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## CONCEPT SPECIFICATIONS

**De.1 Concept Title:** Gastrointestinal Hemorrhage Mortality Rate (IQI #18)

**Co.1.1 Concept Steward:** Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

**De.2 Brief Description of Concept:** Percent of discharges with an in-hospital death among cases with a principal diagnosis of gastrointestinal hemorrhage

**2a1.1 Numerator Statement:** Number of in-hospital deaths among cases meeting the inclusion and exclusion rules for the denominator

**2a1.4 Denominator Statement:** All discharges, age 18 years and older, with a principal diagnosis code of gastrointestinal hemorrhage

**2a1.8 Denominator Exclusions:**
- transferring to another short-term hospital
- MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium)
- with missing discharge disposition, gender, age, quarter, year or principal diagnosis

**1.1 Concept Type:** Outcome

**2a1.25-26 Data Source:** Administrative claims

**2a1.33 Level of Analysis:** Facility

**1.2-1.4 Is this concept paired with another measure?** No

**2a1.1 Numerator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the concept focus or what is being measured about the target population, e.g., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome):**

Number of in-hospital deaths among cases meeting the inclusion and exclusion rules for the denominator

**2a1.3 Numerator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, timeframe, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors should be provided in an Excel file in required format with stage 2 measure submission):**

For new concepts, describe how you plan to identify and calculate the numerator.

All discharges with a Disposition of Patient (DISP) coded as "died" (20)

**2a1.4 Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured):**

All discharges, age 18 years and older, with a principal diagnosis code of gastrointestinal hemorrhage

**2a1.5 Target Population Category (Check all the populations for which the concept is specified and tested if any):** Adult/Elderly Care

**2a1.7 Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions,**
timeframe, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors should be provided in an Excel file in required format with stage 2 measure submission)

For new concepts, describe how you plan to identify and calculate the denominator.

ICD-9-CM principal diagnosis code of Gastrointestinal hemorrhage (see below for detail)

Time window may be determined by the user, but is generally a calendar year.

ICD-9-CM Gastrointestinal hemorrhage diagnosis codes:

4560 ESOPHAG VARICES W BLEED
5307 MALLORY-WEISS SYNDROME
53021 ULCER ESOPHAGUS W BLEED
53082 ESOPHAGEAL HEMORRHAGE
53100 AC STOMACH ULCER W HEM
53101 AC STOMAC ULC W HEM-OBST
53120 AC STOMAC ULC W HEM/PERF
53121 AC STOM ULC HEM/PERF-OBS
53140 CHR STOMACH ULC W HEM
53141 CHR STOM ULC W HEM-OBSTR
53160 CHR STOMACH ULC HEM/PERF
53161 CHR STOM ULC HEM/PERF-OB
53200 AC DUODENAL ULCER W HEM
53201 AC DUODEN ULC W HEM-OBST
53220 AC DUODEN ULC W HEM/PERF
53221 AC DUOD ULC HEM/PERF-OBS
53240 CHR DUODEN ULCER W HEM
53241 CHR DUODEN ULC HEM-OBSTR
53260 CHR DUODEN ULC HEM/PERF
53261 CHR DUOD ULC HEM/PERF-OB
53300 AC PEPTIC ULCER W HEMORR
53301 AC PEPTIC ULC W HEM-OBST
53320 AC PEPTIC ULC W HEM/PERF
53321 AC PEPT ULC HEM/PERF-OBS
53340 CHR PEPTIC ULCER W HEM
53341 CHR PEPTIC ULC W HEM-OBST
53360 CHR PEPT ULC W HEM/PERF
53361 CHR PEPT ULC HEM/PERF-OB
53400 AC MARGINAL ULCER W HEM
53401 AC MARGIN ULC W HEM-OBST
53420 AC MARGIN ULC W HEM/PERF
53421 AC MARG ULC HEM/PERF-OBS
53440 CHR MARGINAL ULCER W HEM
53441 CHR MARGIN ULC W HEM-OBST
53460 CHR MARGIN ULC HEM/PERF
53461 CHR MARG ULC HEM/PERF-OB
53501 ACUTE GASTRITIS W HMRHG
53511 ATROPH GASTRITIS W HMRHG
53521 GSTR MCSL HYPRT W HMRG
53531 ALCHL GSTRITIS W HMRHG
53541 OTH SPF GASTRT W HMRHG
53551 GSTR/DDNTS NOS W HMRHG
53561 DUODENITIS W HMRHG
53783 ANGIO STM/DUDN W HMRHG
53784 DIEULAFOY LES STOM&DUOD
56202 DVRTLCI SML INT W HMRHG
56203 DVRTCLI SML INT W HMRHG
56212 DVRTLCI COLON W HMRHG
2a1.8 Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population):
Exclude cases:
• transferring to another short-term hospital
• MDC 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium)
• with missing discharge disposition, gender, age, quarter, year or principal diagnosis

2a1.9 Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors should be provided in an Excel file in required format with stage 2 measure submission)
For new concepts, describe how you plan to identify and calculate the exclusions.
• transferring to another short-term hospital (Disposition of Patient (DISP) coded as Transfer to Short-term Hospital (2))
• Major Diagnostic Category 14 (pregnancy, childbirth, and puerperium) - note that this exclusion is implied by the fact that the denominator is limited to patients with a principal diagnosis code for gastrointestinal hemorrhage, which maps to MDC 6 (digestive)
• missing discharge disposition (DISP=missing)
• missing gender (SEX=missing)
• missing age (AGE=missing)
• missing quarter (DQTR=missing)
• missing year (YEAR=missing)
• missing principal diagnosis (DX1=missing)

2a1.10 Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors should be provided in an Excel file in required format with stage 2 measure submission)
For new concepts, if you plan to stratify the measure results, describe the plans for stratification.
Not applicable

2a1.13 Statistical Risk Model and Variables (Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development should be addressed in measure testing in the stage 2 measure submission)
For new concepts, if an outcome, describe how you plan to adjust for differences in case mix/risk across measured entities.
The predicted value for each case is computed using a two-stage hierarchical model (the first stage is a logistic regression using Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) to account for clustering of patients within hospitals; the second stage is a reliabli

2a1.25 Data Source (Check all the sources for which the concept is specified and tested). If other, please describe:
Administrative claims

2a1.26 Data Source/Data Collection Instrument (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument, e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.): HCUP State Inpatient Databases (SID). Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP). Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.
Data dictionary and code tables are available at http://www.qualityindicators.ahrq.gov/Downloads/Software/Win

2a1.33 Level of Analysis (Check the levels of analysis for which the concept is specified and tested): Facility

2a1.34 Care Setting (Check all the settings for which the concept is specified and tested): Hospital/Acute Care Facility
**IMPACT, OPPORTUNITY, EVIDENCE - IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT**

Importance to Measure and Report is the criterion that must be met in order to recommend a concept for approval. All three subcriteria must be met to pass this criterion. See guidance on evidence.

1a. High Impact: H □ M □ L □ I □
(The concept directly addresses a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or NPP, or some other high impact aspect of healthcare.)

De.4 Subject/Topic Areas (Check all the areas that apply): Gastrointestinal (GI), Gastrointestinal (GI) : Bleeding
De.5 Cross Cutting Areas (Check all the areas that apply):

1a.1 Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare: A leading cause of morbidity/mortality

1a.2 If “Other,” please describe:

1a.3 Summary of Evidence of High Impact (Provide epidemiologic or resource use data):

More people are admitted to the hospital for upper GI bleeding than for congestive heart failure or deep vein thrombosis. 1 In the United States, the annual rate of hospitalization for upper GI bleeding is estimated to be 165 per 100,000—equating to more than 300,000 hospitalizations per year, at a cost of $2.5 billion, 2, 3 with a case-fatality rate of 7 to 10 percent. 1 However, costs are not constant across all bleed types. In a study using the Nationwide Inpatient Sample, researchers reported a fourfold higher cost and LOS attributable to rebleeding for variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding compared to nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding. 2 Hospitalization costs with and without complications were $5,632 and $3,402 for non-variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding, versus $23,207 and $6,612 for variceal upper gastrointestinal bleeding, respectively. Mean length of stay was 4.4 and 2.7 days for nonvariceal bleeding, versus 15.2 and 3.8 days for variceal bleeding, respectively. 2 Acute, massive lower gastrointestinal bleeding has an incidence of 20 to 27 episodes per 100,000 persons annually, with a mortality rate of 4 to 10 percent. 3 Mortality rates increase in patients with advancing age and increasing number of associated underlying comorbidities, specifically renal and hepatic dysfunction, heart disease, and malignancies. 3-9

Among community hospitals in the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project, the risk-adjusted rate of this indicator was 19.363 per 1,000 eligible admissions (1.94%) in 2008. This rate has steadily declined over the past 14 years, from 5.78% in 1994 to 4.57% in 2000 to 3.02% in 2005.


1b. Opportunity for Improvement: H □ M □ L □ I □
(There is a demonstrated performance gap - variability or overall less than optimal performance)

1b.1 Briefly explain the benefits (improvements in quality) envisioned by use of this concept:
Providers may adopt the processes of care or structures of care of the best performing providers or consumers may select the best
performing providers in order to improve overall outcomes.

1b.2 **Provide data demonstrating performance gap/opportunity for improvement** *(Variation or overall less than optimal performance across providers)*. List citations in 1b.3.

**For endorsement maintenance, provide performance data on the measure as specified** *(mean, std dev, distribution of scores by decile, min, max)*. Describe who was included in the performance data in 1b.3. In regard to figures below:

1st figure: estimate per 1,000, risk adjusted rates
2nd figure: standard error
3rd figure: p value relative to marked group (marked group = “c”)
4th figure: p value: current year relative to prior year

Key:
*c*: Reference for p-value test statistics
***: Data do not meet criteria for statistical reliability, data quality, or confidentiality

HCUPNet: [http://hcupnet.ahrq.gov](http://hcupnet.ahrq.gov)

**Hospital characteristic**:
**Location of inpatient treatment**:
- Northeast: 20.844 0.405 c.ccc 0.000
- Midwest: 17.614 0.367 0.000 0.000
- South: 19.539 0.288 0.009 0.000
- West: 19.688 0.437 0.052 0.000

**Ownership/control**:
- Private, not-for-profit: 18.405 0.208 c.ccc 0.000
- Private, for-profit: 21.746 0.495 0.000 0.001
- Public: 22.779 0.528 0.000 0.000

**Teaching status**:
- Teaching: 17.346 0.333 0.000 0.000
- Nonteaching: 20.192 0.214 c.ccc 0.000

**Location of hospital (NCHS)**:
- Large central metropolitan: 18.404 0.317 0.857 0.000
- Large fringe metropolitan: 18.315 0.379 c.ccc 0.000
- Medium metropolitan: 18.742 0.377 0.424 0.000
- Small metropolitan: 22.087 0.578 0.000 0.008
- Micropolitan: 22.245 0.568 0.000 0.000
- Noncore: 24.739 1.193 0.000 0.000

**Bed size of hospital**:
- Less than 100: 22.932 0.596 0.000 0.000
- 100 - 299: 20.285 0.284 c.ccc 0.000
- 300 - 499: 18.548 0.347 0.000 0.000
- 500 or more: 17.257 0.371 0.000 0.000

1b.3 **Citations for Data on Performance Gap provided in 1b.2**.

**For endorsement maintenance**, describe who was included in the performance results reported in 1b.2 *(number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include)*


There are 630 hospitals with a least 1 denominator case for IQI 18 in the NIS; this represents all such hospitals in the NIS, which is a 20% stratified random sample of all community hospitals.

1b.4 **Provide data on disparities by population group**. List citations in 1b.5.

**For endorsement maintenance, provide performance data by population group on the measure as specified** *(e.g., mean, std dev)*. Describe who was included in the performance data in 1b.5.

In regard to figures below:
1st figure: estimate per 1,000, risk adjusted rates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient characteristic</th>
<th>18-44c</th>
<th>45-64</th>
<th>65 and over</th>
<th>65-69c</th>
<th>70-74</th>
<th>75-79</th>
<th>80-84</th>
<th>85 and over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age groups for conditions affecting any age</td>
<td>04.395</td>
<td>18.300</td>
<td>22.989</td>
<td>13.675</td>
<td>14.911</td>
<td>15.322</td>
<td>21.815</td>
<td>38.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age groups for conditions affecting primarily elderly</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- "c": Reference for p-value test statistics
- "***": Data do not meet criteria for statistical reliability, data quality, or confidentiality

**HCUPNet:** [http://hcupnet.ahrq.gov](http://hcupnet.ahrq.gov)

**Patient characteristic:**

**Age groups for conditions affecting any age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-44c</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age groups for conditions affecting primarily elderly**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65-69c</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Median income of patient’s ZIP code:**

- **First quartile (lowest income):** 20.311
- **Second quartile:** 20.089
- **Third quartile:** 18.554
- **Fourth quartile (highest income):** 17.985

**Location of patient residence (NCHS):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large central</td>
<td>18.732</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>19.466</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>21.911</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micropolitan</td>
<td>20.531</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncore</td>
<td>21.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expected payment source:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected payment source</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private insurance</td>
<td>21.381</td>
<td>0.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare</td>
<td>18.374</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>22.228</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uninsured / self-pay / no charge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>p-value relative to prior year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.117</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>25.447</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>21.007</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1b.5 Citations for Data on Disparities Cited in 1b.4:**

**Sources:**

- Race/ethnicity data are from the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project, State Inpatient Databases, 2008, Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, Rockville, MD.
There are 630 hospitals with at least 1 denominator case for IQI 18 in the NIS; this represents all such hospitals in the NIS, which is a 20% stratified random sample of all community hospitals.

1c. Evidence (Concept focus is a health outcome OR meets the criteria for quantity, quality, consistency of the body of evidence.)
Is the concept focus a health outcome?  Yes[ ] No[ ] If not a health outcome, rate the body of evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-H</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-M-H</td>
<td>L-M-H</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the concept pass subcriterion 1c?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>L-M-H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Health outcome – rationale supports relationship to at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service

Please see the attached Evidence Submission Worksheet for evidence specifications.

Was the concept approval criterion, Importance to Measure and Report, met?
(1a & 1b must be rated moderate or high and 1c yes)  Yes[ ] No[ ]
Provide rationale based on specific subcriteria:

3. USABILITY

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

Current Use:
Planned Use:

5. COMPARISON TO RELATED AND COMPETING CONCEPTS & MEASURES

5.1 If there are related measures (either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and same target population), list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures:

5a.1 If this concept has either the same focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s): Are the specifications completely harmonized?

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

5b.1 If this concept has both the same focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s): Describe why this concept is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible):
Not Applicable

See Guidance for Definitions of Rating Scale: H=High; M=Moderate; L=Low; I=Insufficient; NA=Not Applicable
### CONTACT INFORMATION

| Co.1 Concept Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 540 Gaither Road | Rockville | Maryland | 20850 |
| Co.2 Point of Contact: John | Bott, AHRQ Quality Indicators Senior Analyst | John.Bott@AHRQ.hhs.gov | 301-427-1317- |
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### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

| Concept Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance |
| Year the concept was first released: |
| Month and Year of most recent revision: |
| What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? |
| When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? |
| Copyright statement: Not applicable |
| Disclaimers: Not applicable |
| Additional Information/Comments: |
| Date of Submission (MM/DD/YY): Jul 16, 2012 |
Measure Title: Gastrointestinal Hemorrhage Mortality Rate (IQI #18)
Date of Submission: 7/9/2012

• Respond to all questions with answers immediately following the question.
• Maximum of 6 pages (6 pages includes questions/instructions in the form); minimum font size 11 pt
• All information needed to demonstrate meeting the evidence criterion (1c) must be in this form. An appendix of supplemental materials may be submitted, but there is no guarantee it will be reviewed.
• See NQF guidance on evaluating evidence. Contact NQF staff for examples, resources, or questions.

STRUCTURE-PROCESS-OUTCOME RELATIONSHIP
1c.1. This is a measure of:
Outcome
☒ Health outcome: Inpatient mortality
☐ Intermediate clinical outcome: 2T
☐ Process: 2T
☐ Structure: 2T
☐ Other: 2T

HEALTH OUTCOME MEASURE  If not a health outcome, skip to 1c.3
If the measure focus identified in 1c.1 is a health outcome, answer 1c.2 and 1c.2.1.
1c.2. Briefly state or diagram how the health outcome is related to at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service.

Admission for gastrointestinal hemorrhage is fairly common (circa 100/100,000 adults/year). Mortality is generally regarded as an undesirable outcome of hospital care for this condition, as for many other conditions and procedures (e.g., acute myocardial infarction, heart failure, pneumonia, stroke), although there is a small subset of patients for whom death may be the expected outcome.

Multiple care processes can influence the course of a patient during a hospital stay for gastrointestinal hemorrhage, including but not limited to:
1. Prompt recognition of gastrointestinal hemorrhage as the cause of a patient’s symptoms, necessitating inpatient admission for further evaluation and treatment.
2. Prompt assessment of the severity of the patient’s hemorrhage and the associated risk of mortality, to guide initial decisions about where to admit the patient and how much nursing care to provide.
3. Appropriate stabilization of acutely ill patients with prompt but safe administration of fluids, blood products, vasoressors, and other resuscitative maneuvers.
4. Appropriate diagnostic and evaluation processes to identify the source of bleeding and to characterize the risk of rebleeding.
5. Appropriate monitoring by nurses, physicians, and other health professionals to identify early warning signs of clinical deterioration and to implement “rapid response” as appropriate.
6. Appropriate treatment of high-risk bleeding sources with pharmacologic and procedural interventions that have been demonstrated to reduce the risk of rebleeding and transfusion requirements.

7. Appropriate timing of transfer from the intensive care setting to the regular unit setting, with appropriate handoffs to ensure that all important information is transmitted and that the care plan is continued and modified as needed.

Mortality rates for GI hemorrhage vary greatly, and lower mortality has been associated with more use of treatments such as early endoscopy (within 24-48 hours of presentation), though the strength of this relationship has not been established, with some studies failing to find significant relationships. Mortality rates in large population based databases have not changed since the 1940s, though there have been increases in the ages and comorbidities of patients that may have offset mortality rate declines due to better quality of care.

1c.2.1. State the rationale supporting the relationship between the health outcome and at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service.

A number of medical treatments have been shown to be associated with bleeding control among patients admitted with acute GI hemorrhage, although evidence on mortality is more limited. One meta-analysis showed a slight advantage for early endoscopy versus medical management among unselected patients with acute nonvariceal upper GI hemorrhage, although some individual studies have failed to find significant associations in multivariate analyses.

Recent attention has focused on patients with hemorrhage due to bleeding esophageal varices, who have a particularly high risk of death. A meta-analysis of 12 randomized trials of beta blockers showed a 21% improvement in the percentage of patients free of rebleeding (RR 1.42), a 5.4% improvement in the mean survival rate (RR 1.27), and 7.4% improvement in the mean percentage of patients free of bleeding death (RR 1.50). Eight trials evaluated the effects of antibiotic prophylaxis compared with placebo or no antibiotic prophylaxis in 864 cirrhotic patients with upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage; significant beneficial effects on mortality (RR 0.73 [95% CI, 0.55 to 0.95]) and the incidence of bacterial infections (RR 0.40 [95% CI 0.32 to 0.51]) were observed. Vasoactive agents such as terlipressin also significantly reduce mortality (RR 0.66 [95% CI, 0.49 to 0.88]) relative to placebo but not relative to endoscopic sclerotherapy. A meta-analysis of 23 randomized trials, with 1860 patients, comparing endoscopic plus beta-blocker therapy with either therapy alone, showed that combination therapy reduced overall rebleeding, variceal bleeding, and variceal recurrence more than either endoscopic or beta-blocker therapy alone. Mortality after combination therapy was nonsignificantly lower than that after endoscopic (odds ratio, 0.78 [95% CI, 0.58 to 1.07] or drug therapy alone (odds ratio, 0.70 [95% CI, 0.46 to 1.06]).

These findings from randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses have been incorporated into recent practice guidelines from the American College of Gastroenterology and the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. Their Class 1 recommendations include:

1. Acute GI hemorrhage in a patient with cirrhosis is an emergency that requires prompt attention with intravascular volume support and blood transfusions, being careful to maintain a hemoglobin of 8 g/dL (Class I, Level B).
2. Short-term (maximum 7 days) antibiotic prophylaxis should be instituted in any patient with cirrhosis and GI hemorrhage (Class I, Level A).

3. Pharmacological therapy (somatostatin or its analogues octreotide and vapreotide; terlipressin) should be initiated as soon as variceal hemorrhage is suspected and continued for 3-5 days after diagnosis is confirmed (Class I, Level A).

4. EGD, performed within 12 hours, should be used to make the diagnosis and to treat variceal hemorrhage, either with EVL or sclerotherapy (Class I, Level A).

5. TIPS is indicated in patients in whom hemorrhage from esophageal varices cannot be controlled or in whom bleeding recurs despite combined pharmacological and endoscopic therapy (Class I, Level C).

6. Balloon tamponade should be used as a temporizing measure (maximum 24 hours) in patients with uncontrollable bleeding for whom a more definitive therapy (e.g., TIPS or endoscopic therapy) is planned (Class I, Level B).

Similarly, from the World Gastroenterological Association’s evidence-based guidelines: 
“Management of Acute Variceal Hemorrhage in Patients with Cirrhosis”

Resuscitation measures include:
1. Intravenous (IV) volume support
2. Blood transfusion
3. Correct severe coagulation/platelet deficits
4. Antibiotic prophylaxis (up to 7 days):
   5. Oral norfloxacin (400 mg twice daily [BID]), or
   6. IV ciprofloxacin (400 mg BID), or
   7. IV ceftriaxone (1 g/day) in advanced cirrhosis

Pharmacological therapy includes:
1. Continue 3-5 days after confirmed diagnosis
2. Somatostatin (terlipressin or octreotide, vapreotide)

Within 12 hours:
1. Confirm diagnosis with EGD
2. Treat variceal hemorrhage with EVL or sclerotherapy

In uncontrollable bleeding or recurrence:
1. TIPS indicated

In uncontrollable bleeding while waiting for TIPS or endoscopic therapy:
1. Balloon tamponade as temporizing measure for 24 hours maximum.15

Many of the deaths reported among GI hemorrhage are not associated with bleeding per se. One study found that only one such death was directly related to bleeding, and that patient had several severe comorbidities.3 In many cases, deaths among patients with a principal diagnosis of gastrointestinal hemorrhage are due to infectious or cardiovascular complications of the hemorrhage or the underlying condition (e.g., chronic liver disease, cancer) and not primarily due to the acute hemorrhage itself. Among patients with bleeding from esophageal varices, death rates are higher and appear to be more closely related to blood loss and interventions to minimize blood loss.7,16 However, appropriate risk stratification, early stabilization, ongoing monitoring, and measures to prevent infectious and cardiovascular complications (e.g., central line bundle to prevent central line associated bloodstream
infections, sepsis bundle to detect early signs of sepsis and respond appropriately) appear to have favorable effects on all hospitalized patients at risk, including patients with GI hemorrhage.
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