



Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to subcriterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 0301

Corresponding Measures:

De.2. Measure Title: Surgery patients with appropriate hair removal

Co.1.1. Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of surgery patients with surgical hair site removal with clippers or depilatory or no surgical site hair removal.

1b.1. Developer Rationale: A reduction in the number of patients having hair removal performed by shaving (razors) may reduce the incidence of surgical site infection.

S.4. Numerator Statement: Surgery patients with surgical hair site removal with clippers or depilatory or no surgical site hair removal

S.7. Denominator Statement: All selected surgery patients

Include patients with an ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Codes of selected surgeries.

S.10. Denominator Exclusions: Excluded Populations:

Patients less than 18 years of age

Patients who have a length of Stay greater than 120 days

Patients whose ICD-9-CM principal procedure was performed entirely by laparoscope.

Patients enrolled in clinical trials

Patients whose ICD-9-CM principal procedure occurred prior to the date of admission

Patients who performed their own hair removal

De.1. Measure Type: Process

S.23. Data Source: Claims, Other, Paper Medical Records

S.26. Level of Analysis: Facility, Other, Population : Regional and State

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Nov 15, 2007 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Jan 31, 2012

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results? N/A

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. **Measures must be judged to meet all subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form

0301_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data-635278502478708610.doc

1b. Performance Gap

Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. Briefly explain the rationale for this measure (e.g., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)

A reduction in the number of patients having hair removal performed by shaving (razors) may reduce the incidence of surgical site infection.

1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis. (This is required for endorsement maintenance. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included). This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

In a national sample of 19,497 Medicare patients undergoing surgery in US hospitals in the first quarter of 2005, the rate of appropriate hair removal was 91.5%. In the second quarter of 2010 (most recent data available), the rate was 99.6%.

1b.3. If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.

Number of hospitals reporting: 3629

Denominator:401,573

Numerator:399,933

1b.4. Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability. (This is required for endorsement maintenance. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.

A disparities report is attached to this submission.

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

The attached disparities report uses 2009 data from the clinical data warehouse.

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

The measure addresses:

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

1c.1. Demonstrated high priority aspect of healthcare

Affects large numbers, Frequently performed procedure, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality

1c.2. If Other:

1c.3. Provide epidemiologic or resource use data that demonstrates the measure addresses a high priority aspect of healthcare. List citations in 1c.4.

There are over 40 million surgeries performed in the United States each year. Surgical site infection (SSIs) are the second most common cause of healthcare associated infections.SSIs account for 14-16% of all hospital-acquired infections and are among the most common complications of care, occurring in 2 to 5% of patients after clean extra-abdominal operations and up to 20 % of intra-abdominal procedures. Among surgical patients, SSIs account for 40% of all such hospital-acquired infections. By reducing SSIs, hospitals on average could recognize a savings of \$3.152 and a reductions in extended length of stay by seven days on each patient developing an infection.

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

Selected References:

Zhan C, Miller MR. Excess length of stay, charges and mortality attributable to medical injuries during hospitalization. JAMA 2003; 290: 1868-1874.

Delgado-Rodriguez M, Sillero-Arenas M, Medina-Cuadros M, Martinez-Gallego G. Nosocomial infections in surgical patients: comparison of two measures of intrinsic patient risk. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol 1997; 18: 19-23.

Polk HC, Christmas AB. Prophylactic antibiotics in surgery and surgical wound infections. Am Surg 200; 66: 105-111.

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

2. Reliability and Validity—Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. **Measures must be judged to meet the subcriteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. Subject/Topic Area (check all the areas that apply):

De.6. Non-Condition Specific (check all the areas that apply):

Safety

S.1. Measure-specific Web Page (Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)

<http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228754600169>

S.2a. If this is an eMeasure, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)

Attachment:

S.2b. Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets (and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)

Attachment:

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

S.4. Numerator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome)

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

Surgery patients with surgical hair site removal with clippers or depilatory or no surgical site hair removal

S.5. Time Period for Data (What is the time period in which data will be aggregated for the measure, e.g., 12 mo, 3 years, look back

to August for flu vaccination? Note if there are different time periods for the numerator and denominator.)

Admission to discharge.

S.6. Numerator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b) IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.

Data Elements:

Preoperative Hair Removal

Included Populations:

An ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Code of selected surgeries (as defined in Appendix A, Table 5.10 for ICD-9-CM codes).

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

All selected surgery patients

Include patients with an ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Codes of selected surgeries.

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

Elderly

S.9. Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

Data Elements:

Admission Date

Anesthesia Start Date

Birthdate

Clinical Trial

Discharge Date

ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Code

Laparoscope

Include patients with an ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure code or ICD-9-CM Other Procedure Codes of selected surgeries.

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

Excluded Populations:

Patients less than 18 years of age

Patients who have a length of Stay greater than 120 days

Patients whose ICD-9-CM principal procedure was performed entirely by laparoscope.

Patients enrolled in clinical trials

Patients whose ICD-9-CM principal procedure occurred prior to the date of admission

Patients who performed their own hair removal

S.11. Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)

The data elements include:

Clinical Trial and Laparoscope.

Affirmative answers to these data elements excludes the patient from the measure.

S.12. Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b)

NA

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

No risk adjustment or risk stratification

If other:

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

N/A

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

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

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

S.16. Type of score:

Rate/proportion

If other:

S.17. Interpretation of Score (Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score)

Better quality = Higher score

S.18. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic (Describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)

SCIP-Infection (Inf)-6: Surgery Patients with Appropriate Hair Removal

Variable Key: Patient Age, Surgery Days

1.Start processing. Run cases that are included in the Surgical Care Improvement Project (SCIP) Initial Patient Population and pass the edits defined in the Transmission Data Processing Flow: Clinical through this measure.

2.Calculate Patient Age. The Patient Age, in years, is equal to the Admission Date minus the Birthdate. Use the month and day portion of admission date and birthdate to yield the most accurate age.

3.Check Patient Age

a.If Patient Age is less than 18 years, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of B and will not be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

b.If Patient Age is greater than or equal to 18 years, continue processing and proceed to Laparoscope.

4.Check Laparoscope

a.If Laparoscope is missing, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of X and will be rejected. Stop processing.

b.If Laparoscope equals 1 or 3, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of B and will not be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

c.If Laparoscope equals 2, continue processing and proceed to Clinical Trial.

5.Check Clinical Trial

a.If Clinical Trial is missing, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of X and will be rejected. Stop processing.

b.If Clinical Trial equals Yes, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of B and will not be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

c.If Clinical Trial equals No, continue processing and proceed to Anesthesia Start Date.

6.Check Anesthesia Start Date

a.If the Anesthesia Start Date is missing, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of X and will be rejected. Stop processing.

b.If the Anesthesia Start Date equals Unable To Determine, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of D and will be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

c.If Anesthesia Start Date equals a Non Unable To Determine Value, continue processing and proceed to the Surgery Days

calculation.

7. Calculate Surgery Days. Surgery Days, in days, is equal to the Anesthesia Start Date minus the Admission Date.

8. Check Surgery Days

a. If the Surgery Days is less than zero, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of B and will not be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

b. If the Surgery Days is greater than or equal to zero, continue processing and proceed to Preoperative Hair Removal.

9. Check Preoperative Hair Removal – Note: No allowable value can occur more than once. Allowable values of '1' or '7' cannot be combined with each other or with any of the other allowable values.

a. If Preoperative Hair Removal is missing, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of X and will be rejected. Stop processing.

b. If Any Preoperative Hair Removal equals 6, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of B and will not be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

c. If Any Preoperative Hair Removal equals 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, or 8 and None equals 6, continue processing and recheck Preoperative Hair Removal.

10. Recheck Preoperative Hair Removal

a. If Any Preoperative Hair Removal equals 2, 5, or 7, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of D and will be in the Measure Population. Stop processing.

b. If Any Preoperative Hair Removal equals 1, 3, 4, or 8 and None equals 2, 5, or 7, the case will proceed to a Measure Category Assignment of E and will be in the Numerator Population.

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

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

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

The SCIP Topic Population (common to all SCIP measures) is defined as patients admitted to the hospital for inpatient acute care with an ICD-9-CM Principal Procedure Code for SCIP as defined in Appendix A, Table 5.10 and a Length of Stay (Discharge Date - Admission Date) ≤ 120 days.

Appendix A (PDF) can be found at this link:

<http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier4&cid=1228754600169>

There are eight distinct strata or sub-populations within the SCIP Topic Population, each identified by a specific group of procedure codes. The patients in each stratum are counted in the Initial Patient Population of multiple measures.

The following sample size tables for each option automatically build in the number of cases needed to obtain the required sample sizes.

Quarterly Sampling

For hospitals selecting sample cases for SCIP, a modified sampling procedure is required. Hospitals selecting sample cases for this set must ensure that each individual stratum's population and quarterly sample size meets the following conditions:

- Select within each of the seven individual measure stratum (e.g., colorectal surgery, hip arthroplasty, etc.) and the 8th SCIP stratum (Table 5.25 in Appendix A).

Quarterly Sample Size

Based on Initial Patient Population Size for the SCIP Measure Set

Hospital's Measure

Average Quarterly

Stratum Initial Patient Population Size

"N" Minimum Required

Stratum Sample Size

"n"

≥ 481 49

171-480 10% of Initial Patient Population size

17-170 17

< 17 No sampling; 100% Initial Patient Population required

Monthly Sampling

For hospitals selecting sample cases for SCIP, a modified sampling procedure is required. Hospitals selecting sample cases for this set must ensure that each individual strata population and monthly sample size meets the following conditions:

- Select within each of the seven individual measure stratum (e.g., colorectal surgery, hip arthroplasty, etc.) and the 8th SCIP stratum (Table 5.25 in Appendix A).

Monthly Sample Size

Based on Initial Patient Population Size for the SCIP Measure Set

Hospital's Measure

Average Monthly

Stratum Initial Patient Population Size

"N" Minimum Required

Stratum Sample Size

"n"

>= 151 16

61-150 10% of Initial Patient Population size

6-60 6

<6 No sampling; 100% Initial Patient Population required

All of the SCIP measures' specific exclusion criteria are used to filter out cases that do not belong in the measure denominator.

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

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

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

Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.

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

If other, please describe in S.24.

Claims, Other, Paper Medical Records

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

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

Most facilities use vendors to collect the data electronically. CMS provides a free, downloadable tool called CART. A paper tool modeled after the data collected electronically is provided as an attachment. CART downloads can be found on QualityNet.org at <http://www.qualitynet.org/dcs/ContentServer?c=Page&pagename=QnetPublic%2FPage%2FQnetTier2&cid=1138900279093>

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

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

Facility, Other, Population : Regional and State

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

<p>Inpatient/Hospital If other:</p>
<p>S.28. COMPOSITE Performance Measure - Additional Specifications <i>(Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)</i></p>
<p>2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form 2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form 0301_MeasureTesting_MS5.0_Data-635278502478708610.doc</p>

<p>3. Feasibility</p>
<p>Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.</p>
<p>3a. Byproduct of Care Processes For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).</p> <p>3a.1. Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes. Coded by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims) If other:</p>
<p>3b. Electronic Sources The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.</p> <p>3b.1. To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields? <i>(i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields)</i> No</p> <p>3b.2. If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources. There are plans to provide e-specifications for all measures in the near future.</p> <p>3b.3. If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL. Attachment:</p>
<p>3c. Data Collection Strategy Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.</p> <p>3c.1. Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues. IF a PRO-PM, consider implications for both individuals providing PROM data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured. The measure specifications have been stable for the last 2 manuals.</p> <p>3c.2. Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified <i>(e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm).</i></p>

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. Current and Planned Use

NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

Planned	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Payment Program	
Regulatory and Accreditation Programs	

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

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

4a.2. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons? (e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?)

4a.3. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement. (Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.)

4b. Improvement

Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

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

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

- Progress (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare)
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4b.2. If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4c. Unintended Consequences

The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for

individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

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

Interpretation of data elements will always be a factor, since the instructions for obtaining the data are written by the measure developers. No unintended consequences have been identified with the hair removal measure.

5. Comparison to Related or Competing Measures

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures

Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.

5.1a. List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)

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

5a. Harmonization

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;

OR

The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. If this measure conceptually addresses EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Are the measure specifications completely harmonized?

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

5b. Competing Measures

The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);

OR

Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. If this measure conceptually addresses both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible.)

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific

submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.

Attachment:

Contact Information

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Co.2 Point of Contact: Helen, Dollar-Maples, Helen.Dollar-Maples@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-7214-

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Co.4 Point of Contact: Kristie, Baus, kristie.baus@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-8161-

Additional Information

Ad.1 Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development

Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.

The Surgical Care Improvement Project's Infection TEP was involved in this measure's development and remains involved in its maintenance.

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance

Ad.2 Year the measure was first released: 2008

Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision: 10, 2010

Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? every 6 months

Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 04, 2011

Ad.6 Copyright statement: Trend Report (BM= Benchmark, rate = national score)

Q209

BM: 100 Rate: 99.1

Q309

BM: 100 Rate 99.3

Q409

BM: 100 Rate 99.4

Q110

BM: 100 Rate 99.5

Q210

BM: 100 Rate 99.6

Ad.7 Disclaimers:

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: