers within the measure to promote transparency across the health care system. The Standing Committee also considered the Scientific Methods Panel (SMP)'s decision to pass the measure on reliability and their input on the reliability testing results when voting to recommend these measures for endorsement.

The Standing Committee also acknowledges the commenter's concern that cost, and resource use measure can be influenced by care received in a healthcare setting but also by clinical processes and social risk factors (SRF). While the developers did test for the impact of SRF in the risk models for these measures, some of the measures did not include SRF in the final model. While the Standing Committee notes that it is important to maximize the predictive value of a risk adjustment model, elements of a risk model should be included based on a conceptual and empirical rationale. In light of the SMP's input regarding the validity testing and the approach to the risk adjustment modeling, the majority of the Standing Committee voted to recommend endorsement of these measures. Lastly, the Standing Committee and NQF recognize that cost and resource use measures should be used in the context of and reported with quality measures. The Standing Committee discussed the relationship between cost and quality measures, emphasizing the importance of reporting performance to demonstrate improvements in cost while ensuring similar or higher levels of care quality. Additionally, the current NQF cost and efficiency endorsement criteria do not require specifications or testing of a paired quality measure.

PAGE 220

National Quality Forum
1099 14th Street NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005
<https://www.qualityforum.org>