



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
<p>NQF #: 0455</p> <p>Corresponding Measures:</p> <p>De.2. Measure Title: Recording of Clinical Stage Prior to Surgery for Lung Cancer or Esophageal Cancer Resection</p> <p>Co.1.1. Measure Steward: The Society of Thoracic Surgeons</p> <p>De.3. Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of surgical patients aged 18 years and older undergoing resection for lung or esophageal cancer who had clinical staging provided prior to surgery</p> <p>1b.1. Developer Rationale:</p>
<p>S.4. Numerator Statement: Number of all surgical patients aged 18 years and older undergoing treatment procedures for lung or esophageal cancer who had clinical staging provided prior to surgery</p> <p>S.7. Denominator Statement: Number of all surgical patients undergoing treatment procedures for lung or esophageal cancer</p> <p>S.10. Denominator Exclusions: N/A</p>
<p>De.1. Measure Type: Process</p> <p>S.23. Data Source: Electronic Health Records, Other, Paper Medical Records, Registry Data</p> <p>S.26. Level of Analysis: Clinician : Group/Practice, Facility, Other, Population : Community, County or City, Population : Regional and State</p>
<p>IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Jul 31, 2008 Most Recent Endorsement Date: Jul 31, 2008</p>
<p>IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:</p> <p>IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:</p> <p>De.4. IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results?</p>

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report
<p>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. <i>Measures must be judged to meet all subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.</i></p>
<p>1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form 0455_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data.doc</p>
<p>1b. Performance Gap</p> <p>Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or disparities in care across population groups. <p>1b.1. Briefly explain the rationale for this measure (e.g., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)</p>

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.*

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.

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.*

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.

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

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.

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

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):

Cancer, Cancer : Lung, Esophageal

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

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.sts.org/sites/default/files/documents/STSThoracicDataSpecsV2_2.pdf

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)

URL 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.

Number of all surgical patients aged 18 years and older undergoing treatment procedures for lung or esophageal cancer who had clinical staging provided prior to surgery

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.)

Prior to surgery

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.

Number of surgical patients undergoing treatment procedures for lung or esophageal cancer for whom:

1. Clinical staging performed for lung cancer (ClinStagDoneLung- STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 840) is marked "yes"

or

2. Clinical staging performed for esophageal cancer (ClinStagDoneEsoph- STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 1150) is marked "yes"

Please see STS General Thoracic Surgery Database Data Collection Form, Version 2.2-

http://www.sts.org/sites/default/files/documents/STSThoracicAnnotatedDataCollectionFormV2_2_MajorProc_1%202012.pdf

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

Number of all surgical patients undergoing treatment procedures for lung or esophageal cancer

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)*

1. Lung cancer (LungCancer - STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 830) is marked “yes” and Category of Disease – Primary (CategoryPrim - STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 1300) is marked as one of the following:
(ICD-9, ICD-10)

Lung cancer, main bronchus, carina (162.2, C34.00)

Lung cancer, upper lobe (162.3, C34.10)

Lung cancer, middle lobe (162.4, C34.2)

Lung cancer, lower lobe (162.5, C34.30)

Lung cancer, location unspecified (162.9, C34.90)

or

Esophageal cancer (EsophCancer- STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 1140) is marked “yes” and Category of Disease – Primary (CategoryPrim - STS GTS Database, v 2.2, sequence number 1300) is marked as one of the following:
(ICD-9, ICD-10)

Esophageal cancer, lower third (150.5, C15.5)

Esophageal cancer, middle third (150.4, C15.4)

Esophageal cancer, upper third (150.3, C15.3)

Malignant other part esophagus (150.8, C15.8)

Esophageal cancer, esophagogastric junction (cardia) (151.0, C16.0)

2. Patient has lung cancer (as defined in #1 above) and primary procedure is one of the following CPT codes:

Thoracoscopy, surgical; with lobectomy (32663)

Thoracoscopy with therapeutic wedge resection (eg mass or nodule) initial, unilateral (32666)

Thoracoscopy with therapeutic wedge resection (eg mass or nodule) each additional resection, ipsilateral (32667)

Thoracoscopy with diagnostic wedge resection followed by anatomic lung resection (32668)

Thoracoscopy with removal of a single lung segment (segmentectomy) (32669)

Thoracoscopy with removal of two lobes (bilobectomy) (32670)

Thoracoscopy with removal of lung, pneumonectomy (32671)

Thoracotomy with therapeutic wedge resection (eg mass nodule) initial (32505)

Thoracotomy with therapeutic wedge resection (eg mass nodule) each additional resection, ipsilateral (32506)

Thoracotomy with diagnostic wedge resection followed by anatomic lung resection (32507)

Removal of lung, total pneumonectomy; (32440)

Removal of lung, sleeve (carinal) pneumonectomy (32442)

Removal of lung, total pneumonectomy; extrapleural (32445)

Removal of lung, single lobe (lobectomy) (32480)

Removal of lung, two lobes (bilobectomy) (32482)

Removal of lung, single segment (segmentectomy) (32484)

Removal of lung, sleeve lobectomy (32486)

Removal of lung, completion pneumonectomy (32488)

Resection of apical lung tumor (e.g., Pancoast tumor), including chest wall resection, without chest wall reconstruction(s) (32503)

Resection of apical lung tumor (e.g., Pancoast tumor), including chest wall resection, with chest wall reconstruction (32504)

or

Patient has esophageal cancer (as defined in #1 above) and primary procedure is one of the following CPT codes:
Transhiatal-Total esophagectomy, without thoracotomy, with cervical esophagogastrostomy (43107)
Three hole-Total esophagectomy with thoracotomy; with cervical esophagogastrostomy (43112)
Ivor Lewis-Partial esophagectomy, distal two-thirds, with thoracotomy and separate abdominal incision (43117)
Thoracoabdominal-Partial esophagectomy, thoracoabdominal approach (43122)
Minimally invasive three hole esophagectomy (43XXX)
Minimally invasive esophagectomy, Ivor Lewis approach (43XXX)
Minimally invasive esophagectomy, Abdominal and neck approach (43XXX)
Total esophagectomy without thoracotomy; with colon interposition or small intestine reconstruction (43108)
Total esophagectomy with thoracotomy; with colon interposition or small intestine reconstruction (43113)
Partial esophagectomy, cervical, with free intestinal graft, including microvascular anastomosis (43116)
Partial esophagectomy, with thoracotomy and separate abdominal incision with colon interposition or small intestine (43118)
Partial esophagectomy, distal two-thirds, with thoracotomy only (43121)
Partial esophagectomy, thoracoabdominal with colon interposition or small intestine (43123)
Total or partial esophagectomy, without reconstruction with cervical esophagostomy (43124)

3. Only analyze the first operation of the hospitalization meeting criteria 1-2

Please see STS General Thoracic Surgery Database Data Collection Form, Version 2.2-

http://www.sts.org/sites/default/files/documents/STSThoracicAnnotatedDataCollectionFormV2_2_MajorProc_1%202012.pdf

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

N/A

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)

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)

N/A

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)

None

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.)

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.

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.

Electronic Health Records, Other, Paper Medical Records, Registry Data

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.

STS General Thoracic Surgery Database;

http://www.sts.org/sites/default/files/documents/STSThoracicAnnotatedDataCollectionFormV2_2_MajorProc_1%202012.pdf

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)

Clinician : Group/Practice, Facility, Other, Population : Community, County or City, Population : Regional and State

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

Inpatient/Hospital

If other:

S.28. COMPOSITE Performance Measure - Additional Specifications (Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)

2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form
[0455_MeasureTesting_MSF5.0_Data.doc](#)

3. Feasibility

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.

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).

3a.1. Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.

If other:

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.

3b.1. To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields? (*i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields*)

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.

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:

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.

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.

Data Collection:

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.

Other fees:

STS General Thoracic Surgery Database participants (single surgeon or a group of surgeons) pay annual participant fees of \$400 or \$500, 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.

3c.2. Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified (*e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm*).

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)
Public Reporting	
Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

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.

This measure may be susceptible to human error (i.e., recording the measure inaccurately or not at all).

Both STS and the Duke Clinical Research Institute have a list of database participants making participation in the STS General Thoracic Surgery Database easy to track.

Each participant is responsible for the quality and accuracy of the data they submit to the database. Each participant agrees to the following quality control measures in the participation agreement:

i) "Participant hereby warrants that all data submitted for inclusion in the GTS 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.

ii) Participant warrants that it will take all reasonable steps to avoid the submission of duplicative data for inclusion in the GTS 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."

In addition, the data warehouse and analysis center at Duke Clinical Research Institute, performs a series of internal quality controls on the submitted data and issues an annual data quality report.

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): [The Society of Thoracic Surgeons](#)

Co.2 Point of Contact: [Mark, Antman, mantman@sts.org, 312-202-5856-](#)

Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: [The Society of Thoracic Surgeons](#)

Co.4 Point of Contact: [DeLaine, Schmitz, dschmitz@sts.org, 312-202-5827-](#)

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.

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: [08, 2010](#)

Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? [The STS Workforce on National Databases meets at the STS Annual Meeting and reviews the measures on](#)

Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? [2011](#)

Ad.6 Copyright statement:

Ad.7 Disclaimers:

Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments: [Applicable References:](#)

[Cassivi SD, Allen MS, Vanderwaerdt GD, et al. Patient-centered quality indicators for pulmonary resection Ann Thorac Surg 2008;86:927-933](#)

[Linda H. Harpole, Michael J. Kelley, Gilbert Schreiber, Eric M. Toloza, Jane Kolimaga and Douglas C. McCrory. Assessment of the](#)

Scope and Quality of Clinical Practice Guidelines in Lung Cancer Chest 2003;123; 7S-20S

Malnar K, Phillips JL, Fritz A, Fleming I, Landis SH, McKee R, White M, Stewart AK, Douglas L. Quality of oncology data: Findings from the Commission on Cancer PCE study. J Reg Mgmt 2001; 28:24-34.

Sylvester J, Blankenship C, Carter A, Douglas L, Stewart AK. Quality control: the American College of Surgeons Commission on Cancer Standards, National Cancer Data Base, and Cancer Liaison Program. J Reg Mgmt 2000; 27:68-74.

Fleming ID, Phillips JL, Menck HR, Murphy GP, Winchester DP. The National Cancer Data Base report on recent hospital cancer program progress toward complete American Joint Committee on Cancer / TNM staging. Cancer 1997; 80(12):2305-10.

Eberle C, Phillips JL, Tary P, Menck HR. Quality management in the national cancer data base: a re-abstracting study of the midwest region. J Registry Management 1997; Aug:93-7

Fleming ID, Phillips JL, Menck HR. The National Cancer Data Base report on completeness of American Joint Committee on Cancer staging in United States cancer facilities. Cancer 1996; 78:1498-504.

Clive RE, Zuber-Ocwieja KE, Karnell LH, Hoyler SS, Seiffert JE, Young JL, Henson DE, Winchester DP, Osteen RT, Menck HR, Fremgen AM. A national quality improvement effort: Cancer registry data. J Surg Onc 1995; 58:155-161.