

# NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

## Measure Evaluation 4.1 December 2009

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

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

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

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

Evaluation ratings of the extent to which the criteria are met

C = Completely (unquestionably demonstrated to meet the criterion)

P = Partially (demonstrated to partially meet the criterion)

M = Minimally (addressed BUT demonstrated to only minimally meet the criterion)

N = Not at all (NOT addressed; OR incorrectly addressed; OR demonstrated to NOT meet the criterion)

NA = Not applicable (only an option for a few subcriteria as indicated)

(for NQF staff use) NQF Review #: 0118	NQF Project: Surgery Endorsement Maintenance 2010
MEASURE DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION	
De.1 Measure Title: <a href="#">Anti-Lipid Treatment Discharge</a>	
De.2 Brief description of measure: <a href="#">Percent of patients aged 18 years and older undergoing isolated CABG who were discharged on a statin or other lipid-lowering regimen</a>	
1.1-2 Type of Measure: <a href="#">Process</a>	
De.3 If included in a composite or paired with another measure, please identify composite or paired measure <a href="#">OT1-013-09 - The STS CABG Composite Score</a>	
De.4 National Priority Partners Priority Area: <a href="#">Safety</a>	
De.5 IOM Quality Domain: <a href="#">Safety</a>	
De.6 Consumer Care Need: <a href="#">Getting better</a>	

CONDITIONS FOR CONSIDERATION BY NQF	
Four conditions must be met before proposed measures may be considered and evaluated for suitability as voluntary consensus standards:	<b>NQF Staff</b>
<p>A. The measure is in the public domain or an intellectual property (<a href="#">measure steward agreement</a>) is signed. <i>Public domain only applies to governmental organizations. All non-government organizations must sign a measure steward agreement even if measures are made publicly and freely available.</i></p> <p>A.1 Do you attest that the measure steward holds intellectual property rights to the measure and the right to use aspects of the measure owned by another entity (e.g., risk model, code set)? <a href="#">Yes</a></p> <p>A.2 Indicate if Proprietary Measure (as defined in measure steward agreement):</p> <p>A.3 Measure Steward Agreement: <a href="#">Agreement will be signed and submitted prior to or at the time of measure submission</a></p> <p>A.4 Measure Steward Agreement attached: <a href="#">STS Measure Steward Agreement. Fully Executed-634281998899954268.pdf</a></p>	A Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

B. The measure owner/steward verifies there is an identified responsible entity and process to maintain and update the measure on a schedule that is commensurate with the rate of clinical innovation, but at least every 3 years. <b>Yes, information provided in contact section</b>	B Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
C. The intended use of the measure includes <u>both</u> public reporting <u>and</u> quality improvement. ► <b>Purpose:</b>	C Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
D. The requested measure submission information is complete. Generally, measures should be fully developed and tested so that all the evaluation criteria have been addressed and information needed to evaluate the measure is provided. Measures that have not been tested are only potentially eligible for a time-limited endorsement and in that case, measure owners must verify that testing will be completed within 12 months of endorsement. D.1 <b>Testing:</b> <b>Yes, fully developed and tested</b> D.2 <b>Have NQF-endorsed measures been reviewed to identify if there are similar or related measures?</b> <b>Yes</b>	D Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>(for NQF staff use) Have all conditions for consideration been met?</b> Staff Notes to Steward (if submission returned):	Met Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
Staff Notes to Reviewers (issues or questions regarding any criteria):	
Staff Reviewer Name(s):	

<b>TAP/Workgroup Reviewer Name:</b>	
<b>Steering Committee Reviewer Name:</b>	
<b>1. IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT</b>	
Extent to which the specific measure focus is important to making significant gains in health care quality (safety, timeliness, effectiveness, efficiency, equity, patient-centeredness) and improving health outcomes for a specific high impact aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall poor performance. <b>Measures must be judged to be important to measure and report in order to be evaluated against the remaining criteria.</b> ( <a href="#">evaluation criteria</a> ) <b>1a. High Impact</b>	<u>Eval</u> <u>Rating</u>
<b>(for NQF staff use) Specific NPP goal:</b>	
<b>1a.1 Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare:</b> <b>Affects large numbers, Frequently performed procedure, Leading cause of morbidity/mortality, High resource use, Severity of illness, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality</b> <b>1a.2</b> <b>1a.3 Summary of Evidence of High Impact:</b> <b>Recognizing the importance of statins including their protean effects as well as lipid lowering effects, patients with bypass conduits have the potential to benefit from antilipid therapy as noted in the references.</b> <b>1a.4 Citations for Evidence of High Impact:</b> - Campeau L. Lipid Lowering and coronary bypass graft surgery. Curr Opin Cardiol. 2000;15(6):395-399. - Denton TA, Fonarow GC, LaBresh KA, et al. Secondary prevention after coronary bypass: the American Heart Association “Get with the Guidelines” program. Ann Thorac Surg. 2003;75(3):758-760. - Faulkner MA, Wadibia EC, Lucas BD, et al. Impact of pharmacy counseling on compliance and effectiveness of combination lipid-lowering therapy in patients undergoing coronary artery revascularization: a randomized, controlled trial. Pharmacotherapy. 2003;20(4):410-416. - Hunninghake DB. Is aggressive cholesterol control justified? review of the post-coronary artery bypass graft trial. Am J Cardiol. 1998;82(10B):45T-48T. - Welke KF, Ferguson TB, Coombs LP, et al. Validity of the Society of Thoracic Surgeons National Adult Cardiac Surgery Database. Ann Thorac Surg. 2004;77:1137-1139. - Shah SJ, Waters DD, Barter P, Kastelein JJP, Shepherd J, Wenger NK, DeMicco DA, Breazna A,	<b>1a</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>LaRosa JC. Intensive Lipid-lowering with Atorvastatin for secondary prevention in patients after coronary artery bypass surgery. J Am Coll Cardiol. 2008; 51(20):1938-1943.</p> <p>- Vaduganathan M, Stone NJ, Lee R, McGee EC, Malaisrie SC, Silverberg RA, McCarthy,PM. Perioperative statin therapy reduces mortality in normolipidemic patients undergoing cardiac surgery. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2010;140(5):1018-1027.</p>	
<p><b>1b. Opportunity for Improvement</b></p> <p><b>1b.1 Benefits (improvements in quality) envisioned by use of this measure:</b> Expanding the appropriate statin use has the potential to enhance the outcomes for the population of postoperative patients who have risk modification as a part of their care secondary to statin initiation</p> <p><b>1b.2 Summary of data demonstrating performance gap (variation or overall poor performance) across providers:</b> Please see attachment</p> <p><b>1b.3 Citations for data on performance gap:</b> Dates: January 1, 2009-December 31, 2009</p> <p>Analysis includes 610 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants who had at least 100 eligible cases for the measure and reported data to STS for all 12 months.</p> <p><b>1b.4 Summary of Data on disparities by population group:</b> Please see attachment for tables</p> <p><b>1b.5 Citations for data on Disparities:</b> Analysis includes STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants that had more than 50 eligible cases in 2008 and 2009, and reported data for at least 15 months.</p> <p>230714 Patients from 891 Participants were included in the Gender = Male sub-group. 75206 Patients from 632 Participants were included in the Gender = Female sub-group. 12331 Patients from 127 Participants were included in the Race = Black sub-group. 270978 Patients from 879 Participants were included in the Race = White sub-group. 12264 Patients from 116 Participants were included in the Race = Other sub-group. 9215 Patients from 90 Participants were included in the Ethnicity = Hispanic sub-group. 298755 Patients from 895 Participants were included in the Ethnicity = Non-Hispanic sub-group.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">1b C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>1c. Outcome or Evidence to Support Measure Focus</b></p> <p><b>1c.1 Relationship to Outcomes</b> (For non-outcome measures, briefly describe the relationship to desired outcome. For outcomes, describe why it is relevant to the target population): Enlarging the population of post operative CAB patients on statins affords a larger patient group benefits of statin therapy</p> <p><b>1c.2-3. Type of Evidence:</b> Observational study, Expert opinion, Systematic synthesis of research, Other Clinical results from approximately 90% of cardiac surgery centers in the US</p> <p><b>1c.4 Summary of Evidence</b> (as described in the criteria; for outcomes, summarize any evidence that healthcare services/care processes influence the outcome): Expanding the appropriate statin use has the potential to enhance the outcomes for the population of postoperative patients who have risk modification as a part of their care secondary to statin initiation</p> <p><b>1c.5 Rating of strength/quality of evidence</b> (also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):</p> <p><b>1c.6 Method for rating evidence:</b></p> <p><b>1c.7 Summary of Controversy/Contradictory Evidence:</b></p>	<p style="text-align: right;">1c C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p><b>1c.8 Citations for Evidence (other than guidelines):</b> - Campeau L. Lipid Lowering and coronary bypass graft surgery. <i>Curr Opin Cardiol.</i> 2000;15(6):395-399.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Denton TA, Fonarow GC, LaBresh KA, et al. Secondary prevention after coronary bypass: the American Heart Association “Get with the Guidelines” program. <i>Ann Thorac Surg.</i> 2003;75(3):758-760.</li> <li>- Faulkner MA, Wadibia EC, Lucas BD, et al. Impact of pharmacy counseling on compliance and effectiveness of combination lipid-lowering therapy in patients undergoing coronary artery revascularization: a randomized, controlled trial. <i>Pharmacotherapy.</i> 2003;20(4):410-416.</li> <li>- Hunninghake DB. Is aggressive cholesterol control justified? review of the post-coronary artery bypass graft trial. <i>Am J Cardiol.</i> 1998;82(10B):45T-48T.</li> <li>- Welke KF, Ferguson TB, Coombs LP, et al. Validity of the Society of Thoracic Surgeons National Adult Cardiac Surgery Database. <i>Ann Thorac Surg.</i> 2004;77:1137-1139.</li> <li>- Shah SJ, Waters DD, Barter P, Kastelein JJP, Shepherd J, Wenger NK, DeMicco DA, Breazna A, LaRosa JC. Intensive Lipid-lowering with Atorvastatin for secondary prevention in patients after coronary artery bypass surgery. <i>J Am Coll Cardiol.</i> 2008; 51(20):1938-1943.</li> <li>- Vaduganathan M, Stone NJ, Lee R, McGee EC, Malaisrie SC, Silverberg RA, McCarthy, PM. Perioperative statin therapy reduces mortality in normolipidemic patients undergoing cardiac surgery. <i>J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.</i> 2010;140(5):1018-1027.</li> </ul> <p><b>1c.9 Quote the Specific guideline recommendation (including guideline number and/or page number):</b></p> <p><b>1c.10 Clinical Practice Guideline Citation:</b></p> <p><b>1c.11 National Guideline Clearinghouse or other URL:</b></p> <p><b>1c.12 Rating of strength of recommendation (also provide narrative description of the rating and by whom):</b></p> <p><b>1c.13 Method for rating strength of recommendation (If different from <a href="#">USPSTF system</a>, also describe rating and how it relates to USPSTF):</b></p> <p><b>1c.14 Rationale for using this guideline over others:</b></p>	
<p><b>TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for <i>Importance to Measure and Report</i>?</b></p>	1
<p><b>Steering Committee: Was the threshold criterion, <i>Importance to Measure and Report</i>, met? Rationale:</b></p>	1 Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2. SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY OF MEASURE PROPERTIES</b>	
<p>Extent to which the measure, <u>as specified</u>, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. (<a href="#">evaluation criteria</a>)</p>	<a href="#">Eval Rating</a>
<b>2a. MEASURE SPECIFICATIONS</b>	
<p><b>S.1 Do you have a web page where current detailed measure specifications can be obtained?</b> <b>S.2 If yes, provide web page URL:</b></p> <p><b>2a. Precisely Specified</b></p>	
<p><b>2a.1 Numerator Statement (Brief, text description of the numerator - what is being measured about the target population, e.g. target condition, event, or outcome):</b> Number of patients undergoing isolated CABG who were discharged on a statin or other lipid-lowering regimen</p> <p><b>2a.2 Numerator Time Window (The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion in the numerator):</b></p>	2a- specs C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

**2a.3 Numerator Details** (All information required to collect/calculate the numerator, including all codes, logic, and definitions):

Number of isolated CABG procedures in which discharge lipid lowering medication [DCLipid (STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Version 2.73)] is marked "yes"

**2a.4 Denominator Statement** (Brief, text description of the denominator - target population being measured):

All patients undergoing isolated CABG

**2a.5 Target population gender:** Female, Male

**2a.6 Target population age range:** 18 yrs and older

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

12 months

**2a.8 Denominator Details** (All information required to collect/calculate the denominator - the target population being measured - including all codes, logic, and definitions):

Number of isolated CABG procedures excluding cases with in-hospital mortality or cases for which discharge anti-lipid treatment use was contraindicated.

Isolated CABG is determined as a procedure for which all of the following apply:

- OpCAB is marked "Yes"
- (VADProc is marked "No" or "Missing") or (VADProc is marked "Yes, Implanted" and UnplVAD is marked "yes")
- OCarASDTy is marked "PFO" or "missing"
- OCarAFibAProc is marked "primarily epicardial" or "missing" and
- OpValve, VSAV, VSAVPr, ResectSubA, VSMV, VSMVPr, OpTricus, OpPulm, OpONCard, OCarLVA, OCarVSD, OCarSVR, OCarCong, OCarTrma, OCarCrTx, OCAoProcType, EndoProc, OCTumor, OCPulThromDis, OCarOthr are all marked "no" or "missing"

**2a.9 Denominator Exclusions** (Brief text description of exclusions from the target population): Cases are removed from the denominator if there was an in-hospital mortality or if discharge anti-lipid treatment was contraindicated.

**2a.10 Denominator Exclusion Details** (All information required to collect exclusions to the denominator, including all codes, logic, and definitions):

Mortality Discharge Status (MtDCStat), Mortality Date (MtDate), and Discharge Date (DischDt) indicate an in-hospital mortality; DCLipid is marked as "Contraindicated"

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

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

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

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

**2a.18-19 Type of Score:** Rate/proportion

**2a.20 Interpretation of Score:** Better quality = Higher score

**2a.21 Calculation Algorithm** (Describe the calculation of the measure as a flowchart or series of steps):

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

Two-sided 95% binomial confidence intervals; a confidence interval is calculated for each database

<p>participant. If the overall STS database result falls within the participant's 95% binomial confidence interval, the participant's performance is considered not significantly different from the overall database result. If the overall STS database result falls to the right of the participant's 95% binomial confidence interval, then the participant's performance is considered significantly lower than the overall database results. If the overall STS database result falls to the left of the participant's 95% binomial confidence interval, then the participant's performance is considered significantly higher than the overall database results.</p>	
<p><b>2a.23 Sampling (Survey) Methodology</b> <i>If measure is based on a sample (or survey), provide instructions for obtaining the sample, conducting the survey and guidance on minimum sample size (response rate):</i></p>	
<p><b>2a.24 Data Source</b> <i>(Check the source(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)</i> Registry data</p>	
<p><b>2a.25 Data source/data collection instrument</b> <i>(Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument, e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.):</i> STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database - Version 2.73</p>	
<p><b>2a.26-28 Data source/data collection instrument reference web page URL or attachment:</b> URL Data Collection Form (an updated version will be made available on the STS Website in mid-January 2011 --- <a href="http://www.sts.org/documents/pdf/ndb2010/STSAultCVDDataCollectionForm2_7_Annotated_20101021.pdf">http://www.sts.org/documents/pdf/ndb2010/STSAultCVDDataCollectionForm2_7_Annotated_20101021.pdf</a></p>	
<p><b>2a.29-31 Data dictionary/code table web page URL or attachment:</b> URL <a href="http://www.sts.org/documents/pdf/ndb2010/STSAultCVDDataSpecificationsV2_7_20101021.pdf">http://www.sts.org/documents/pdf/ndb2010/STSAultCVDDataSpecificationsV2_7_20101021.pdf</a> -- an updated version will be made available on the STS Website in mid-January 2011</p>	
<p><b>2a.32-35 Level of Measurement/Analysis</b> <i>(Check the level(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)</i> Clinicians : Group, Facility/Agency, Population : Counties or cities, Population : National, Population : Regional/network, Population : states</p>	
<p><b>2a.36-37 Care Settings</b> <i>(Check the setting(s) for which the measure is specified and tested)</i> Hospital</p>	
<p><b>2a.38-41 Clinical Services</b> <i>(Healthcare services being measured, check all that apply)</i> Clinicians: Physicians (MD/DO)</p>	
<b>TESTING/ANALYSIS</b>	
<p><b>2b. Reliability testing</b></p>	
<p><b>2b.1 Data/sample</b> <i>(description of data/sample and size):</i> STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database - Compared results between two proximate time periods: January 2008-December 2008 and January 2009-December 2009.</p>	
<p><b>2b.2 Analytic Method</b> <i>(type of reliability &amp; rationale, method for testing):</i> Compared results between two proximate time periods: January 2008-December 2008 and January 2009-December 2009. Excluded from analysis are participants that did not submit results for both time periods. Because database participants can change their underlying care processes at any time, we would not expect perfect correlation between two sets of results from even proximate time periods.</p>	<p>2b C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2b.3 Testing Results</b> <i>(reliability statistics, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted):</i> Please see attachment</p>	
<p><b>2c. Validity testing</b></p>	<p>2c C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2c.1 Data/sample</b> <i>(description of data/sample and size):</i> STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database</p>	<p>C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/></p>



<p>Audits conducted in 2010, all cases performed in 2009; N = 40 randomly selected sites participating in the STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database</p> <p><b>2c.2 Analytic Method</b> (<i>type of validity &amp; rationale, method for testing</i>): Participating sites are randomly selected for participation in STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Audit, which is designed to evaluate the accuracy, consistency, and comprehensiveness of data collection and ultimately validate the integrity of the data contained in the database. The Iowa Foundation for Medical Care (IFMC), the quality improvement organization for Iowa and Illinois, has conducted audits on behalf of STS since 2006.</p> <p>Each year, the IFMC conducts audits at randomly selected sites throughout the country and tracks the individual agreement rates by variable and by year. More specifically, for each site, agreement rates are calculated for 73 individual elements. In addition, aggregate agreement rates for each element, variable category (e.g., pre-operative risk factors, previous interventions, etc), and overall for all categories are calculated for all sites. While this is not region specific, it is data point specific and comparison agreement rates confirm the improvement over time as well as the consistency.</p> <p><b>2c.3 Testing Results</b> (<i>statistical results, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted</i>): Lipid Lowering Medications at Discharge: 96.5% agreement rate</p>	<p>N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2d. Exclusions Justified</b></p> <p><b>2d.1 Summary of Evidence supporting exclusion(s):</b></p> <p><b>2d.2 Citations for Evidence:</b></p> <p><b>2d.3 Data/sample</b> (<i>description of data/sample and size</i>): January 1, 2009-December 31, 2009; 628 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants who had at least 100 eligible cases for the measure and reported data to STS for all 12 months. Patients with contraindications to the medication are excluded from this NQF measure.</p> <p><b>2d.4 Analytic Method</b> (<i>type analysis &amp; rationale</i>):</p> <p><b>2d.5 Testing Results</b> (<i>e.g., frequency, variability, sensitivity analyses</i>): Please see attachment</p>	<p>2d C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2e. Risk Adjustment for Outcomes/ Resource Use Measures</b></p> <p><b>2e.1 Data/sample</b> (<i>description of data/sample and size</i>): n/a</p> <p><b>2e.2 Analytic Method</b> (<i>type of risk adjustment, analysis, &amp; rationale</i>):</p> <p><b>2e.3 Testing Results</b> (<i>risk model performance metrics</i>):</p> <p><b>2e.4 If outcome or resource use measure is not risk adjusted, provide rationale:</b></p>	<p>2e C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2f. Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance</b></p> <p><b>2f.1 Data/sample from Testing or Current Use</b> (<i>description of data/sample and size</i>): 610 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants who had at least 100 eligible cases for the measure and reported data to STS for all 12 months; January 1, 2009-December 31, 2009</p> <p><b>2f.2 Methods to identify statistically significant and practically/meaningfully differences in performance</b> (<i>type of analysis &amp; rationale</i>):</p>	<p>2f C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p>Two-sided 95% binomial confidence intervals; a confidence interval is calculated for each database participant. If the overall STS database result falls within the participant’s 95% binomial confidence interval, the participant’s performance is considered not significantly different from the overall database result. If the overall STS database result falls to the right of the participant’s 95% binomial confidence interval, then the participant’s performance is considered significantly lower than the overall database results. If the overall STS database result falls to the left of the participant’s 95% binomial confidence interval, then the participant’s performance is considered significantly higher than the overall database results.</p> <p><b>2f.3 Provide Measure Scores from Testing or Current Use</b> (<i>description of scores, e.g., distribution by quartile, mean, median, SD, etc.; identification of statistically significant and meaningfully differences in performance</i>): Please see attachment</p>	
<p><b>2g. Comparability of Multiple Data Sources/Methods</b></p> <p><b>2g.1 Data/sample</b> (<i>description of data/sample and size</i>):</p> <p><b>2g.2 Analytic Method</b> (<i>type of analysis &amp; rationale</i>):</p> <p><b>2g.3 Testing Results</b> (<i>e.g., correlation statistics, comparison of rankings</i>):</p>	<p>2g C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>2h. Disparities in Care</b></p> <p><b>2h.1</b> If measure is stratified, provide stratified results (<i>scores by stratified categories/cohorts</i>):</p> <p><b>2h.2</b> If disparities have been reported/identified, but measure is not specified to detect disparities, provide follow-up plans:</p>	<p>2h C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for <i>Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties</i>?</b></p>	<p>2</p>
<p><b>Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, <i>Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties</i>, met?</b> Rationale:</p>	<p>2 C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>3. USABILITY</b></p>	
<p>Extent to which intended audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) can understand the results of the measure and are likely to find them useful for decision making. (<a href="#">evaluation criteria</a>)</p>	<p><a href="#">Eval Rating</a></p>
<p><b>3a. Meaningful, Understandable, and Useful Information</b></p> <p><b>3a.1 Current Use:</b> In use</p> <p><b>3a.2 Use in a public reporting initiative (disclosure of performance results to the public at large)</b> (<i>If used in a public reporting initiative, provide name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not publicly reported, state the plans to achieve public reporting within 3 years</i>): This measure is one of eleven component measures of the STS CABG Composite Score. Composite star ratings are presented on the STS website, <a href="http://www.sts.org/publicreporting">www.sts.org/publicreporting</a> and in the health section of the Consumers Union website, <a href="http://www.ConsumerReportsHealth.org">www.ConsumerReportsHealth.org</a>.</p> <p>There are approximately 330 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants who voluntarily participate in the Consumer’s Union public reporting initiative. In addition, approximately 352 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants voluntarily take part in STS Public Reporting Online.</p> <p><b>3a.3 If used in other programs/initiatives</b> (<i>If used in quality improvement or other programs/initiatives, name of initiative(s), locations, Web page URL(s). If not used for QI, state the plans to achieve use for QI</i>):</p>	<p>3a C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/></p>



<p><i>within 3 years</i>):  <a href="http://www.cms.hhs.gov/pqri">CMS Physician Quality Reporting Initiative (PQRI), www.cms.hhs.gov/pqri</a></p> <p><b>Testing of Interpretability</b> (<i>Testing that demonstrates the results are understood by the potential users for public reporting and quality improvement</i>)  <b>3a.4 Data/sample</b> (<i>description of data/sample and size</i>): <a href="#">See 3a.6 below</a></p> <p><b>3a.5 Methods</b> (<i>e.g., focus group, survey, QI project</i>):</p> <p><b>3a.6 Results</b> (<i>qualitative and/or quantitative results and conclusions</i>):  Please see attachment</p>	
<p><b>3b/3c. Relation to other NQF-endorsed measures</b></p> <p><b>3b.1 NQF # and Title of similar or related measures:</b>  <a href="#">OT1-013-09 - The STS CABG Composite Score; Component measures: 0114 Risk-Adjusted Post-Operative Renal Failure, 0115 Risk-Adjusted Surgical Re-exploration, 0116 Anti-Platelet Medication at Discharge, 0117 Beta Blockade at Discharge, 0118 Anti-Lipid Treatment at Discharge, 0119 Risk-Adjusted Operative Mortality for CABG, 0127 Pre-Operative Beta Blockade, 0129 Risk-Adjusted Prolonged Intubation (ventilation), 0130 Risk-Adjusted Deep Sternal Wound Infection Rate, 0131 Risk-Adjusted Stroke/Cerebrovascular Accident, 0134 Use of Internal Mammary Artery (IMA) in Coronary Artery Bypass Graft (CABG)</a></p>	
<p><b>(for NQF staff use) Notes on similar/related <a href="#">endorsed</a> or submitted measures:</b></p>	
<p><b>3b. Harmonization</b>  If this measure is related to measure(s) already <a href="#">endorsed by NQF</a> (e.g., same topic, but different target population/setting/data source <u>or</u> different topic but same target population):  <b>3b.2 Are the measure specifications harmonized? If not, why?</b>  N/A; however, data definitions and key elements have been established by a multi-societal writing committee called the “ACCF/AHA Writing Committee to Develop Acute Coronary Syndromes and Coronary Artery Disease Clinical Data Standards” with representatives from each of the following organizations:</p> <p><a href="#">Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality</a>  <a href="#">American College of Cardiology</a>  <a href="#">American College of Chest Physicians</a>  <a href="#">American College of Emergency Physicians</a>  <a href="#">American College of Physicians</a>  <a href="#">American College of Preventative Medicine</a>  <a href="#">American Heart Association</a>  <a href="#">American Medical Association</a>  <a href="#">Centers for Disease Control and Prevention</a>  <a href="#">Emergency Nurses Association</a>  <a href="#">Food and Drug Administration</a>  <a href="#">Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations</a>  <a href="#">National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians</a>  <a href="#">National Association of EMS Physicians</a>  <a href="#">National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute</a>  <a href="#">Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association</a>  <a href="#">Society for Academic Emergency Medicine</a>  <a href="#">Society of Chest Pain Centers and Providers</a>  <a href="#">Society of General Internal Medicine</a>  <a href="#">Society of Thoracic Surgeons</a></p>	<p><b>3b</b>  C <input type="checkbox"/>  P <input type="checkbox"/>  M <input type="checkbox"/>  N <input type="checkbox"/>  NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>3c. Distinctive or Additive Value</b>  <b>3c.1 Describe the distinctive, improved, or additive value this measure provides to existing NQF-endorsed measures:</b></p> <p><b>5.1 If this measure is similar to measure(s) already endorsed by NQF (i.e., on the same topic and the</b></p>	<p><b>3c</b>  C <input type="checkbox"/>  P <input type="checkbox"/>  M <input type="checkbox"/>  N <input type="checkbox"/>  NA <input type="checkbox"/></p>

same target population), Describe why it is a more valid or efficient way to measure quality:	
<b>TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for <i>Usability</i>?</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, <i>Usability</i>, met?</b> Rationale:	<b>3</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4. FEASIBILITY</b>	
Extent to which the required data are readily available, retrievable without undue burden, and can be implemented for performance measurement. ( <a href="#">evaluation criteria</a> )	<a href="#">Eval Rating</a>
<b>4a. Data Generated as a Byproduct of Care Processes</b>  4a.1-2 How are the data elements that are needed to compute measure scores generated? Data generated as byproduct of care processes during care delivery (Data are generated and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition), Coding/abstraction performed by someone other than person obtaining original information (E.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims, chart abstraction for quality measure or registry)	<b>4a</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4b. Electronic Sources</b>  4b.1 Are all the data elements available electronically? ( <i>elements that are needed to compute measure scores are in defined, computer-readable fields, e.g., electronic health record, electronic claims</i> ) Yes  4b.2 If not, specify the near-term path to achieve electronic capture by most providers.	<b>4b</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4c. Exclusions</b>  4c.1 Do the specified exclusions require additional data sources beyond what is required for the numerator and denominator specifications? No  4c.2 If yes, provide justification.	<b>4c</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> NA <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>4d. Susceptibility to Inaccuracies, Errors, or Unintended Consequences</b>  4d.1 Identify susceptibility to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences of the measure and describe how these potential problems could be audited. If audited, provide results. This measure may be susceptible to human error (i.e., recording the measure inaccurately or not at all).  When data collection on this measure is done through participation in the STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database, an auditing strategy is in place.  Both STS and the Duke Clinical Research Institute have a list of database participants making participation in the STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database easy to track.  Each participant is responsible for the quality and accuracy of the data they submit to the database. The participant agrees to the following quality control measures in the participation agreement: i) Participant hereby warrants that all data submitted for inclusion in the STS National Database will be accurate and complete, and acknowledges that such data may be subject to independent audit. Participant will use its best efforts to address any data or related deficiencies identified by the independent data warehouse service provider and agrees to cooperate with and assist STS and its designees in connection with the performance of any independent audit.	<b>4d</b> C <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> M <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>ii) Participant warrants that it will take all reasonable steps to avoid the submission of duplicative data for inclusion in the STS National Database, including but not limited to apprising the Director of the STS National Database and the independent data warehouse service provider about any other Participation Agreements in which an individual cardiothoracic surgeon named above or on Schedule A attached hereto (as amended from time to time) is also named.</p> <p>STS audited for these potential problems during testing. Please see IFMC audit results.</p>	
<p><b>4e. Data Collection Strategy/Implementation</b></p> <p><b>4e.1 Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data/missing data, timing/frequency of data collection, patient confidentiality, time/cost of data collection, other feasibility/ implementation issues:</b></p> <p><b>4e.2 Costs to implement the measure (costs of data collection, fees associated with proprietary measures):</b>  <b>Data Collection:</b>          There are no direct costs to collect the data for this measure. Costs to develop the measure included volunteer cardiothoracic time, STS staff time, and DCRI statistician and project management time.</p> <p><b>Other fees:</b>          STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database participants (single cardiothoracic surgeons or a group of surgeons) pay annual participant fees of \$2,950 or \$3,700, depending on whether participants are STS members (or whether the majority of surgeons in a group are STS members). As a benefit of STS membership, STS members are charged the lesser of the two fees.</p> <p><b>4e.3 Evidence for costs:</b></p> <p><b>4e.4 Business case documentation:</b></p>	<p>4e          C <input type="checkbox"/>          P <input type="checkbox"/>          M <input type="checkbox"/>          N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>TAP/Workgroup: What are the strengths and weaknesses in relation to the subcriteria for Feasibility?</b></p>	<p>4</p>
<p><b>Steering Committee: Overall, to what extent was the criterion, Feasibility, met?</b>  <b>Rationale:</b></p>	<p>4          C <input type="checkbox"/>          P <input type="checkbox"/>          M <input type="checkbox"/>          N <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>RECOMMENDATION</b></p>	
<p><b>(for NQF staff use) Check if measure is untested and only eligible for time-limited endorsement.</b></p>	<p>Time-limited  <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>Steering Committee: Do you recommend for endorsement?</b>  <b>Comments:</b></p>	<p>Y <input type="checkbox"/>          N <input type="checkbox"/>          A <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><b>CONTACT INFORMATION</b></p>	
<p><b>Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner)</b>  <b>Co.1 Organization</b>          Society of Thoracic Surgeons, 633 North Saint Clair Street, Suite 2320, Chicago, Illinois, 60611</p> <p><b>Co.2 Point of Contact</b>          Jane, Han, MSW, jhan@sts.org, 312-202-5856-</p>	
<p><b>Measure Developer If different from Measure Steward</b></p>	

<p><b>Co.3 Organization</b>  <a href="#">Society of Thoracic Surgeons, 633 North Saint Clair Street, Suite 2320, Chicago, Illinois, 60611</a></p> <p><b>Co.4 Point of Contact</b>  <a href="#">Jane, Han, MSW, <a href="mailto:jhan@sts.org">jhan@sts.org</a>, 312-202-5856-</a></p>
<p><b>Co.5 Submitter If different from Measure Steward POC</b>  <a href="#">Jane, Han, MSW, <a href="mailto:jhan@sts.org">jhan@sts.org</a>, 312-202-5856-, Society of Thoracic Surgeons</a></p>
<p><b>Co.6 Additional organizations that sponsored/participated in measure development</b></p>
<p><b>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION</b></p>
<p><b>Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development</b>  <b>Ad.1 Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.</b>  <a href="#">Members of the STS Task Force on Quality Initiatives provide clinical expertise as needed. The STS Workforce on National Databases meets at the STS Annual Meeting and reviews the measures on a yearly basis. Changes or updates to the measure will be at the recommendation of the Workforce.</a></p>
<p><b>Ad.2 If adapted, provide name of original measure:</b>  <b>Ad.3-5 If adapted, provide original specifications URL or attachment</b></p>
<p><b>Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance</b>  <b>Ad.6 Year the measure was first released:</b> <a href="#">2004</a>  <b>Ad.7 Month and Year of most recent revision:</b> <a href="#">12, 2010</a>  <b>Ad.8 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?</b> <a href="#">annually</a>  <b>Ad.9 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?</b> <a href="#">2011</a></p>
<p><b>Ad.10 Copyright statement/disclaimers:</b></p>
<p><b>Ad.11 -13 Additional Information web page URL or attachment:</b> <a href="#">Attachment 0118 Sections 1b.2, 1b.4, 2b.3, 2d.5, 2f.3, 3a.6.pdf</a></p>
<p><b>Date of Submission (MM/DD/YY):</b> <a href="#">03/28/2011</a></p>

**1b.2. Summary of Measure Results Demonstrating Performance Gap** (*Descriptive statistics for performance results for this measure - distribution of scores for measured entities by quartile/decile, mean, median, SD, min, max, etc.*)

<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge</i>
N	610
Mean	93.8%
1 <sup>st</sup>	69.7%
5 <sup>th</sup>	80.7%
10 <sup>th</sup>	85.0%
25 <sup>th</sup>	91.4%
Median	96.2%
75 <sup>th</sup>	98.5%
90 <sup>th</sup>	99.7%
95 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%
99 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%
Outlier	360 (59.0%)
High	226
Low	134

**1b.4. Summary of Measure Results on Disparities by Population Group** (*Descriptive statistics for performance results for this measure by population group*)

<i>Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge</i>		
<i>Population Group</i>		
<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
N	891	632
Mean	92.9%	91.6%
1 <sup>st</sup>	69.8%	67.1%
5 <sup>th</sup>	79.2%	76.0%
10 <sup>th</sup>	83.7%	81.1%
25 <sup>th</sup>	90.0%	88.0%
Median	95.0%	93.8%
75 <sup>th</sup>	97.9%	97.3%
90 <sup>th</sup>	99.3%	99.3%
95 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	100.0%
99 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	100.0%
Outlier	518 (58.1%)	275 (43.5%)
High	315	159
Low	203	116

<i>Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge</i>			
<i>Population Group</i>			
<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Other</i>
N	127	879	116
Mean	92.5%	92.6%	92.0%
1 <sup>st</sup>	71.4%	69.0%	72.2%
5 <sup>th</sup>	76.1%	78.9%	76.6%
10 <sup>th</sup>	81.0%	82.6%	79.3%
25 <sup>th</sup>	88.5%	89.5%	88.0%
Median	94.8%	94.7%	94.0%
75 <sup>th</sup>	98.1%	97.8%	97.9%
90 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	99.2%	98.9%
95 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
99 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%



---

*Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge*

*Population Group*

*Black*

*White*

*Other*

*Measurement*

---

Outlier	53 (41.7%)	536 (61.0%)	51 (44.0%)
High	27	326	31
Low	26	210	20

---

---

*Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge*

*Population Group*

*Hispanic*

*Non-Hispanic*

*Measurement*

---


N	90	895
Mean	90.3%	92.5%
1 <sup>st</sup>	67.7%	69.5%
5 <sup>th</sup>	75.4%	78.7%
10 <sup>th</sup>	79.4%	82.2%
25 <sup>th</sup>	86.7%	89.3%
Median	92.7%	94.6%
75 <sup>th</sup>	95.0%	97.7%
90 <sup>th</sup>	98.0%	99.2%
95 <sup>th</sup>	98.9%	99.8%
99 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%	100.0%
Outlier	28 (31.1%)	569 (63.6%)
High	14	345
Low	14	224

---

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

Testing results:  $\rho = 0.76$

Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge ( $\rho=0.76$ )




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

Anti-lipid Treatment  
at Discharge

# of Patients	140573
# excluded	2477
% excluded	0.02

Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge ( $\rho=0.89$ )



**2f.3. Measure Scores from Testing or Current Use** (*Description of scores, e.g., distribution by quartile, mean, median, SD, etc.; identification of statistically significant and meaningful differences in performance*)

Results below are from January 1, 2009-December 31, 2009. The sample contains 610 STS Adult Cardiac Surgery Database Participants who had at least 100 eligible cases for the measure and reported data to STS for all 12 months.

<i>Measurement</i>	<i>Anti-lipid Treatment at Discharge</i>
N	610
Mean	93.8%
1 <sup>st</sup>	69.7%
5 <sup>th</sup>	80.7%
10 <sup>th</sup>	85.0%
25 <sup>th</sup>	91.4%
Median	96.2%
75 <sup>th</sup>	98.5%
90 <sup>th</sup>	99.7%
95 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%
99 <sup>th</sup>	100.0%
Outlier†	360 (59.0%)
High	226
Low	134

†Represents the number of participants that are outliers according to two-sided 95% binomial confidence interval.

### 3a.6. Results *(Qualitative or quantitative results and conclusions)*

Although formal testing of interpretability has not been performed, this measure has been used and reported for STS Adult Cardiac Surgery database participants since 2007. Current report presentation and interpretation manuals are presented below. These materials are updated as needed based upon feedback from database participants.

#### **1) Report Overview and Interpretation Manual:**

##### **The NQF Measures Report**

###### **a. Organization**

This report section is separated into three areas corresponding to: 1) NQF volume measures, 2) NQF process measures, and 3) NQF outcomes measures, in that order. The header at the top of each page references the report section for that page. Each NQF measure is presented on a single row in the section. Tabular data are on the left-hand side of each page and a standard graphic representation is shown on the right-hand side.

###### **b. Statistical Calculation and Details – NQF Measures**

**Time period:** This report section contains information on the individual STS participant and overall STS performance for the most recent 12 months for volume, process and CABG outcomes measures and the most recent 60 months for Valve and Valve + CABG outcomes. The 5 years (60 months) of performance for outcomes involving Valve procedures is necessary due to smaller sample sizes.

**Volume Measures:** The NQF report provides average annual case volumes data for three surgery categories: i) Isolated CABG, ii) Valve without CABG, and iii) combined CABG + Valve. Definitions of the three surgery categories are provided in Table 2 of this NQF Report Overview. For each type of surgery, the participant's annualized volume is calculated as:

$$\text{Participant Annualized Volume} = 12 \times (\# \text{ of surgeries}) / (\# \text{ of months})$$

where (# of surgeries) denotes the number of surgeries of the specified type performed by the participant during the specified time period, and (# of months) is the number of months during the specified time period for which the participant submitted at least one cardiac surgery of any type. The intent of calculating “annualized” volumes is to adjust for participants who participated in the database for fewer months than the time period specified. For participants who participated in the database and submitted cases every month during 2006, the annualized volume for 2006 is simply the total number of cases.

The STS Average Annualized Volume is the average value of all of the participant annualized volumes across the entire population of STS participants. The Participant Percentile indicates the percent of STS participants whose annualized volumes are less than, or equal to, your own. Higher percentiles indicate higher volumes in relation to other STS participant sites. The Distribution of Participant Values shows the range and percentiles of the distribution of participant annualized volumes across all database participants. For example, 90% of participants have annualized volumes less than or equal to the value marked “90<sup>th</sup> percentile.” Confidence intervals are not provided for volume measures, as volume is known with certainty and is not estimated.

**Process Measures:** The NQF process measures provide data on the frequency of usage of five therapies among subsets of Isolated CABG patients. The therapies are: i) preoperative beta blockade therapy, ii) use of IMA, iii) discharge anti-platelet medication, iv) discharge beta blockade therapy, and v) discharge anti-lipid medication. The patient population for each measure differs, in accordance with the NQF specifications (see Table 2 of this NQF Report Overview for details). The number of Eligible

Procedures is the number of cases performed by the participant during the specified time period who meet the eligibility requirements to be included in the calculations when summarizing the participant's data. ***Beginning with the 2008 Harvest 3 report (covering the procedure time period through 6/30/2008), STS implementation of NQF medication process measures using data version 2.61 excludes records for which the medication was contraindicated/not indicated from the eligible population.*** The main summary statistic, Participant Usage, is the percent of eligible Isolated CABG cases during the specified time period for which the patient received the specified therapy. The Overall STS Usage is the percent of all eligible patients in the entire STS population during the specified time period who received the specified therapy. ***In calculating these percentages, missing data are treated as a "No", emphasizing the importance of having complete data in these fields.***

The Participant Percentile indicates the percent of STS participants who applied the therapy in their respective populations less frequently than or as frequently as did your institution. The Distribution of Participant Values shows the range and percentiles of the distribution of participant usage across all participants in the database. For example, 90% of participants use the therapy less frequently than the amount indicated by the "90<sup>th</sup> percentile". A bar identified as "Participant" indicates the point estimate and limits of a 95% Confidence Interval (CI) for the participant's usage of therapy. The underlying parameter being estimated is the long-run usage rate that would be observed in a large sample of patients. The 95% CI indicates the range of usage rates that are consistent with the data in light of sampling variability.

**Outcomes Measures:** The NQF outcomes data provide risk-adjusted analyses of mortality and morbidity for Isolated CABG surgery as well as risk-adjusted operative mortality for Isolated AVR, Isolated MVR, AVR+CABG, and MVR+CABG. The main summary statistic provided is the Participant's Estimated Odds Ratio (OR) based on a hierarchical logistic regression analysis. The OR measures the impact that a participant's performance level has on a patient's probability of experiencing an adverse outcome. The interpretation is similar to that of an O/E ratio (see the Risk-Adjusted Results: Overview portion of the General Report Overview for details on STS risk adjustment). An OR greater than 1.0 implies that the participant increases a patient's risk of experiencing the outcome, relative to an "average" STS participant. An OR less than 1.0 implies that the participant decreases a patient's risk of experiencing the outcome, relative to an "average" STS participant. Each measure is calculated among patients undergoing surgery of the type specified during the time period specified who additionally meet certain eligibility requirements. The column labeled Eligible Procedures indicates the number of patients who met the inclusion criteria to be included in the analysis for the indicated measure. The Participant Percentile is the percent of STS participants who have an estimated OR that is greater than or equal to your estimated OR. Note that this is different than performance percentiles for process measures, where the percentile indicates the percentage of STS participants with performance that is *less than* the specified number. This simply reflects the fact that high process compliance is desirable, whereas a high OR is undesirable.

The Observed Participant Rate is the percent of eligible patients who experienced the specified outcome. Unlike the participant estimated OR, the observed participant rate is not risk-adjusted. The estimated OR is the main summary statistic for summarizing the NQF measure in this report.

The Distribution of Participant Values shows the range and percentiles of the distribution of estimated Odds Ratios across all STS participants. For example, 90% of STS participants have an OR greater than the value indicated by the "90<sup>th</sup> percentile." The line that extends to the left and right of the Participant Value indicates the lower and upper limits of a 95% Confidence Interval (CI) surrounding the participant's estimated OR.

### **c. Technical Notes**

**Calculation of Percentiles for the Distribution of Participant Values:** The graph provided for each measure contains information about the distribution of the value of the measure across all STS



participants, namely the minimum, maximum, 10<sup>th</sup> percentile, 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. The “X<sup>th</sup>” percentile, denoted  $P_x$ , is loosely defined as the number having the property that X% of the participant values are less than  $P_x$ , and (100 – X)% of the participant values are greater than  $P_x$ . **For process measures, participants with greater than 5% missing data were excluded when calculating percentiles of the STS distribution and do not have a calculated participant percentile.** For participants having less than 5% missing data on a process measure, the missing values on the process measure were converted to “No” before calculating percentiles. For outcomes measures, all participants submitting at least one eligible case were included when calculating percentiles of the STS distribution. Missing data on outcomes variables were treated as “No.”


**NQF/STS Results Comparison:** Participants may see some differences between summaries of their data provided in the NQF section of the report and summaries of their data reported elsewhere in the STS report. These differences are due to subtle variations in variable definitions, patient inclusion and exclusion criteria, and rules for handling missing data in the NQF section versus the rest of the report. Definitions used in the NQF report were designed to match current NQF specifications as closely as possible. It is expected that these differences will eventually disappear as the NQF measures are refined. Some important differences are:

*Case Volumes* – The NQF report section presents “annualized” volumes. These are case volumes that have been adjusted for the number of months that a participant was an active contributor to the database. Elsewhere in the STS report, total case volumes are presented without adjustment for the length of participation.

*Eligible Cases* - The NQF report also presents the number of “eligible cases” for each measure. Separate inclusion criteria are applied to each measure, and these inclusion criteria do not always match the definitions used elsewhere in the STS report. Please refer to the footnotes in each section for specific details.

## Interpretation Manual

In addition to the statistics provided for each of the STS Composite Quality Domains and NQF measures, a figure representing the distribution of values for the entire STS population is provided.



The figure allows participants to quickly judge their performance relative to the overall STS. The scale of the figure is set up such that the right side of the distribution represents the most favorable performance and the left side represents the least favorable performance (Note that in some cases smaller numbers will be on the left; in other instances, smaller numbers will be on the right. For example, for the Pre-operative Beta Blockade Therapy measure, the far left side of the distribution will contain the *lowest* percentage Beta Blockade Therapy for an STS participant – this corresponds to least

favorable performance. Alternatively, for the Operative Mortality Measure, the far left side of the distribution will contain the *highest* Estimated Odds Ratio – this also corresponds to least favorable performance). If a participant’s value for a given measure is to the left of the STS overall value, the participant is performing worse on that measure than the overall STS. Conversely, if the participant’s value for a given measure is located to the right of the overall STS value, the participant is performing better than the overall STS.

**NOTE!** Care should be given to reading these figures. In some instances, the various percentiles presented cluster very close together in the data. In such cases, the label for the percentile is not necessarily located immediately at the point on the distribution where the percentile occurs. An example of this is apparent in the figure above: The 50<sup>th</sup> percentile corresponds to a value of 93.7 and looks to align fairly closely with the STS overall value as represented by the large black dot. However, the expandable figure marking actually points to a place somewhere to the right of the STS overall value for the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile marking. So the STS overall value would be some amount less than 93.7.

Also, please note that in some cases, small sample sizes preclude valid comparisons between the participant and the STS overall. Such instances are clearly noted in the report output.

**a. NQF Measures Interpretation Example**

Sample CABG Operative Mortality results – tabular and figure representation.


NQF Measure	Eligible Procedures	Participant Estimated OR	Participant Percentile	Participant Observed Rate
2005 CABG Operative Mortality	74	1.14	26.3	5.4%

Eligible Procedures: 74 patients met the inclusion criteria for the indicated measure.

Participant Estimated OR (Odds Ratio): The main summary statistic measuring the impact that a participant’s performance has on a patient’s probability of experiencing an adverse outcome has a value of 1.14 indicating worse than expected performance.

Participant Percentile: 26.3% of STS participants had an estimated OR greater than or equal to your estimated OR. In other words, 26.3% had the same or worse performance.

Participant Observed Rate: 5.4% of the 74 eligible patients experienced the specified outcome.



The highest OR among all STS participants = 2.29  
 The lowest OR among all STS participants = 0.45  
 The STS average OR is 1.00

The 95% confidence interval for the participant's OR spans from <0.45 to ~1.90

**2) Sample page from section of the report that contains NQF measure results:**



**NQF Measures  
Process Measures  
Participant 99999  
STS Period Ending 12/31/2008**



NQF Measure	Eligible Procedures	Participant Usage (95% CI)	Participant Percentile	Overall STS Usage	Distribution of Participant Values ● = Overall STS Usage
Jan 2008 - Dec 2008 Preoperative Beta Blockade Therapy <sup>1</sup>	541	89.3% (86.4 , 91.8)	69.9	82.1%	
Jan 2008 - Dec 2008 Use of IMA <sup>2</sup>	536	96.5% (94.5 , 97.9)	63.3	94.2%	
Jan 2008 - Dec 2008 Discharge Anti-Platelet Medication <sup>3</sup>	536	98.7% (97.3 , 99.5)	68.7	96.1%	
Jan 2008 - Dec 2008 Discharge Beta Blockade Therapy <sup>4</sup>	538	96.1% (94.1 , 97.6)	53.4	93.7%	
Jan 2008 - Dec 2008 Discharge Anti-Lipid Treatment <sup>4</sup>	535	91.8% (89.1 , 94.0)	40.7	91.4%	

<sup>1</sup>Excludes v2.61 contraindicated / not indicated records.

<sup>2</sup>Excludes patients with prior CABG surgery

<sup>3</sup>Anti-platelet use includes Aspirin and ADP Inhibitors, and excludes in-hospital mortalities. Excludes v2.61 contraindicated / not indicated records.

<sup>4</sup>Excludes in-hospital mortalities. Excludes v2.61 contraindicated / not indicated records.