Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

# **Measures Under Consideration Entry/Review and Information Tool 2024 Data Template for Candidate Measures**

## **Instructions:**

1. Before accessing the CMS MERIT (Measures Under Consideration Entry/Review and Information Tool) online system, you are invited to complete the measure template below by entering your candidate measure information in the column titled “Add Your Content Here.”
2. All rows that have an asterisk symbol \* in the Field Label require a response, unless otherwise indicated in the template.
3. For each row, the “Guidance” column provides details on how to complete the template and what kinds of data to include. Unless otherwise specified, the character limit for text fields in CMS MERIT is 8000 characters.
4. For check boxes, note whether the field is “select one” or “select all that apply.” You can click on the box to place or remove the “X.”
5. For all fields, especially Numerator and Denominator, use plain text whenever possible. Please convert any special symbols, math expressions, or equations to plain text (keyboard alphanumeric, such as + - \* /).
6. For all free-text fields: Be sure to spell out all abbreviations and define special terms at their first occurrence.
7. Numeric fields are noted, where applicable, in the “Add Your Content Here” column.
8. Row numbers are for convenience only and do not appear on the CMS MERIT user interface.
9. Send any questions to [MMSsupport@battelle.org](mailto:MMSsupport@battelle.org) with the subject line “Pre-Rulemaking”.

### **PROPERTIES**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure Information | 001 | \*Measure Title | Provide the measure title only (255 characters or less). Put any program-specific identification (ID) number under Characteristics, not in the title.  Note: Do not enter the CMIT ID, consensus-based entity (endorsement) ID, former Jira MUC ID number, or any other ID numbers here (see other fields below). The CMS program name should not ordinarily be part of the measure title, because each measure record already has a required field that specifies the CMS program. An exception would be if there are several measures with otherwise identical titles that apply to different programs. In this case, including or imbedding a program name in the title (to prevent there being any otherwise duplicate titles) is helpful. For additional information on measure title, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-specification/document-measure>. | Quality of Life Outcome for Patients with Neurologic Conditions |
| Measure Information | 002 | \*Measure Description | Provide a brief description of the measure. For additional information on measure description, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-specification/document-measure>. | Percentage of patients whose quality of life assessment results are maintained or improved during the measurement period. |
| Measure Information | 003 | \*Select the CMS program(s) for which the measure is being submitted. | Select all that apply. Please note, measures specified and intended for use at more than one level of analysis must be submitted separately for each level of analysis (e.g., individual clinician, facility).  If you choose multiple programs for this submission, please ensure the programs fall under the same level of analysis. If you choose multiple programs and need guidance as to whether your selection represents multiple levels of analysis, please contact [MMSSupport@battelle.org](mailto:MMSSupport@battelle.org). There is functionality within CMS MERIT to decrease the data entry process for multiple submissions of the same measure. Please reach out to [MMSSupport@battelle.org](mailto:MMSSupport@battelle.org)  for guidance and support.  If you are submitting for MIPS, there are two choices of program. Do NOT enter both MIPS-Quality and MIPS-Cost for the same measure. Choose MIPS-Quality for measures that pertain to quality and/or efficiency. Choose MIPS-Cost only for measures that pertain to cost. | Ambulatory Surgical Center Quality Reporting Program  End-Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) Quality Incentive Program  Home Health Quality Reporting Program  Hospice Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program  Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program  Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program  Inpatient Psychiatric Facility Quality Reporting Program  Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Quality Reporting Program  Long-Term Care (LTC) Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Medicare Promoting Interoperability Program  Medicare Shared Savings Program  Merit-based Incentive Payment System-Cost  Merit-based Incentive Payment System-Quality  Part C Star Ratings  Part D Star Ratings  Prospective Payment System-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Rural Emergency Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Skilled Nursing Facility Quality Reporting Program  Skilled Nursing Facility Value-Based Purchasing Program |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Merit-based Incentive Payment System -Quality” in Row 003, then Row 004 becomes an optional field. If you do not select “Merit-based Incentive Payment System -Quality” in Row 003, then skip to Row 005.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Information | 004 | MIPS Quality: Identify any links with related Cost measures and Improvement Activities | Where available, provide description of linkages and a rationale that correlates this MIPS quality measure to other performance category measures and activities. | Free text field |
| Measure Information | 005 | \*Completed Stage(s) of Development | Select all stages of development that have been completed. There are five stages in the Measure Lifecycle: conceptualization; specification; testing; implementation; and use, continuing evaluation, and maintenance. Measure conceptualization is the first stage; however, the stages are not necessarily sequential. Instead, the stages are iterative and can occur concurrently.  The measure conceptualization stage initiates information gathering and business case development.  The measure specification stage involves establishing the basic elements of the measure, including the numerator, calculation algorithm, and data source identification.  The measure testing stage examines the specifications, usually with a limited number of real settings, to make sure the measure is scientifically acceptable and feasible.  Measure specification and measure testing are iterative.  For additional information regarding stage of development, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/blueprint-measure-lifecycle-overview>. | Measure Conceptualization  Measure Specification  Measure Testing  Measure Use, Continuing Evaluation & Maintenance |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select only “Measure Conceptualization” and/or “Measure Specification” in Row 005, then Row 006 becomes a required field. If your selections include “Measure Testing” or “Measure Use, Continuing Evaluation & Maintenance” in Row 005, then skip to Row 007.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Information | 006 | \*Stage of Development Details | If testing is not yet completed, describe when testing is planned (i.e., specific dates), what type of testing is planned (e.g., alpha, beta) as well as the types of facilities in which the measure will be tested.  For additional information, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/blueprint-measure-lifecycle-overview>. | Testing has not been completed despite having this measure integrated into the Axon Registry for several years. The data required to complete testing was unavailable. The AAN does not have plans to test at this point in time. |
| Measure Information | 007 | \*Level of Analysis | Select one. Select the level of analysis at which the measure is specified and intended for use. If the measure is specified and intended for use at more than one level, submit the other levels separately. Any testing results provided in subsequent sections of this submission must be conducted at the level of analysis selected here.  For submission to the MIPS-Quality program, you must report, at minimum, the results of individual clinician-level testing. If testing is performed at both clinician-individual and clinician-group levels of analysis, you may select “Clinician: Individual and Group.” Please submit results of individual clinician-level testing in this form and group-level testing results in an attachment.  For submission to the MIPS-Cost program, clinician group-level testing is sufficient. | Accountable Care Organization  Clinician: Group  Clinician: Individual  Clinician: Individual and Group  Facility  Health plan  Integrated Delivery System  Medicaid program (e.g., Health Home or 1115)  Population: Community, County or City  Population: Regional and State |
| Measure Information | 008 | \*In which setting(s) was this measure tested? | Select all that apply. | Ambulatory surgery center  Ambulatory/office-based care  Behavioral health clinic  Community hospital  Dialysis facility  Emergency department  Federally qualified health center (FQHC)  ☐ Health and Drug Plans  Hospital outpatient department (HOD)  Home health  Hospice  Hospital inpatient acute care facility  Inpatient psychiatric facility  Inpatient rehabilitation facility  Long-term care hospital  Nursing home  PPS-exempt cancer hospital  Skilled nursing facility  Veterans Health Administration facility  Not yet tested  Other (enter here): |
| Measure Information | 009 | \*Multiple Scores | Does the submitter recommend that more than one measure score be separately reported for this measure (e.g., 7- and 30-day rate, rates for different procedure types, etc.)? This does not include index measures, where component measure scores result in one overall index score. Note: If “Yes”, please describe one score only in this form. Submit separate attachments for each of the other scores. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 009, then Rows 010-012 become required fields. If you select, “No”, then skip to Row 013.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Information | 010 | \*Measures with Multiple Scores: Number of Scores | How many measure scores are recommended for this measure? | Numeric field |
| Measure Information | 011 | \*Measures with Multiple Scores: Names of Score Reported in MERIT Form | Please enter the name of the score described in this MERIT form. | Free text field |
| Measure Information | 012 | \*Measures with Multiple Scores: Names of Scores | Please enter the names of all additional scores included in this measure but not described in this MERIT form. Please enter the names separated by a semicolon and do not enter any additional information in this field. | Free text field |
| Measure Information | 013 | \*Is the measure a composite and/or a paired measure? | Select all that apply.  A composite measure contains two or more individual measures, resulting in a single measure and a single score. This includes index measures. If this measure is a composite measure, please enter data pertaining to the overall composite measure into this form. Please attach any additional information pertaining to individual components.  Paired measures have different measure scores, but results require them to be reported together to be interpreted appropriately. Note: Individual measures comprising a paired measure must be submitted individually. | Yes, this is a composite measure  Yes, this is a paired measure  No, this is neither a composite nor a paired measure |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes, this is a paired measure” in Row 013, then Rows 014-015 become required fields. If you do not select “Yes, this is a paired measure” in this field, then skip to Row 016.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Information | 014 | \*How many measures are intended to be paired with this measure? | How many other measures are intended to be paired with this measure? Do not include this measure in the count. | Numeric field |
| Measure Information | 015 | \*What are the titles of all measures that should be paired with this measure? | Please enter the measure titles for all other measures that should be paired with this measure. Do not include this measure in the list. Please enter the measure titles separated by a semicolon, and do not enter any additional information in this field. | Free text field |
| Measure Information | 016 | \*Numerator | The upper portion of a fraction used to calculate a rate, proportion, or ratio. An action to be counted as meeting a measure's requirements. | Patients whose PROMIS Global Health-10 score at 12 months (+/- 60 days) was maintained or improved from the index score.  \*For patients with more than 2 scores present at twelve months (+/- 60 days) the last score recorded shall be compared to the index visit score. |
| Measure Information | 017 | \*Numerator Exclusions | For additional information on exclusions/exceptions, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/exclusions>. If not applicable, enter 'N/A.' | None |
| Measure Information | 018 | \*Denominator | The lower part of a fraction used to calculate a rate, proportion, or ratio. The denominator is associated with a given population that may be counted as eligible to meet a measure’s inclusion requirements. | Patients aged 18 years and older diagnosed with a neurologic condition.  Denominator identification period: The period in which eligible patients can have an index event. The denominator identification period occurs prior to the measurement period and is defined as 14 months to two months prior to the start of the measurement period. For example, the denominator identification period for the 2019 calendar year is from 11/1/2017 to 10/31/2018. For patients with an index event, there needs to be enough time following index for the patients to have the opportunity to reach comparison twelve months +/- 60 days after the index event date. |
| Measure Information | 019 | \*Denominator Exclusions | For additional information on exclusions/exceptions, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/exclusions>. If not applicable, enter 'N/A.' | * Patients who died * Second PROMIS Global Health-10 score not collected at 12 months (+/- 60 days) |
| Measure Information | 020 | \*Denominator Exceptions | For additional information on exclusions/exceptions, see: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/exclusions>. If not applicable, enter ‘N/A.’ | None |
| Measure Information | 021 | \*Briefly describe the rationale for the measure | Briefly describe the rationale for the measure and/or the impact the measure is anticipated to achieve. Details about the evidence to support the measure will be captured in the Evidence section. | Measuring quality of life allows patients and providers to identify areas of concern and develop appropriate treatment plan adjustments as needed. Collecting quality of life data in a neurology ambulatory setting is feasible and found to be meaningful. |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure Implementation | 022 | \*Feasibility of Data Elements | Select one. Select the extent to which the specified data elements are available in electronic fields. Electronic fields should include a designated location and format for the data in claims, EHRs, registries, etc.   * Select “ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources” if the data elements needed to calculate the measure are all available in discrete and electronically defined fields. * Select “Some data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources” if the data elements needed to calculate the measure are not all available in discrete and electronically defined fields. * Select “No data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources” if none of the data elements needed to calculate the measure are available in discrete and electronically defined fields. * Select “Not applicable" ONLY for CAHPS measures. * Select “Unable to Determine” ONLY if a feasibility assessment has not yet been completed.   For a PRO-PM, select the most appropriate option based on the data collection format(s). | ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources  Some data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources  No data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources  Not applicable (applies only for CAHPS measures)  Unable to determine (applies only if a feasibility assessment has not yet been completed) |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “ALL data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources” or “Some data elements are in defined fields in electronic sources in Row 022, then Row 023 becomes a required field, otherwise, skip to row 024.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Implementation | 023 | \*USCDI Data Elements | Select one. Indicate the extent to which the data elements that are in defined fields in electronic sources align with United States Core Data for Interoperability (USCDI) v4 or USCDI+ Quality draft standard definitions.  For more information about USCDI, please refer to the HealthIT.gov website available at: <https://www.healthit.gov/isa/united-states-core-data-interoperability-uscdi>  For more information about USCDI+ Quality, please refer to the HealthIT.gov website available at: <https://www.healthit.gov/topic/interoperability/uscdi-plus> | ALL data elements align with USCDI/USCDI+ Quality standard definitions  Some data elements align with USCDI/USCDI+ Quality standard definitions  None of the data elements align with USCDI/USCDI+ Quality standard definitions  USCDI/USCDI+ Quality alignment not assessed |
| Measure Implementation | 024 | \*Method of Measure Calculation | Select one. Select the method used to calculate measure scores for the version of the measure proposed in this submission form. Please review guidance before making selections:   * Select “Electronically Derived Administrative Data (Claims and/or Non-Claims)” if the measure can be calculated exclusively from administrative data submitted electronically for billing or other purposes. * Select “eCQM” if the measure is exclusively specified and formatted to use data from electronic health record (EHRs) and/or health information technology systems, using the Quality Data Model (QDM) to define the data elements and Clinical Quality Language (CQL) to express measure logic. * Select “Other digital method” if the measure does not meet the definition of an eCQM as described above, but can be calculated electronically (e.g., registry, MDS, OASIS). * Select “Manual abstraction” if all data elements in the measure requires manual review of records, paper-based billing, or manual calculation (e.g., CAHPS). * Select “Combination” if two or more types of data sources are required to calculate the measure score.   For all other measures that rely on patient surveys (e.g., PRO-PMs), select the option that best describes the way the measure is calculated. For example, if a patient survey is collected electronically and does not require manual abstraction, select "Other digital method" or "eCQM" depending on where the data are collected. | Electronically Derived Administrative Data (Claims and/or Non-Claims)  eCQM  Other digital method  Manual abstraction  Combination |
| Measure Implementation | n/a | *If you select "Combination" in Row 024, then Row 025 becomes a required field; otherwise, skip to Row 026.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Implementation | 025 | \*Combination measure: Methods of calculation | Select all that apply. A minimum of two options must be selected. | Electronically Derived Administrative Data (Claims and/or Non-Claims)  eCQM  Other digital method  Manual abstraction |
| Measure Implementation | 026 | \*How is the measure expected to be reported to the program? | This is the anticipated data submission method. Select all that apply. Use the “Submitter Comments” field to specify or elaborate on the type of reporting data, if needed to define your measure. | eCQM  Clinical Quality Measure (CQM)  Claims  Web interface  Other (enter here): |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Burden | 027 | \*Did the provider workflow have to be modified to collect additional data needed to report the measure? | Select one.  Select “Yes” if workflow modifications impose moderate to significant additional data entry burden on a clinician or other provider to collect the data elements to report the measure because data are not routinely collected during clinical care, OR EHR interface changes were necessary.  Select “No” if workflow modifications impose no or limited additional data entry burden on a clinician or other provider to collect the data elements to report the measure because data are routinely collected during the clinical care, AND no EHR interface changes were necessary.  Select "Not applicable" if the measure imposes no data entry burden on the clinician or provider because:  A) the measure is calculated by someone other than the clinician or provider AND uses data that are routinely generated (i.e., administrative data and claims), OR  B) the data are collected by someone other than the clinician or provider (e.g., CAHPS), OR  C) the measure repurposes existing data sets to calculate a measure score (e.g., HEDIS).  Select "Unable to determine” if a workflow analysis was not completed and/or it cannot be determined whether the workflow modifications impose additional data entry burden to collect data needed to report the measure. | Yes  No  Not applicable  Unable to determine |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Groups | 028 | \*Is this measure an electronic clinical quality measure (eCQM)? | Select 'Yes' or 'No'. If your answer is yes, the Measure Authoring Tool (MAT) ID number must be provided below. For more information on eCQMs, see: <https://www.emeasuretool.cms.gov/> | Yes  No |
| Groups | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 028, then Rows 029-031 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 028, then skip to Row 032.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Groups | 029 | \*Measure Authoring Tool (MAT) Number | You must attach Bonnie test cases for this measure, with 100% logic coverage (test cases should be appended), attestation that value sets are published in Value Set Authority Center (VSAC), and feasibility scorecard. If not an eCQM, or if MAT number is not available, enter 0. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| Groups | 030 | \*If eCQM, does the measure have a Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) specification in alignment with the latest HQMF and eCQM standards, and does the measure align with Clinical Quality Language (CQL) and Quality Data Model (QDM)? | Select 'Yes' or 'No'. For additional information on HQMF standards, see: <https://ecqi.healthit.gov/tool/hqmf> | Yes  No |
| Groups | 031 | \*Number of unique EHR vendors represented in testing dataset | Enter the number of unique EHR vendors represented in the dataset to demonstrate that measure data elements are valid and that the measure score can be accurately calculated across different systems (e.g., Epic, Cerner, etc.). | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 032 | \*Reliability | Indicate whether reliability testing was conducted for the accountable entity-level measure scores. Acceptable reliability tests include signal-to-noise (or inter-unit reliability) or random split-half correlation. For more information on accountable entity-level reliability testing, refer to the Blueprint content on the CMS Measures Management System (MMS) Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/reliability>).  Select “Yes” if acceptable accountable entity-level reliability testing has been completed as of submission of this form.  Select “No” if you are not able to provide the results of acceptable accountable entity-level reliability testing in this submission. If testing results are incomplete, or if you are submitting a different type of reliability testing, provide as an attachment.  Note: This section refers to the reliability of the accountable entity-level measure scores in the final performance measure. For testing of surveys or patient reported tools, refer to the Patient-Reported Data section. Note: for MIPS-Quality submissions, please provide individual clinician-level results. If the measure was also tested at the clinician group level, you may include those results in an attachment. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 032, then Row 33 becomes a required field. If you select “No” in Row 032, then skip to Row 042.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 033 | \*Reliability: Type of analysis | Select all that apply.  Signal-to-noise (or inter-unit reliability) is the precision attributed to an actual construct versus random variation (e.g., ratio of between unit variance to total variance) (Adams J. The reliability of provider profiling: a tutorial. Santa Monica, CA: RAND; 2009. <http://www.rand.org/pubs/technical_reports/TR653.html>).  Random split-half correlation is the agreement between two measures of the same concept, using data derived from split samples drawn from the same entity at a single point in time. | Signal-to-Noise  Random Split-Half Correlation |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Signal-to-Noise” in Row 033, then Rows 034-037 become required fields. If you select, “Random Split-Half Correlation” in Row 033, then Rows 038-041 become required fields.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 034 | \*Signal-to-Noise: Level of Analysis | Select the level of analysis at which the signal-to-noise analysis was conducted. If the measure is specified and intended for use at more than one level, ensure the results in this section are at the same level of analysis selected in the Measure Information section of this form.  For MIPS-Quality submissions, you must report the results of individual clinician-level testing. If group-level testing is available, you may submit those results as an attachment. | Accountable Care Organization  Clinician – Group  Clinician – Individual  Facility  Health plan  Integrated Delivery System  ☐ Medicaid program (e.g., Health Home or 1115)  Population: Community, County or City  Population: Regional and State |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 035 | \*Signal-to-Noise: Sample size | Indicate the number of accountable entities sampled to test the final performance measure. Note that this field is intended to capture the number of measured entities and not the number of individual patients or cases included in the sample. | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 036 | \*Signal-to-Noise: Median Statistical result | Indicate the median result for the signal-to-noise analysis used to assess accountable entity level reliability. Results should range from 0.00 to 1.00. Calculate reliability as the measure is intended to be implemented (e.g., after applying minimum denominator requirements, appropriate type of setting, provider, etc.). | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 037 | \*Signal-to-Noise: Interpretation of results | Describe the type of statistic and interpretation of the results (e.g., low, moderate, high). Provide the distribution of signal-to-noise results across measured entities (e.g., min, max, percentiles). List accepted thresholds referenced and provide a citation. If applicable, include the precision of the statistical result (e.g., 95% confidence interval) and/or an assessment of statistical significance (e.g., p-value). | Free text field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 038 | \*Random Split-Half Correlation: Level of Analysis | Select the level of analysis at which the random split-half analysis was conducted. If the measure is specified and intended for use at more than one level, ensure the results in this section are at the same level of analysis selected in the Measure Information section of this form.  For MIPS-Quality submissions, you must report the results of individual clinician-level testing. If group-level testing is available, you may submit those results as an attachment. | Accountable Care Organization  Clinician – Group  Clinician – Individual  Facility  Health plan  Integrated Delivery System  ☐ Medicaid program (e.g., Health Home or 1115)  Population: Community, County or City  Population: Regional and State |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 039 | \*Random Split-Half Correlation: Sample size | Indicate the number of accountable entities sampled to test the final performance measure. If number varied by sample, use the largest number of measured entities. Note that this field is intended to capture the number of measured entities and not the number of individual patients or cases included in the sample. | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 040 | \*Random Split-Half Correlation: Statistical result | Indicate the statistical result for the random split-half correlation analysis used to assess accountable entity level reliability. Results should range from -1.00 to 1.00. Calculate reliability as the measure is intended to be implemented (e.g., after applying minimum denominator requirements, appropriate type of setting, provider, etc.). | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 041 | \*Random Split-Half Correlation: Interpretation of results | Describe the type of statistic and interpretation of the results (e.g., low, moderate, high). List accepted thresholds referenced and provide a citation. If applicable, include the precision of the statistical result (e.g., 95% confidence interval) and/or an assessment of statistical significance (e.g., p-value). | Free text field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 042 | \*Empiric Validity | Indicate whether empiric validity testing was conducted for the accountable entity-level measure scores. For more information on accountable entity level empiric validity testing, refer to the Blueprint content on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/validity>)  Note: This section refers to the empiric validity of the accountable entity level measure scores in the final performance measure. Refer to the Patient-Reported Data section for testing of surveys or patient reported tools.  Note: for MIPS-Quality submissions, please provide individual clinician-level results. If the measure was also tested at the clinician group level, you may include those results in an attachment. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 042, then Rows 043-046 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 042, then skip to Row 047.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 043 | \*Empiric Validity: Level of Analysis | Select the level of analysis at which the empiric validity analysis was conducted. If the measure is specified and intended for use at more than one level, ensure the results in this section are at the same level of analysis selected in the Measure Information section of this form.  For MIPS-Quality submissions, you must report the results of individual clinician-level testing. If group-level testing is available, you may submit those results as an attachment. | Accountable Care Organization  Clinician – Group  Clinician – Individual  Facility  Health plan  Integrated Delivery System  ☐ Medicaid program (e.g., Health Home or 1115)  Population: Community, County or City  Population: Regional and State |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 044 | \*Empiric Validity: Sample size | Indicate the number of accountable entities sampled to test the final performance measure. Note that this field is intended to capture the number of measured entities and not the number of individual patients or cases included in the sample. | Numeric field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountability Entity Level) Testing | 045 | \*Empiric Validity: Methods and findings | Describe the methods used to assess accountable entity level validity. Describe the comparison groups or constructs used to verify the validity of the measure scores, including hypothesized relationships (e.g., expected to be positively or negatively correlated). Describe your findings for each analysis conducted, including the statistical results and the strongest and weakest results across analyses. If applicable, include the precision of the statistical result(s) (e.g., 95% confidence interval) and/or an assessment of statistical significance (e.g., p-value). If methods and results require more space, include as an attachment. | Free text field |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 046 | \*Empiric Validity: Interpretation of results | Indicate whether the statistical result affirmed the hypothesized relationship for the analysis conducted. | Yes  No |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 047 | \*Face validity | Indicate if a vote was conducted among experts and patients/caregivers on whether the final performance measure scores can be used to differentiate good from poor quality of care.  Select “No” if experts and patients/caregivers did not provide feedback on the final performance measure at the specified level of analysis or if the feedback was related to a property of the measure unrelated to its ability to differentiate performance among measured entities.  This item is intended to assess whether face validity testing was conducted on the final performance measure and is not intended to assess whether patient-reported surveys or tools have face validity. Survey item testing results can be provided in an attachment and described in the Patient-Reported Data Section. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 047, then Rows 048-050 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 047, then skip to Row 051.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 048 | \*Face validity: Total number of voting experts and patients/caregivers | Indicate the number of experts and patients/caregivers who voted on face validity (specifically, whether the measure could differentiate good from poor quality care among accountable entities). | 17 |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 049 | \*Face validity: Number of experts and patients/caregivers who voted in agreement | Indicate the number of experts and patients/caregivers who voted in agreement that the measure could differentiate good from poor quality care among accountable entities. If votes were conducted using a scale, sum all responses in agreement with the statement. Do not include neutral votes. If more than one question was asked of the experts and patients/caregivers, only provide results from the question relating to the ability of the final performance measure to differentiate good from poor quality care. | 12 |
| Measure Score Level (Accountable Entity Level) Testing | 050 | Face validity: Interpretation | Briefly explain the interpretation of the result, including any disagreement with the face validity of the performance measure. | 71% of surveyed members voted in favor of the measure’s face validity, which indicates acceptable face validity. |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 051 | \*Patient/Encounter Level Testing | Indicate whether patient/encounter level testing of the individual data elements in the final performance measure was conducted (i.e., measure of agreement such as kappa or correlation coefficient). Prior studies of the same data elements may be submitted.   * Select “Yes” if data element agreement was assessed at the individual data element level as of submission of this form. * Select “No” if you are not able to provide the results of data element agreement in this submission. If you are submitting preliminary testing results or a different type of data element testing, provide as an attachment. * Select “No” and skip to the Patient-Reported Data section if data element testing was only conducted for a survey or patient reported tool (e.g., internal consistency) rather than data element agreement for the final performance measure. * Select “Not applicable” if the measure relies entirely on administrative data.   Note: This section includes tests of both data element reliability and validity. | Yes  No  Not applicable |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 051, then Rows 052-056 become required fields. If you select “No” or “Not applicable” in Row 051, then skip to Row 057.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 052 | \*Type of Analysis | Select all that apply. For more information on patient/encounter level testing, refer to the Blueprint content on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-testing/evaluation-criteria/scientific-acceptability/reliability>)  Note: This section refers to the patient/encounter level data elements in the final performance measure. Refer to the Patient-Reported Data section for testing of patient/encounter level data elements in surveys or patient reported tools. | Agreement between two manual reviewers  Agreement between eCQM and manual reviewer  Agreement between other gold standard and manual reviewer |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 053 | \*Sample Size | Indicate the number of patients/encounters sampled. |  |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 054 | \*Statistic Name | Select one. Indicate the statistic used to assess agreement (e.g., percent agreement, kappa, positive predictive value, etc.). If more than one type of statistic was calculated, list the one that best depicts the reliability and/or validity of the data elements in your measure. Other statistics and results should be provided in the “Interpretation of results” field or provided as an attachment. | Percent agreement  Kappa  Correlation coefficient  Sensitivity  Positive Predictive Value |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 055 | \*Statistical Results: Individual Data Element | Indicate the single lowest critical data element result of the statistic selected above. This field is intended to capture the least reliable or least valid data element included in the measure. Information about all critical data elements should be provided in the “Interpretation of results” field.  If providing kappa or a correlation coefficient, results should be between -1 and 1.  If providing percent agreement, sensitivity, or positive predictive value, results should be between 0% and 100%. The percent value should be entered as a whole number; for example, 70% would be entered as 70 and NOT 0.7.  If not tested at the individual data element level, enter 9999. |  |
| Patient/Encounter Level (Data Element Level) Testing | 056 | \*Interpretation of results | Briefly describe the interpretation of results. Include a list of all data elements tested including their frequency, statistical results, and 95% confidence intervals, as applicable. Include 95% confidence intervals for the overall denominator and numerator results, as applicable. Provide results broken down by test site to demonstrate whether reliability/validity varied between sites, if available. If more room is needed and testing results are included in an attachment, provide the name of the attachment and location in the attachment.  If any data element has low reliability or validity, describe the anticipated impact and whether it could introduce bias to measure scores. If there is variation in reliability or validity scores across test sites/measured entities, describe how this variation impacts overall interpretation of the results. |  |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Patient-Reported Data | 057 | \*Does the performance measure use survey or patient-reported data? | Indicate whether the performance measure utilizes data from structured surveys or patient-reported tools. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 057, then Rows 058 and 059 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 057, then skip to Row 060.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Patient-Reported Data | 058 | \*Survey level testing methodology and results | List each survey or patient-reported outcome tool accepted by the performance measure. Indicate whether the tool(s) are being used as originally specified and tested or if modifications are required. If available, provide each survey or tool as a link or attachment.  Describe the mode(s) of administration available (e.g., electronic, phone, mail) and the number of languages the survey(s) or tool(s) are available in.  Indicate whether any of the surveys or tools is proprietary requiring licenses or fees for use.  Briefly describe the method used to psychometrically test or validate the patient survey or patient-reported outcome tool. (e.g., Cronbach’s alpha, ICC, Pearson correlation coefficient, Kuder-Richardson test). If the survey or tool was developed prior to the development of the performance measure, describe how the intended use of the survey or tools for the performance measure aligns with the survey or tool as originally designed and tested. Indicate whether the measure uses all components within a tool, or only parts of the tool. Summarize the statistical results and briefly describe the interpretation of results. | PROMIS Global Health-10. Being used as originally specified.  PROMIS Global Health-10 is available as a paper-based measure, and digitally through REDCap, Epic, Assessment Center API, PROMIS iPad APP and NIH Toolbox iPad App, and many other digital tools.  The paper-based measure is available for free online. Digital tools may require fees.  PROMIS measures have undergone content validity, cross-sectional validity, responsiveness to change, clinical validity evidence, and validation in pediatric chronic disease populations.  Using item response theory (graded response model), 11 item banks were calibrated on a sample of 21,133, measuring components of self-reported physical, mental and social health, along with a 10-item global health scale. Short forms from each bank were developed and compared to the overall bank as well as with other well-validated and widely accepted (“legacy”) measures. All item banks demonstrated good reliability across the majority of the score distributions. Construct validity was supported by moderate to strong correlations with legacy measures. (Cella D, Riley W, Stone A, et al. Initial Adult Health Item Banks and First Wave Testing of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information Systems (PROMIS) Network: 2005-2008. J Clin Epidemiol 2010; 63(11):1179-1194.)  Initial evidence in support of the reliability and validity of IRT-derived summary scores for PROMIS item banks. With the exception of fatigue, which was developed to sample across content without regard for degree of information provided by each item, all correlations were above r=0.95. This suggests that the short form is reliably measuring the same thing as the item bank from which it was drawn. Reliability (defined here as measurement precision along the continuum) remained high for all banks from scores at the mean to two or more standard deviation units worse than the mean. The consistently low standard errors across the majority of the measurement continuum provides confidence in the precision of score estimates, even at the individual level. (Cella D, Riley W, Stone A, et al. Initial Adult Health Item Banks and First Wave Testing of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information Systems (PROMIS) Network: 2005-2008. J Clin Epidemiol 2010; 63(11):1179-1194.)  The Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS™) provides item banks that offer the potential for PRO measurement that is efficient (minimizes item number without compromising reliability) flexible (enables optional use of interchangeable items), and precise (has minimal error in estimate) measurement of commonly-studied PROs.  (Cella D, Riley W, Stone A, et al. Initial Adult Health Item Banks and First Wave Testing of the Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information Systems (PROMIS) Network: 2005-2008. J Clin Epidemiol 2010; 63(11):1179-1194.)  The PROMIS tool was created in 2004 before this measure existed. PROMIS includes over 300 measures of physical, mental, and social health for use with the general population and with individuals living with chronic conditions.  The PROMIS Global Health 10 questionnaire contains ten questions about a patient’s general health and quality of life including mood, social activities, physical activities, emotional problems, fatigue, and pain. This measure is meant to quantify if a patient’s quality of life has been maintained or improved over a 12-month period which helps the patient’s care team have a more efficient encounter and create a better plan of care that is patient-centered. This measure looks at the score difference between an index event and an office visit 10-14 months from the index date. |
| Patient-Reported Data | 059 | \*Spanish development of the survey instrument. | Select all that apply. Survey instruments are expected to be developed in Spanish, in addition to English. | Survey instrument was developed in Spanish and validated  Survey instrument was developed in Spanish but not yet validated  Working on Spanish version of survey instrument  There are no plans to develop a Spanish version of survey instrument |
| Measure Performance | 060 | \*Measure performance - type of score | Select one. Measure performance score type should be at the level of accountable entity. | Categorical (e.g., measured entity scores yes/no, pass/fail, or rating scale/score)  Composite scale/non-weighted score  Composite scale/weighted score  Continuous variable (e.g., average)  Count  Frequency Distribution  Proportion  Rate  Ratio |
| Measure Performance | 061 | \*Measure performance score interpretation | Select one | Better quality = Higher score  Better quality = Lower score  Better quality = Score within a defined interval  Passing score above a specified threshold defines better quality  ☐ Passing score below a specified threshold defines better quality |
| Measure Performance | 062 | \*Number of accountable entities included in analysis | Provide the number of accountable entities included in the analysis of the distribution of performance scores.  Please enter a single value and do not enter a range.  If unknown or not available, enter 9999. | Numeric field |
| Measure Performance | 063 | \*Number of accountable entities: unit | Provide the unit of accountable entities included in the analysis of the distribution of performance scores. | Free text field |
| Measure Performance | 064 | \*Number of persons | Provide the number of persons included in the analysis of the distribution of performance scores | Numeric field |
| Measure Performance | 065 | \*10th percentile | Provide the performance score at the 10th percentile for the testing sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  If this is a proportion measure, provide the 10th percentile score in percentage form, without the symbol. For example, if the 10th percentile performance score is 21.2%, enter 21.2 and not 0.212.  If a 10th percentile performance score is not available, enter 9999. | Numeric field |
| Measure Performance | 066 | \*50th percentile (median) | Provide the median performance score (50th percentile) for the testing sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  Please enter only one value in the response field and do not enter a range of values.  If this is a proportion measure, provide the median performance score in percentage form, without the symbol. For example, if the median performance score is 85.6%, enter 85.6 and not 0.856.  If a median performance score is not available, enter 9999. | Numeric field |
| Measure Performance | 067 | \*90th percentile | Provide the performance score at the 90th percentile for the testing sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  If this is a proportion measure, provide the 90th percentile score in percentage form, without the symbol. For example, if the 90th percentile performance score is 85.6%, enter 85.6 and not 0.856.  If a 90th percentile performance score is not available, enter 9999. | Numeric field |
| Measure Performance | 068 | \*Additional measure performance information | Provide the following additional measure performance information, as applicable:  - Mean performance score across accountable entities in the test sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  - Minimum and maximum performance score for the testing sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  - Standard deviation of performance scores for the testing sample that is relevant to the intended use of the measure.  - Passing score for the performance measure.  - Performance score’s defined interval, including upper and lower limit of the performance score. | Free text field |
| Measure Performance | 069 | \*Is there evidence for statistically significant gaps in measure score performance among select subpopulations of interest defined by one or more social risk factors? | Select one. Social risk factors may include age, race, ethnicity, linguistic and cultural context, sex, gender, sexual orientation, social relationships, residential and community environments, Medicare/Medicaid dual eligibility, insurance status (insured/uninsured), urbanicity/rurality, disability, and health literacy. | Yes  No  Not tested |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Importance | 070 | \*Meaningful to Patients. Did the majority of patients/caregivers consulted agree that the measure is meaningful and/or produces information that is valuable to them in making their care decisions? | Select one. Patients and/or caregivers can include any of the following:   * Patients * Primary caregivers * Family * Other relatives | Yes  No  Not evaluated |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 070, then Row 071 becomes a required field. If you select “No” or “Not evaluated” in Row 070, then skip to Row 072.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Importance | 071 | \*Description of input collected from patients/caregivers consulted | Describe the input collected from patient/caregivers consulted about the measure, including the number of patients/caregivers consulted and the number who agreed that the measure is meaningful and produces information that is valuable in making care decisions. | The TEP had one patient and one caregiver. They both were advocates for this measure and helped push it forward even with neurologist disapproval. |
| Importance | 072 | Description of input collected from measured entities. | Describe the input collected from measured entities, or others such as consumers, purchasers, policy makers, etc., using any of the following methods:   * Focus groups * Structured interviews * Surveys of potential users   Notes:   * This is separate from face validity testing of the performance measure. | The American Academy of Neurology (AAN) seated a multidisciplinary technical expert panel (TEP) to create the headache measures. Representatives from the American Association of Neuroscience Nurses, Epilepsy Foundation, and International Essential Tremor Foundation were seated on the TEP to inform well rounded measures. In addition to TEP members, the AAN conducts a public comment period where members of the AAN and associations that participated on the TEP are invited to review the measures and provide comment. |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Background Information | 073 | \*What is the history or background for including this measure on the current year MUC List? | Select one  Note:   * “CMS program” in the response options refers only to the Medicare programs that undergo the Pre-Rulemaking process. A full list of these programs can be found on the [CMS Program Measure Needs and Priorities](https://mmshub.cms.gov/sites/default/files/2023-MUC-List-Program-Specific-Measure-Needs-and-Priorities.pdf) report. | New measure never reviewed by Measure Applications Partnership (MAP) Workgroup, or Pre-Rulemaking Measure Review (PRMR) or used in a CMS program  Submitted previously but not included in MUC List  Measure previously submitted to MAP or PRMR, refined, and resubmitted per MAP or PRMR recommendation  Measure currently used in a CMS program being submitted without substantive changes for a new or different program  Measure currently used in a CMS program, but the measure is undergoing substantive change |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “New measure never reviewed by Measure Applications Partnership (MAP) Workgroup, or Pre-Rulemaking Measure Review (PRMR) or used in a CMS Program” in Row 073, then skip to Row 078. If you select “Measure currently used in a CMS program being submitted without substantive changes for a new or different program” or “Measure currently used in a CMS program, but the measure is undergoing substantial change” then Rows 074-077 become required fields.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Background Information | 074 | \*Range of year(s) this measure has been used by CMS Program(s). | Example: Hospice Quality Reporting (2012-2018) | MIPS reporting (2019-2023) as QCDR measure AAN 22 |
| Background Information | 075 | \*What other federal programs are currently using this measure? | Select all that apply. These should be current use programs only, not programs for the upcoming year’s submittal. | Ambulatory Surgical Center Quality Reporting Program  End-Stage Renal Disease (ESRD) Quality Incentive Program  Home Health Quality Reporting Program  Hospice Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Inpatient Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Outpatient Quality Reporting Program  Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program  Hospital Value-Based Purchasing Program  Hospital-Acquired Condition Reduction Program  Inpatient Psychiatric Facility Quality Reporting Program  Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Quality Reporting Program  Long-Term Care Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Medicare Promoting Interoperability Program  Medicare Shared Savings Program  Merit-based Incentive Payment System-Cost  ☐ Merit-based Incentive Payment System-Quality  ☐ Part C Star Rating  ☐ Part D Star Rating  Prospective Payment System-Exempt Cancer Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Rural Emergency Hospital Quality Reporting Program  Skilled Nursing Facility Quality Reporting Program  Skilled Nursing Facility Value-Based Purchasing Program  Other (enter here): CMMI Dementia Care Model |
| Background Information | 076 | \*How will this measure align with the same measure(s) that are currently used in other federal programs? | Describe how this measure will achieve alignment with the same measure(s) that are currently used in other federal programs. Please include the names of the same measure(s) that are used in other federal programs and include the corresponding unique identifier (e.g., federal program ID, CBE#, etc.), if available.  Alignment is achieved when a set of measures works well across care settings or programs to produce meaningful information without creating extra work for those responsible for the measurement. Alignment includes using the same quality measures in multiple programs when possible. It can also come from consistently measuring important topics across care settings. | The measure used in the CMMI Dementia Care Model will be the same measure planned for use in the QPP program. CMMI program has a measure license with the AAN and the AAN will provide any measure revisions with the CMMI program.  The AAN’s QCDR is shutting down operations as of June 1, 2024. The AAN is seeking to submit this measure through the MUC process so neurologists and other clinicians may maintain access to reporting neurology-specific measures. |
| Background Information | 077 | \*If this measure is being submitted to meet a statutory requirement, list the corresponding statute | List title and other identifying citation information. If this measure is not being submitted to meet a statutory requirement, enter N/A. | N/A |
| Previous Measures | 078 | \*Was this measure published on a previous year’s Measures Under Consideration List? | Select “Yes” or “No.” If yes, you are submitting an existing measure for expansion into additional CMS programs or the measure has substantially changed since originally published. | ☐ Yes  ☐ No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 078, then Rows 079-085 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 078, then skip to Row 086.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Previous Measures | 079 | \*In what prior year(s) was this measure published on the Measures Under Consideration List? | Select all that apply. NOTE: If your measure was published on more than one prior annual MUC List, as you use the MERIT interface, click “Add Another Measure” and complete the information section for each of those years. | 2011  2012  2013  2014  2015  2016  2017  2018  2019  2020  2021  2022  2023 |
| Previous Measures | 080 | \*What was the MUC ID for the measure in each year? | List both the year and the associated MUC ID number in each year. If unknown, enter N/A. | Free text field |
| Previous Measures | 081 | \*List the CMS CBE workgroup(s) (MAP or PRMR) in each year | List both the year and the associated workgroup name in each year. MAP and PRMR workgroup options include: Clinician; Hospital; Post-Acute Care/Long-Term Care; Coordinating Committee. Example: “Clinician, 2014.” | Free text field |
| Previous Measures | 082 | \*What were the programs that MAP or PRMR reviewed the measure for in each year? | List both the year and the associated CMS programs in each year. | Free text field |
| Previous Measures | 083 | \*What was the MAP or PRMR recommendation in each year? | List the year(s), the program(s), and the associated recommendation(s) in each year. Options: Support; Do Not Support; Conditionally Support; Refine and Resubmit. | Free text field |
| Previous Measures | 084 | \*Why was the measure not recommended by the MAP or PRMR workgroups in those year(s)? | Briefly describe the reason(s) if known. | Free text field |
| Previous Measures | 085 | \*MAP or PRMR report page number being referenced for each year | List both the year and the associated MAP report page number for each year. | Free text field |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Data Sources | 086 | \*What data sources are used for the measure? | Select all that apply.  For example, if the measure uses survey data that are captured both electronically and in paper format, select the “Applications: Patient-Reported Health Data or Survey Data (electronic)” from the “Digital Data Sources” category and “Patient-Reported Health Data or Survey Data (telephonic or paper-based)” from the “Non-Digital Data Sources” category.  For more information about digital data sources, please refer to the “Digital Data Sources” section of the “dQMs - Digital Quality Measures” webpage on the eCQI Resource Center available at: <https://ecqi.healthit.gov/dqm?qt-tabs_dqm=1> | Digital-Administrative systems: Administrative Data (non-claims)  Digital-Administrative systems: Claims Data  Digital-Applications: Patient-Generated Health Data (e.g., home blood pressure monitoring)  Digital-Applications: Patient-Reported Health Data or Survey Data (electronic)  Digital-Case Management Systems  Digital-Clinical Registries  Digital-Electronic Clinical Data (non-EHR) or Social Needs Assessments  Digital-Electronic Health Record (EHR) Data  Digital-Health Information Exchanges (HIE) Data  Digital-Instrument Data (e.g., medical devices and wearables)  Digital-Laboratory Systems Data  Digital-Patient Portal Data  Digital-Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Data  Digital-Standardized Patient Assessment Data (electronic)  Digital-Other (enter here):  Non-Digital-Paper Medical Records  Non-Digital-Standardized Patient Assessments (paper-based)  Non-Digital-Patient-Reported Health Data or Survey Data (telephonic or paper-based)  Non-Digital-Other (enter here): |
| n/a | n/a | *If your selections in Row 086 only include digital data sources, then skip to Row 089. Otherwise, Row 087 becomes a required field.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Data Sources | 087 | \*Measure version that uses only digital data sources | Select one. Indicate whether there is a version of the measure that uses only digital data sources. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 087, then skip to Row 089. Otherwise, Row 088 becomes a required field.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Data Sources | 088 | \*Path to Digital Format | Select one. Indicate whether there is a viable path for the measure to be transitioned to an exclusively digital format. | Yes  No |

### **STEWARD**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steward Information | 089 | \*Measure Steward | Enter the current Measure Steward. Typically, this is an organization or other agency/institution/entity name. | See Appendix A.085 for list choices.  Copy/paste or enter your choices here: American Academy of Neurology |
| Steward Information | 090 | \*Measure Steward Contact Information | Please provide the contact information of the measure steward. | *Erin Lee*  [*Elee@aan.com*](mailto:Elee@aan.com)  *201 Chicago Ave*  *Minneapolis, MN 55415* |
| Long-Term Steward Information | 091 | \*Is the long-term steward different than the steward? | Entity or entities that will be the permanent measure steward(s), responsible for maintaining the measure and conducting CBE endorsement maintenance review. Select all that apply. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 091, then Row 092 becomes a required field. If you select “No” in Row 091, then skip to Row 093.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Long-Term Steward Information | 092 | \*Long-Term Measure Steward Contact Information | If different from Steward above, enter the required contact information for the Long-Term Measure Steward listed above | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| Submitter Information | 093 | Is primary submitter the same as steward? | Select “Yes” or “No.” | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “No” in Row 093, then Row 094 becomes a required field. If you select “Yes” in Row 093, then skip to Row 095.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Submitter Information | 094 | \*Primary Submitter Contact Information | If different from Steward above: Last name, First name; Affiliation; Telephone number; Email address. NOTE: The primary and secondary submitters entered here do not automatically have read/write/change access to modify this measure in CMS MERIT. To request such access for others, when logged into the CMS MERIT interface, navigate to “About” and “Contact Us,” and indicate the name and e-mail address of the person(s) to be added. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| Submitter Information | 095 | Secondary Submitter Contact Information | If different from name(s) above: Last name, First name; Affiliation; Telephone number; Email address. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| n/a | n/a | *If applicable, select from drop-down menu “Other MERIT users who will contribute to this measure”* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |

### **CHARACTERISTICS**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| General Characteristics | 096 | \*Measure Type | Select only one type of measure. For definitions, see:  <https://mmshub.cms.gov/about-quality/new-to-measures/types>. | ☐ Cost/Resource Use  ☐ Efficiency  ☐ Intermediate Outcome  ☐ Outcome  ☐ PRO-PM or Patient Experience of Care  ☐ Process  ☐ Structure |
| *n/a* | *n/a* | *If you select “PRO-PM or Patient Experience of Care” in Row 096, then Row 097 and Row 122 become required fields. If not, then skip to Row 098. If you select “Outcome” in Row 096, then Row 122 becomes a required field.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| General Characteristics | 097 | \*Assessment of patient experience of care | Select one. Indicate whether this measure assesses patient experience of care. | ☐ Yes  ☐ No |
| General Characteristics | 098 | \*Is this measure in the CMS Measures Inventory Tool (CMIT)? | Select Yes or No. Current measures can be found at <https://cmit.cms.gov/cmit/#/MeasureInventory> | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 098, then Row 099 becomes a required field. If you select “No” in Row 098, then skip to Row 100.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| General Characteristics | 099 | \*CMIT ID | If the measure is currently in CMIT, enter the CMIT ID in the format #####-##-X-PRGM. Current measures and CMIT IDs can be found at https://cmit.cms.gov/cmit/#/MeasureInventory | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| General Characteristics | 100 | Alternate Measure ID | This is an alphanumeric identifier (if applicable), such as a recognized program ID number for this measure (20 characters or less). Examples: 199 GPRO HF-5; ACO 28; CTM-3; PQI #08. DO NOT enter consensus-based entity (endorsement) ID, CMIT ID, or previous year MUC ID in this field. | *AAN 22* |
| General Characteristics | 101 | \*What is the target population of the measure? | What populations are included in this measure? E.g., Medicare Fee for Service, Medicare Advantage, Medicaid, Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), All Payer, etc. | All payer |
| General Characteristics | 102 | \*What one area of specialty the measure is aimed to, or which specialty is most likely to report this measure? | Select the ONE most applicable area of specialty. | See Appendix A.098 for list choices. Copy/paste or enter your choice(s) here: Neurology |
| General Characteristics | 103 | \*Evidence of performance gap | Evidence of a performance gap among the units of analysis in which the measure will be implemented. Provide analytic evidence that the units of analysis have room for improvement and, therefore, that the implementation of the measure would be meaningful.  If you have lengthy text add the evidence as an attachment, named to clearly indicate the related form field. | There is no non-zero performance data from the Axon Registry. Collecting quality of life data in a neurology ambulatory setting is feasible and found to be  meaningful. (1, 2)  1. Moura LMVR, Schwamm E, Moura Jr V., et al. Feasibility of the collection of patient-reported outcomes in an ambulatory neurology clinic. Neurology. 2016;87:1-8.  2. Katzan IL, Lapin B. PROMIS GH (Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Global |
| General Characteristics | 104 | \*Unintended consequences | Summary of potential unintended consequences if the measure is implemented. Information can be taken from the CMS consensus-based entity Consensus Development Process (CDP) manuscripts or documents. If referencing CDP documents, you must submit the document or a link to the document, and the page being referenced. | Concern about penalizing clinicians who treat patients with chronic degenerative diseases. |
| Evidence | 105 | \*Type of evidence to support the measure | Select all that apply. Refer to the Blueprint content on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-conceptualization/information-gathering-overview>) and the Environmental Scan supplemental material (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/tools-and-resources/mms-supplemental-materials>) to obtain updated guidance. | Clinical Guidelines or USPSTF (U.S. Preventive Services Task Force) Guidelines  Peer-Reviewed Systematic Review  Peer-Reviewed Original Research  Empirical data  Grey Literature |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Clinical Guidelines or USPSTF (U.S. Preventive Services Task Force) Guidelines” in Row 105, then Rows 106-113 become required fields. If you select “Peer-Reviewed Systematic Review” in Row 105, then Rows 114 and 115 become required fields. If you select “Peer-Reviewed Original Research” in Row 105, then Rows 116 and 117 become required fields. If you select “Empirical data” in Row 105, then Rows 118 and 119 become required fields. If you select “Grey Literature” in Row 105, then Rows 120 and 121 become required fields.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Evidence | 106 | \*Outline the clinical guideline(s) supporting this measure | Provide a detailed description of which guideline(s) support the measure and indicate for each, whether they are evidence-based or consensus-based.  Summarize the meaning/rationale of the guideline statements that are being referenced, their relation to the measure concept and how they support the measure whether directly or indirectly, and how the guideline statement(s) relate to the measure’s intended accountable entity. Describe the body of evidence that supports the statement(s) by describing the quantity, quality and consistency of the studies that are pertinent to the guideline statements/sentence. Quantity of studies represent the number of studies and not the number of publications associated with a study. If the statement is advised by 3 publications reporting outcomes from the same RCT at 3 different time points, this is considered a single study and not 3 studies.  If referencing a standard norm which may or may not be driven by evidence, provide the description and rationale for this norm or threshold as reasoned by the guideline panel.  If this is an outcome measure or PRO-PM, indicate how the evidence supports or demonstrates a link between at least one process, structure, or intervention and the outcome.  Document the criteria used to assess the quality of the clinical guidelines such as those proposed by the Institute of Medicine or ECRI Guideline’s Trust (see the Information Gathering Overview on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-conceptualization/information-gathering-overview>) and the Environmental Scan supplemental material section addressing evidence review (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/tools-and-resources/mms-supplemental-materials>).  If there is lengthy text, describe the guidelines in an evidence attachment. | Free text field |
| Evidence | 107 | \*Guideline citation | Provide any of the following:   * Full citation for the primary clinical guideline in any established citation style (e.g., AMA, APA, Chicago, Vancouver, etc.) * URL * DOI or ISBN for clinical guideline document | Citation (enter here)  URL (enter here)  DOI (enter here)  Not available |
| Evidence | 108 | \*List the guideline statement that most closely aligns with the measure concept. | If there are more than one statement from this clinical guideline that may be relevant to this measure concept, document the statement that most closely aligns with the measure concept as it is written in the guideline document.  For example, Statement 1: In patients aged 65 years and older who have prediabetes, we recommend a lifestyle program similar to the Diabetes Prevention Program to delay progression to diabetes. No more than one statement should be written in the text box. All other relevant statements should be submitted in a separate evidence attachment. | Free text field |
| Evidence | 109 | \*Is the guideline graded? | A graded guideline is one which explicitly provides evidence rating and recommendation grading conventions in the document itself. Grades are usually found next to each recommendation statement.  Select one. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 109, then Rows 110-111, and 113 become required fields.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Evidence | 110 | \*List evidence grading system used and all categories and corresponding definitions for the evidence grading system used to describe strength of recommendation in the guideline. | Insert the complete list of evidence grading systems, grading categories, and category definitions used by the clinical guideline (e.g., GRADE or USPSTF) to describe the guideline statement’s strength of recommendation.  If there is lengthy text, include details in a separate evidence attachment. | Free text field |
| Evidence | 111 | \*For the guideline statement that most closely aligns with the measure concept, what is the associated strength of recommendation? | Select the associated strength of recommendation using the convention used by the guideline developer.  Select one. | USPSTF Grade A, Strong recommendation or similar  USPSTF Grade B, Moderate recommendation or similar  USPSTF Grade C or I, Conditional/weak recommendation or similar  Expert Opinion  USPSTF Grade D, Moderate or high certainty that service has no net benefit or harm outweighs benefit  Best Practice Statement/Standard Practice |
| *n/a* | *n/a* | *If you select “USPSTF Grade D, Moderate or high certainty that the service has no net benefit or harm outweighs benefit” in Row 111, then Row 112 becomes a becomes a required field; otherwise, skip to Row 113.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Evidence | 112 | \*Is the selected guideline statement used to support an inappropriate use/care measure? | Select one. Indicate whether the guideline statement mentioned in “List the guideline statement that most closely aligns with the measure concept” is used to promote the practice of not performing a specific action, process or intervention to support an inappropriate use or inappropriate care measure. | Yes  No |
| Evidence | 113 | \*List all categories and corresponding definitions for the evidence grading system used to describe level of evidence or level of certainty in the evidence. | Insert the complete list of grading categories and their definitions. | Free text field |
| Evidence | 114 | \*Briefly summarize the peer-reviewed systematic review(s) that inform this measure concept | Summarize the peer-reviewed systematic review(s) that address this measure concept. For each systematic review, provide the number of studies within the systematic review that addressed the specifications defined in this measure concept, indicate whether a study-specific risk of bias/quality assessment was performed for each study, and describe the consistency of findings. Number of studies is not equivalent to the number of publications. If there are three publications from a single cohort study cited in the systematic review, report one when indicating the number of studies. If this is an outcome measure or PRO-PM, indicate how the evidence supports or demonstrates a relationship between at least one process, structure, or intervention with the outcome.  If there is lengthy text, submit details via an evidence attachment. | Free text field |
| Evidence | 115 | \*Peer-reviewed systematic review citation | If more than one article was identified, provide at least one of the following for one key article:   * Citation * URL * DOI   Provide the complete list of citations with accompanying DOI or URL in a separate attachment. | Citation (enter here:)  URL (enter here:)  DOI (enter here:)  Not available |
| Evidence | 116 | \*Peer-reviewed original research | If the evidence synthesis provided to support this measure concept was performed using peer-reviewed original research articles, indicate whether a systematic search of the literature was conducted.  If “Yes,” please provide documentation of the search strategy in an attachment (e.g., years searched, keywords and search terms used, databases used, etc.). | Yes  No |
| Evidence | 117 | \*Peer-reviewed original research citation | If more than one article was identified, provide at least one of the following for one key article:   * Citation * URL * DOI   Provide the complete list of citations with accompanying DOI or URL in a separate attachment. | Citation (enter here:)  URL (enter here:)  DOI (enter here:) [10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.018766](https://doi.org/10.1161/STROKEAHA.117.018766)  [10.1212/WNL.0000000000003409](https://doi.org/10.1212%2FWNL.0000000000003409)  [10.1007/s11136-009-9496-9](https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs11136-009-9496-9)  Not available |
| Evidence | 118 | \*Summarize the empirical data | Provide a summary of the empirical data and how it informs this measure concept. Describe the limitations of the data. If this is an outcome measure or PRO-PM, indicate how the evidence supports or demonstrates a link between at least one process, structure, or intervention with the outcome. Describe the source of the empirical data (e.g., peer-reviewed narrative literature review, published and publicly available reports, internal data analysis, etc.).  If there is lengthy text, include details in a separate evidence attachment. | Hays et al. study conclusion supports the construct validity of the PROMIS global health items. Their correlation analysis was similar to those done for the SF-36 survey instrument. They go on to say that the PROMIS Global Health questionnaire has a major advance with the brevity of the survey taking about 2 minutes to complete compared to the SF-36 which takes about 7-10 minutes.  Moura et al. studied the ability to collect PROMIS-10 data in the waiting room using customized iPads, and scores were validated with the modified Rankin Scale (mRS) and the Quality of Life in Epilepsy (QOLIE-10). The study demonstrated that systematic digital collection of patient-reported outcomes in practice and instructive in a neurological clinic setting.  Katzan et al. studied the performance of the PROMIS-10 tool in a stroke population to evaluate the psychometric properties in patients with ischemic stroke and intracerebral hemorrhage. They found that the PROMIS-10 tool exhibited acceptable performance in patients with stroke and should be used as the standard set of outcome measures in stroke. |
| Evidence | 119 | \*Empirical data citation | If more than one empirical data was identified, provide at least one of the following for one key empirical data:   * Citation * URL * DOI   Provide the complete list of citations with accompanying DOI or URL in a separate attachment. | Citation (enter here:)  Hays RD, Bjorner JB, Revicki DA, et al. Development of physical and mental  health summary scores from the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS) global items. Qual Life Res. 2009;18:873–880.  URL (enter here:)  DOI (enter here:)  Not available |
| Evidence | 120 | \*Summarize the grey literature | Provide a summary of the grey literature(s) used to inform this measure concept. Describe the limitations of the data. If this is an outcome measure or PRO-PM, indicate how the evidence supports or demonstrates a link between at least one process, structure, or intervention with the outcome.  Provide the complete list of citations with accompanying DOI or URL in a separate attachment. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| Evidence | 121 | \*Grey literature citation | If more than one grey literature was identified, provide at least one of the following for one key piece of evidence:   * Citation * URL * DOI   Provide the complete list of citations with accompanying DOI or URL in a separate attachment. | Citation (enter here:)  URL (enter here:)  DOI (enter here:)  Not available |
| Evidence | 122 | \*Does the evidence discuss a relationship between at least one process, structure, or intervention with the outcome? | Select “Yes” if the evidence that was discussed in the evidence section demonstrate a relationship between at least one process, structure, or intervention with the outcome. | Yes  No |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 123 | \*Is the measure risk adjusted? | Indicate whether the final measure is risk adjusted.  Note that if you select “Yes,” you are encouraged to upload documentation about the risk adjustment model as an attachment. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 123, then Row 124 becomes a become required field. If you select “No” in Row 123, then skip to Row 134.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 124 | \*Was a conceptual model outlining the pathway between patient risk factors, quality of care, and the outcome of interest established? | Select “Yes” if a conceptual model was established based on a review of published literature. The conceptual model can be supplemented by other sources of information such as expert opinion or empirical analysis.  Select “No” if a conceptual model was not established or the conceptual model was based solely on expert opinion or empirical analysis. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 124, then Row 125 becomes a required field. If you select “No” in Row 124, then skip to Row 126.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 125 | \*Were all key risk factors identified in the conceptual model available for testing? | If some key risk factors were not available for testing or inclusion in the risk model approach, select “No” and describe the anticipated impact on measure scores (e.g., magnitude and direction of bias). | Yes  No (enter here:) |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 126 | Risk adjustment variable types | Select ALL risk adjustment variable types that are included in your final risk model. For more information on how to select risk factors for accountability measures, refer to the Blueprint content on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-specification/data-protocol/risk-adjustment>).  Select “Patient-level demographics” if the measure uses information related to each patient’s age, sex, race/ethnicity, etc.  Select “Patient-level health status & clinical conditions” if the measure uses information specific to each individual patient about their health status prior to the start of care (e.g., case-mix adjustment).  Select “Patient functional status” if the measure uses information specific to each individual patient’s functional status prior to the start of care (e.g., body function, ability to perform activities of daily living, etc.)  Select “Patient-level social risk factors” if the measure uses patient-reported information related to their individual social risks (e.g., income, living alone, etc.).  Select “Proxy social risk factors” if the measure uses data related to characteristics of the people in the patient’s community (e.g., neighborhood level income from the census).  Select “Patient community characteristics” if the measure uses information about the patient’s community (e.g., percent of vacant houses, crime rate).  Select “Other” if the risk factor is related to the healthcare provider, health system, or other factor that is not related to the patient. | Patient-level demographics  Patient-level health status & clinical conditions  Patient functional status  Patient-level social risk factors  Proxy social risk factors  Patient community characteristics  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | n/a | *If you select “Patient-Level Demographics” in Row 126, then Row 127 becomes a required field. If you select “Patient-level health status & clinical conditions” in Row 126, then Row 128 becomes a required field. If you select “Patient functional status” in Row 126, then Row 129 becomes a required field. If you select “Patient-level social risk factors” in Row 126, then Row 130 becomes a required field. If you select “Proxy social risk factors” in Row 126, then Row 131 becomes a required field. If you select “Patient community characteristics” in Row 126, then Row 132 becomes a required field.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 127 | \*Patient-level demographics: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Age  Sex  Gender  Race/ethnicity  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 128 | \*Patient-level health status & clinical conditions: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Case-Mix Adjustment  Severity of Illness  Comorbidities  Health behaviors/health choices  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 129 | \*Patient functional status: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Body Function  Ability to perform activities of daily living  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 130 | \*Patient-level social risk factors: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Income  Education  Wealth  Living Alone  Social Support  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 131 | \*Proxy social risk factors: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Neighborhood Level Income from the Census  Dual Eligibility for Medicare and Medicaid  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 132 | \*Patient community characteristics: please select all that apply | Select all that apply | Percent of Vacant Houses  Crime Rate  Urban/Rural  Other (enter here): |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 133 | \*Risk model performance | Provide empirical evidence that the risk model adequately accounts for confounding factors (e.g., assessment of model calibration and discrimination). Describe your interpretation of the results. | Free text field |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 134 | \*Is the measure recommended to be stratified based on evidence from testing and/or literature? | Select one. Indicate whether the final measure is recommended to be stratified. Indicate whether the recommended stratification is intended to address an equity gap.  Health equity elements for stratification include sociodemographic data such as race, ethnicity, tribal sovereignty, language, geography, sex, sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI), language, income, and disability status, as well as social determinants of health (SDOH) featured in the Healthy People 2030 SDOH Framework across five domains: economic stability, education access and quality, health care access and quality, neighborhood and built environment, and social and community context.  For more information about health equity elements, please refer to the Equity Data Standardization page on the CMS MMS Hub and the CMS Office of Minority Heath white paper titled “The Path Forward: Improving Data to Advance Health Equity Solutions,” available at: <https://mmshub.cms.gov/about-quality/quality-at-CMS/goals/cms-focus-on-health-equity/equity-data-standardization>. | Yes, the measure is recommended to be stratified to address an equity gap  Yes, the measure is recommended to be stratified for reasons unrelated to an equity gap  Yes, the measure is recommended to be stratified both to address an equity gap AND for other reasons  No, the measure is not recommended to be stratified |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select a “Yes” response in Row 134, then Row 135 becomes a required field. If you select a “No” response in Row 134 AND selected a “No” response in Row 123, then Row 136 becomes a required field. Otherwise skip to Row 137.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 135 | \*Stratification approach | Describe the recommended stratification approach including the data elements used to stratify scores for subgroups. Demonstrate that there is sufficient sample size within measured entities to stratify measure scores.  Indicate whether the recommendation to stratify the measure is based on evidence from testing and/or the literature.  If findings from testing informed the recommendation to stratify the measure, summarize the findings indicating that stratification would improve interpretation of measure results. If more room is needed, provide testing results as an attachment and list the name of the attachment in this field.  If evidence from the literature informed the recommendation to stratify the measure, provide citations supporting your stratification approach. | Free text field |
| Risk Adjustment and Stratification | 136 | \*Rationale for using neither risk adjustment nor stratification | Select ALL reasons for not implementing a risk adjustment model or stratification approach in the measure. For more information, refer to the Risk Adjustment in Quality Measurement supplemental material on the CMS MMS Hub (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/tools-and-resources/mms-supplemental-materials>) and the guidance on defining stratification schemes (<https://mmshub.cms.gov/measure-lifecycle/measure-specification/develop-specification/stratification>) | Addressed through exclusions (e.g., process measures)  Risk adjustment not appropriate based on conceptual or empirical rationale (enter here):  Data were not available to evaluate risk adjustment or stratification (enter here):  Risk adjustment and stratification were not considered during development or testing  Other (enter here): |

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Healthcare Domain | 137 | \*What one Meaningful Measures 2.0 priority is most applicable to this measure? | Select the ONE most applicable Meaningful Measures 2.0 priority. For more information, see: <https://www.cms.gov/meaningful-measures-20-moving-measure-reduction-modernization> | Person-Centered Care  Equity  Safety  Affordability and Efficiency  Chronic Conditions  Wellness and Prevention  Seamless Care Coordination  Behavioral Health |
| Healthcare Domain | 138 | What, if any, additional Meaningful Measures 2.0 priorities apply to this measure? | Select up to two additional Meaningful Measures 2.0 priorities that apply to this measure.  For more information, see: <https://www.cms.gov/meaningful-measures-20-moving-measure-reduction-modernization> | Person-Centered Care  Equity  Safety  Affordability and Efficiency  Chronic Conditions  Wellness and Prevention  Seamless Care Coordination  Behavioral Health |
| Other Priorities | 139 | \*Does this measure address CMS priorities to improve maternal health care or maternal outcomes? | Select one. | Yes  No |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 140 | \*What is the endorsement status of the measure? | Select only one. For information on consensus-based entity (CBE) endorsement, measure ID, and other information, refer to: https://p4qm.org/ | Endorsed  Endorsed with conditions  Endorsement removed  Submitted  Failed endorsement or decision to not endorse  Never submitted |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 141 | \*CBE ID (CMS consensus-based entity, or endorsement ID) | Four- or five-character identifier with leading zeros and following letter if needed. Add a letter after the ID (e.g., 0064e) and place zeros ahead of ID if necessary (e.g., 0064). If no CBE ID number is known, enter numerals 9999. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 142 | If endorsed: Is the measure being submitted **exactly** as endorsed by the CMS CBE? | Select 'Yes' or 'No'. Note that 'Yes' should only be selected if the submission is an EXACT match to the CBE-endorsed measure. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “No” in Row 142, then Rows 143-144 become required fields.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 143 | If not exactly as endorsed, specify the locations of the differences | Indicate which specification fields are different. Select all that apply | Measure title  Description  Numerator  Denominator  Exclusions  Target population  Setting (for testing)  Level of analysis  Data source  eCQM status  Other (enter here and see next field): |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 144 | If not exactly as endorsed, describe the nature of the differences | Briefly describe the differences | Free text field |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 145 | If endorsed: Year of most recent CBE endorsement | Select one | 2017  2018  2019  2020  2021  2022  2023 |
| Endorsement Characteristics | 146 | Year of next anticipated CBE endorsement review | Select one. If you are submitting for initial endorsement, select the anticipated year. | 2024  2025  2026  2027  2028 |

### **SIMILAR MEASURES**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Related and Competing Measures | 147 | \*Is this measure related to and/or competing with measure(s) already in a program? | Select either Yes or No. Consider other measures with related purposes. | Yes  No |
| n/a | n/a | *If you select “Yes” in Row 147, then Rows 148-150 become required fields. If you select “No” in Row 147, then skip to Row 151.* | *n/a* | *This is not a data entry field.* |
| Related and Competing Measures | 148 | \*Which measure(s) already in a program is your measure related to and/or competing with? | Identify the other measure(s) including title and any other unique identifier. | Free text field |
| Related and Competing Measures | 149 | \*How will this measure add value to the CMS program? | Describe benefits of this measure, in comparison to measure(s) already in a program. | Free text field |
| Related and Competing Measures | 150 | \*How will this measure be distinguished from other related and/or competing measures? | Describe key differences that set this measure apart from others. | Free text field |
| Related and Competing Measures | 151 | \*Universal Foundation Measure | Select one. Indicate whether this measure is a Universal Foundation quality measure.  To be considered a Universal Foundation quality measure, the submitted measure’s population must align with the population of the existing Universal Foundation measure (i.e., adult and/or pediatric).  Please refer to the “Aligning Quality Measures Across CMS – the Universal Foundation” webpage for more information about Universal Foundation of quality measures available at: <https://www.cms.gov/aligning-quality-measures-across-cms-universal-foundation> | Measure is a Universal Foundation quality measure (populations must align)  Measure is not a Universal Foundation quality measure |

### **ATTACHMENTS**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | 152 | Attachment(s) | You are encouraged to attach the measure information form (MIF) if available. This is a detailed description of the measure used by the CMS consensus-based entity (CBE) during endorsement proceedings. If a MIF is not available, comprehensive measure methodology documents are encouraged.  If you are submitting for MIPS (either Quality or Cost), you are required to download the MIPS Peer Reviewed Journal Article Template and attach the completed form to your submission using the “Attachments” feature. See <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/QualityMeasures/Pre-Rulemaking>  If your measure is risk adjusted, you are encouraged to attach documentation that provides additional detail about the measure risk adjustment model such as variables included, associated code system codes, and risk adjustment model coefficients  If eCQM, you must attach MAT Output/HQMF, Bonnie test cases for this measure, with 100% logic coverage (test cases should be appended), attestation that value sets are published in VSAC, and feasibility scorecard. | *ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE* |
| N/A | 153 | MIPS Peer Reviewed Journal Article Template | Select Yes or No. For those submitting measures to MIPS program, enter “Yes.” Attach your completed Peer Reviewed Journal Article Template. | Yes  No |

### **SUBMITTER COMMENTS**

| **Subsection** | **Row** | **Field Label** | **Guidance** | **ADD YOUR CONTENT HERE** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N/A | 154 | Submitter Comments | Any notes, qualifiers, external references, or other information not specified above. | Free text field |

**Send any questions to** [MMSsupport@battelle.org](mailto:MMSsupport@battelle.org)

### **Appendix: Lengthy Lists of Choices**

A. 085 Choices for **Measure Steward** and **Long-Term Measure Steward (if different)**

Agency for Healthcare Research & Quality

Alliance of Dedicated Cancer Centers

Ambulatory Surgical Center (ASC) Quality Collaboration

American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology (AAAAI)

American Academy of Dermatology

American Academy of Neurology

American Academy of Ophthalmology

American Academy of Otolaryngology – Head and Neck Surgery (AAOHN)

American College of Cardiology

American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association

American College of Emergency Physicians

American College of Emergency Physicians (previous steward Partners-Brigham & Women's)

American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG)

American College of Radiology

American College of Rheumatology

American College of Surgeons

American Gastroenterological Association

American Health Care Association

American Medical Association

American Nurses Association

American Psychological Association

American Society for Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

American Society for Radiation Oncology

American Society of Addiction Medicine

American Society of Anesthesiologists

American Society of Clinical Oncology

American Society of Clinical Oncology

American Urogynecologic Society

American Urological Association (AUA)

Audiology Quality Consortium/American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (AQC/ASHA)

Bridges to Excellence

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Eugene Gastroenterology Consultants, PC Oregon Endoscopy Center, LLC

Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) - HIV/AIDS Bureau

Heart Rhythm Society (HRS)

Indian Health Service

Infectious Diseases Society of America (IDSA)

Intersocietal Accreditation Commission (IAC)

KCQA- Kidney Care Quality Alliance

Minnesota (MN) Community Measurement

National Committee for Quality Assurance

National Minority Quality Forum

Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology/Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services

Oregon Urology Institute

Oregon Urology Institute in collaboration with Large Urology Group Practice Association

Pharmacy Quality Alliance

Philip R. Lee Institute for Health Policy Studies

Primary (care) Practice Research Network (PPRNet)

RAND Corporation

Renal Physicians Association; joint copyright with American Medical Association -

Seattle Cancer Care Alliance

Society of Gynecologic Oncology

Society of Interventional Radiology

The Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics

The Joint Commission

The Society for Vascular Surgery

The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center

University of Minnesota Rural Health Research Center

University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill

Wisconsin Collaborative for Healthcare Quality (WCHQ)

Other (enter in Row 084 and/or Row 086)

A.098 Choices for **Areas of specialty**

Addiction medicine

Allergy/immunology

Anesthesiology

Behavioral health

Cardiac electrophysiology

Cardiac surgery

Cardiovascular disease (cardiology)

Chiropractic medicine

Colorectal surgery (proctology)

Critical care medicine (intensivists)

Dermatology

Diagnostic radiology

Electrophysiology

Emergency medicine

Endocrinology

Family practice

Gastroenterology

General practice

General surgery

Geriatric medicine

Gynecological oncology

Hand surgery

Hematology/oncology

Hospice and palliative care

Infectious disease

Internal medicine

Interventional pain management

Interventional radiology

Maxillofacial surgery

Medical oncology

Nephrology

Neurology

Neuropsychiatry

Neurosurgery

Nuclear medicine

Nursing

Nursing homes

Obstetrics/gynecology

Ophthalmology

Optometry

Oral surgery (dentists only)

Orthopedic surgery

Osteopathic manipulative medicine

Otolaryngology

Pain management

Palliative care

Pathology

Pediatric medicine

Peripheral vascular disease

Physical medicine and rehabilitation

Plastic and reconstructive surgery

Podiatry

Preventive medicine

Primary care

Psychiatry

Public and/or population health

Pulmonary disease

Pulmonology

Radiation oncology

Rheumatology

Sleep medicine

Sports medicine

Surgical oncology

Thoracic surgery

Urology

Vascular surgery  
Other (enter in Row 097)

**Send any questions to** [MMSsupport@battelle.org](mailto:MMSsupport@battelle.org)