



## 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 sub criterion 1b).

### Brief Measure Information

**NQF #:** 3532

**Corresponding Measures:**

**De.2. Measure Title:** Discouraging the routine use of occupational and/or supervised physical therapy after carpal tunnel release.

**Co.1.1. Measure Steward:** American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

**De.3. Brief Description of Measure:** Percentage of patients 18+ with carpal tunnel syndrome who received surgical carpal tunnel release, and who should not routinely be prescribed postoperative physical and/or occupational therapy within 6 weeks after release.

**1b.1. Developer Rationale:** This measure should discourage (and thus decrease) the routine use of physical therapy or occupational therapy, after carpal tunnel syndrome release procedures, as such post-procedural therapy does not improve outcomes.

**S.4. Numerator Statement:** Number of patients with carpal tunnel syndrome, who underwent carpal tunnel release, and who did not receive postoperative hand, physical therapy (low, moderate, or high complexity) and/or occupational therapy (low, moderate, or high complexity) within 6 weeks (42 days) of the carpal tunnel release.

**S.6. Denominator Statement:** Patients 18 years or older, with a diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome, undergoing carpal tunnel syndrome release.

**S.8. Denominator Exclusions:** N/A

**De.1. Measure Type:** Process

**S.17. Data Source:** Claims

**S.20. Level of Analysis:** Clinician : Individual, Facility

**IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Most Recent Endorsement Date:**

**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 sub criteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.**

**1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form**  
[nqf\\_evidence\\_attachment\\_7.1-PY\\_DONE-636996657653061203.docx](#)

**1a.1 For Maintenance of Endorsement: Is there new evidence about the measure since the last update/submission?**

Do not remove any existing information. If there have been any changes to evidence, the Committee will consider the new evidence. Please use the most current version of the evidence attachment (v7.1). Please use red font to indicate updated evidence.

No

### 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., how the measure will improve the quality of care, the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)

*If a COMPOSITE (e.g., combination of component measure scores, all-or-none, any-or-none), SKIP this question and answer the composite questions.*

This measure should discourage (and thus decrease) the routine use of physical therapy or occupational therapy, after carpal tunnel syndrome release procedures, as such post-procedural therapy does not improve outcomes.

**1b.2. Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis.** *(This is required for maintenance of endorsement. 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 include.) This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*

System	Time	Denominator	Numerator	Performance	Facility-level Range
VA	2016	7530	7187	95.4%	65.4 – 100.0
VA	2017	7070	6317	89.3%	14.7 – 100.0
VA	2018	6213	5495	88.4%	8.0 – 100.0
VA	FY16-18 20813	19455	91.3%	32.9 – 100.0	

**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.**

N/A.

**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 maintenance of endorsement. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included.) For measures that show high levels of performance, i.e., “topped out”, disparities data may demonstrate an opportunity for improvement/gap in care for certain sub-populations. This information also will be used to address the sub-criterion on improvement (4b1) under Usability and Use.*

N/A

**1b.5. If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b.4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations. Not necessary if performance data provided in 1b.4**

See above.

## 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 sub criteria 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):

**De.7. Target Population Category** (Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):

**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.)

<https://www.aaos.org/contentassets/85f5a78e1b054c27ac679adeb3459e81/cts-measures-technical-report-2019-update.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)

[This is not an eMeasure](#) 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 Attachment: [Data\\_Dictionary.xlsx](#)

**S.2c.** Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.

[No, this is not an instrument-based measure](#) Attachment:

**S.2d.** Is this an instrument-based measure (i.e., data collected via instruments, surveys, tools, questionnaires, scales, etc.)? Attach copy of instrument if available.

[Not an instrument-based measure](#)

**S.3.1. For maintenance of endorsement:** Are there changes to the specifications since the last updates/submission. If yes, update the specifications for S1-2 and S4-22 and explain reasons for the changes in S3.2.

[No](#)

**S.3.2. For maintenance of endorsement,** please briefly describe any important changes to the measure specifications since last measure update and explain the reasons.

[N/A](#)

**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) DO NOT include the rationale for the measure.

*IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).*

[Number of patients with carpal tunnel syndrome, who underwent carpal tunnel release, and who did not receive postoperative hand, physical therapy \(low, moderate, or high complexity\) and/or occupational therapy \(low, moderate, or high complexity\) within 6 weeks \(42 days\) of the carpal tunnel release.](#)

**S.5. 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, time period for data collection, 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 (S.14).*

[Patient encounter for Carpal Tunnel Release \(CPT\): 64721 or 29848](#)

[AND](#)

Diagnosis of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (ICD-10-CM): G560, G5600, G5601, G5602, G5603

AND

No Patient encounter for postoperative hand, physical therapy (low, moderate, or high complexity) within 6 weeks (42 days) of carpal tunnel release (CPT): 97161, 97162, 97163

OR

No patient encounter for postoperative hand occupational therapy (low, moderate, or high complexity) within 6 weeks (42 days) of carpal tunnel release (CPT): 97165, 97166, 97167.

**S.6. Denominator Statement** (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)

Patients 18 years or older, with a diagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome, undergoing carpal tunnel syndrome release.

**S.7. Denominator Details** (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, 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 target population is identified. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm (S.14).

Patient encounter for Carpal Tunnel Release (CPT): 64721 or 29848

AND

Diagnosis of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome (ICD-10-CM): G560, G5600, G5601, G5602, G5603.

Denominator cases must have (1) a CTS diagnosis, and (2) a CTS-R code. The measurement period is 1-year. This is a claims-based measure, and a process/appropriate use measure. Denominator cases that did not undergo supervised physical therapy or occupational therapy (defined by PT/OT evaluation codes), in the 42-day (or 6-week) post-procedural window, will be numerator patients. This is a patient-based, provider-level measure.

**S.8. Denominator Exclusions** (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)

N/A

**S.9. Denominator Exclusion Details** (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, time period for data collection, 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.)

N/A

**S.10. Stratification Information** (Provide all information required to stratify the measure results, if necessary, including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets, and the risk-model covariates and coefficients for the clinically-adjusted version of the measure when appropriate – 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.11. Risk Adjustment Type** (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in measure testing attachment)

No risk adjustment or risk stratification

If other:

**S.12. Type of score:**

Ratio

If other:

**S.13. 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 = Lower score

**S.14. Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic** (Diagram or 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; time period for data, aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.)

- 1) Identify cases with a carpal tunnel syndrome diagnosis code (ICD-10-CM: G560, G5600, G5601, G5602, G5603).
- 2) Identify those from above with an associated carpal tunnel syndrome release procedural CPT code: 64721 or 29848.
- 3) Ensure cases pulled are within the age range of > 17, are labeled as denominator patients, did not leave AMA, were not discharged dead, and were not discharged to hospice. Label the date of the CTS-R procedure, so we can identify cases in the post-procedural window.
- 4) Specify the 42-day post-procedure window. Ensure CTS-R dates are prior to PT/OT dates.
- 5) Pull those denominator cases that did not have a PT/OT code in the 42-day post-procedure window. Ensure cases did not have a PT/OT CPT code: 97161, 97162, 97163, 97165, 97166, 97167.
- 6) Label cases as numerator patients.

**S.15. Sampling** (If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)

IF an instrument-based performance measure (e.g., PRO-PM), identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.  
N/A.

**S.16. Survey/Patient-reported data** (If measure is based on a survey or instrument, provide instructions for data collection and guidance on minimum response rate.)

Specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.  
N/A.

**S.17. Data Source** (Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).  
If other, please describe in S.18.

Claims

**S.18. Data Source or Collection Instrument** (Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument (e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc., and describe how data are collected.)

IF instrument-based, identify the specific instrument(s) and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.  
N/A

**S.19. Data Source or Collection Instrument** (available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)

Available at measure-specific web page URL identified in S.1

**S.20. Level of Analysis** (Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Clinician : Individual, Facility

**S.21. Care Setting** (Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)

Inpatient/Hospital, Outpatient Services

If other:

**S.22. 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.)

N/A

## 2. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form

[nqf\\_testing\\_attachment\\_updated\\_AAOS\\_Nov\\_2020.docx](#)

### 2.1 For maintenance of endorsement

Reliability testing: If testing of reliability of the measure score was not presented in prior submission(s), has reliability testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.

Yes

## 2.2 For maintenance of endorsement

*Has additional empirical validity testing of the measure score been conducted? If yes, please provide results in the Testing attachment. Please use the most current version of the testing attachment (v7.1). Include information on all testing conducted (prior testing as well as any new testing); use red font to indicate updated testing.*

No

## 2.3 For maintenance of endorsement

*Risk adjustment: For outcome, resource use, cost, and some process measures, risk-adjustment that includes social risk factors is not prohibited at present. Please update sections 1.8, 2a2, 2b1,2b4.3 and 2b5 in the Testing attachment and S.140 and S.11 in the online submission form. NOTE: These sections must be updated even if social risk factors are not included in the risk-adjustment strategy. You MUST use the most current version of the Testing Attachment (v7.1) -- older versions of the form will not have all required questions.*

No - This measure is not risk-adjusted

## 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.

Coded by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., DRG, ICD-9 codes on claims)

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)** Update this field for maintenance of endorsement.

ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic claims

**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.** For maintenance of endorsement, if this measure is not an eMeasure (eCQM), please describe any efforts to develop an eMeasure (eCQM).

**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. Please also complete and attach the NQF Feasibility Score Card.**

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. Required for maintenance of endorsement.** Describe difficulties (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 instrument-based,** consider implications for both individuals providing data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and

those whose performance is being measured.

This measure requires accurate coding using CPT and ICD-9 or ICD-10 codes.

**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).**

No additional cost beyond accurate claims reporting should be incurred by entities who choose to utilize this measure.

## 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.

Specific Plan for Use	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Payment Program	
Quality Improvement (external benchmarking to organizations)	
Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

**4a1.1 For each CURRENT use, checked above (update for maintenance of endorsement), provide:**

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

N/A.

**4a1.2. 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?)**

We plan to submit this measure to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services for consideration for inclusion in Merit-Based Incentive Payment System.

**4a1.3. 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.)**

We plan to submit this measure to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid services for consideration for inclusion in Merit-Based Incentive Payment System.

**4a2.1.1. Describe how performance results, data, and assistance with interpretation have been provided to those being**



measured or other users during development or implementation.

**How many and which types of measured entities and/or others were included? If only a sample of measured entities were included, describe the full population and how the sample was selected.**

This measure's technical report was provided for public comment for a 30-day period. This was publicized by both the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) and The American Society for Surgery of the Hand (ASSH). The technical report included measure descriptions, specifications, analysis of reliability, validity, and performance variance.

**4a2.1.2. Describe the process(es) involved, including when/how often results were provided, what data were provided, what educational/explanatory efforts were made, etc.**

A total of 99 respondents provided feedback for this measure, with 94% generally supportive of the measure as written. The full public comment report is available at:

<https://www.aaos.org/uploadedFiles/PreProduction/Quality/Measures/CTS%20PM%20Public%20Comment%20Report.pdf>.

**4a2.2.1. Summarize the feedback on measure performance and implementation from the measured entities and others described in 4d.1.**

**Describe how feedback was obtained.**

The full public comment report is available at:

<https://www.aaos.org/uploadedFiles/PreProduction/Quality/Measures/CTS%20PM%20Public%20Comment%20Report.pdf>.

**4a2.2.2. Summarize the feedback obtained from those being measured.**

The full public comment report is available at:

<https://www.aaos.org/uploadedFiles/PreProduction/Quality/Measures/CTS%20PM%20Public%20Comment%20Report.pdf>.

**4a2.2.3. Summarize the feedback obtained from other users**

The full public comment report is available at:

<https://www.aaos.org/uploadedFiles/PreProduction/Quality/Measures/CTS%20PM%20Public%20Comment%20Report.pdf>.

**4a2.3. Describe how the feedback described in 4a2.2.1 has been considered when developing or revising the measure specifications or implementation, including whether the measure was modified and why or why not.**

There was a robust response and support to the proposed Measure #3 addressing the routine use of formal therapy after carpal tunnel release. I reviewed all of the written responses, and in collaboration with representatives of the ASSH and the AAOS, we discussed the findings. The workgroup developed this measure based on an AAOS Clinical Practice Guideline with Moderate Evidence for no additional benefit to routine supervised therapy over home programs in the immediate postoperative period. The Workgroup determined that nudging surgeons away from the routine use of formal therapy would improve quality of care by minimizing unnecessary interventions. There were multiple respondents that highlighted the need, at times, for therapy for certain patients with stiff proximal interphalangeal joints, generalized arthritis of the digits, or preoperative stiffness. The Workgroup was in complete agreement with these concerns and discussed these specific examples during the in person meeting. The Workgroup acknowledged that these comorbidities are uncommon and implementation of the measure would drive utilization towards 0% but it would never reach 0%. The literature does not support the routine use of formal therapy but implementation of the measure will establish a national benchmark of utilization and will identify outliers that routinely use therapy 100% of the time, as we found during our validation study. The workgroup did not believe building in exclusion criteria would be beneficial as the incidence of these comorbidities requiring formal therapy is uncommon when patients are appropriately educated and counseled on a home program.

Robin Kamal, MD

Chair, Carpal Tunnel Quality Measures Workgroup

Vice-Chair, ASSH Quality Metrics Committee

#### **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.

**4b1. Refer to data provided in 1b but do not repeat here. Discuss any progress on improvement (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.)

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.

The literature does not support the routine use of formal therapy but implementation of the measure will establish a national benchmark of utilization and will identify outliers that routinely use therapy 100% of the time, as we found during our validation study.

#### 4b2. 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).

**4b2.1. Please explain any unexpected findings (positive or negative) during implementation of this measure including unintended impacts on patients.**

N/A.

**4b2.2. Please explain any unexpected benefits from implementation of this measure.**

N/A.

### 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.

No

**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 of Related Measures

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 harmonized to the extent possible?**

Yes

**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.)**

There are no competing measures.

## 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.

Available at measure-specific web page URL identified in S.1 Attachment:

## Contact Information

**Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner):** American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

**Co.2 Point of Contact:** Ryan, Pezold, [pezold@aaos.org](mailto:pezold@aaos.org), 847-384-4311-

**Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward:** American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

**Co.4 Point of Contact:** Ryan, Pezold, [pezold@aaos.org](mailto:pezold@aaos.org), 847-384-4311-

## 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.**

1. Steve McCollam, MD

Oversight Chair

2. Robin Kamal, MD

Chair

3. Philip Blazar, MD

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

4. Mia Erickson, PT, EdD, CHT, ACT

American Society of Hand Therapists

5. Brent Graham, MD, MSc

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

6. Andy Gurman, MD

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

7. Peter Jebson, MD

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

8. William Jones, MD

American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation

9. John Kincaid, MD

American Academy of Neurology

10. David Ring, MD, PhD

American Association for Hand Surgery

11. John Seiler, MD

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

12. Alex Sox-Harris, PhD, MS

Hand Surgery Quality Consortium

13. John Stephenson, MD

American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

14. Jennifer Waljee, MD  
American Society of Plastic Surgeons  
15. Daniel Wessell, MD, PhD  
American College of Radiology  
16. Hayes Wilson, MD  
American Society for Surgery of the Hand/American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

**Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance**

**Ad.2 Year the measure was first released:** 2017

**Ad.3 Month and Year of most recent revision:** 01, 2020

**Ad.4 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?** 1 to 3 years

**Ad.5 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?**

**Ad.6 Copyright statement:** The Measures are not clinical guidelines, do not establish a standard of medical care, and have not been tested for all potential applications.

The Measures, while copyrighted, can be reproduced and distributed, without modification, for noncommercial purposes, eg, use by health care providers in connection with their practices. Commercial use is defined as the sale, license, or distribution of the Measures for commercial gain, or incorporation of the Measures into a product or service that is sold, licensed or distributed for commercial gain. Commercial uses of the Measures require a license agreement between the user and the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS).

The American Society for Surgery of the Hand's significant past efforts and contributions to the development and updating of the Measures is acknowledged. AAOS is solely responsible for the review and enhancement ("Maintenance") of the Measures as of publication. AAOS encourages use of the Measures by other health care professionals, where appropriate.

**Ad.7 Disclaimers:** N/A.

**Ad.8 Additional Information/Comments:** The American Society for Surgery of the Hand should be listed as an additional developer, with AAOS as the sole measure steward.