



Episode-Based Cost Measure (EBCM) At-A-Glance

NON-PRESSURE ULCERS

Overview

Measure Concept

- Chronic ulcers are highly prevalent in older adults
 - 15-25% of diabetes patients develop foot ulcers
 - Venous ulcers affect 5% of older adults
- Ulcers greatly impact quality of life and lead to poor health outcomes, loss of function, and amputation
- Measure aligns with several MIPS quality measures, supports CMS in assessing the overall value of care, and has low reporting burden for clinicians
- Captures podiatrists, who do not currently have an applicable an episode-based cost measure

Development & Input

- Clinical expert workgroup provided detailed input on all aspects of measure over 18 months
 - ✓ 19 members representing 21 professional societies
 - ✓ Member specialties include podiatry, wound care specialists, critical care, family medicine, vascular surgery, PT, OT, radiology, dermatology
- Nation-wide field testing/public comment opportunity in February 2024 gathered broad input on measure specs, testing, and informational reports
- Persons with lived experience provided input to the workgroup and during public comment 

Measure Features & Calculation

- Measure evaluates a clinician or group on the costs for non-pressure ulcer care across all patients/episodes during a performance period
- Only* includes costs *clinically related* to ulcer care
- Costs are *risk adjusted*, which allows fairer comparisons and accounts for differences in patient cohorts (e.g., comorbid health conditions including diabetes, lymphedema, smoking, frailty, ulcer type, practice location)
- Measure calculated as comparison (ratio) of observed costs to expected costs, across all attributed episodes
 - ✓ Observed costs are *actual* payment-standardized costs for treatment
 - ✓ Expected costs are how much it would be *expected* to cost to treat each patient after accounting for their unique disease severity and comorbidities
- A lower score is better, and means that, on average, a clinicians' observed costs were lower than expected

Top 5 Specialties

- Podiatry
- Nurse Practitioners
- Family Practice
- General Surgery
- Internal Medicine



Measure Importance & Impact

Evaluates care provided across many patients & clinicians



389,870
episodes



314,800
patients



4,060 clinicians
(20-episode testing threshold)



4,174 groups
(20-episode testing threshold)

Covers large amount of Medicare costs



\$1.91 billion

(Group-level, 20-episode testing threshold)

Opportunities for Improvement

Examples of Included Service Costs	Wound debridement services	Durable medical equipment and supplies (wound care products, orthotic devices, etc.)	Inpatient hospitalization (infection/ cellulitis, amputation, etc.)	Advanced wound care treatments, hyperbaric oxygen therapy (HBOT)
Potential Improvement Opportunities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide as needed for venous ulcers Limit wound debridement and compression therapy per Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) for arterial ulcers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offloading treatments (e.g., total contact casting, removable cast walkers, forefoot casting) for appropriate periods of time for diabetic ulcers Use of compression systems (e.g., multi-component bandage) for venous ulcers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved patient education on wound care and infection prevention may reduce complications Frequent diabetic ulcers evaluation to assess for infection and response to treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider advanced therapies for higher stage diabetic ulcers (e.g., negative pressure wound therapy, extracellular matrix products, HBOT) Follow CPGs for determining appropriate use across ulcer types



Refer to the *Measure Information Form (MIF)* or *Measure Codes List* for more information on measure specifications and included costs on the [CMS.gov Cost Measures Information Page](https://www.cms.gov/costmeasures).



Episode-Based Cost Measure (EBCM) At-A-Glance

NON-PRESSURE ULCERS

Testing and Acceptability

Performance Gap & Improvement Opportunity | sufficient variation

Distribution of scores across the most and least efficient clinicians helps to understand if the measure is useful to understand cost performance and incentivize clinician improvements

- ✓ 90th percentile is more than triple the 10th percentile score for groups and individual clinicians
- ✓ Strong variation in clinician performance, and therefore, opportunity for improvement

	Average Risk Adjusted Cost	Distribution Across Percentiles					
		Level	10 th	25 th	50 th	75 th	90 th
Groups	\$9,109						
Individual Clinicians	\$8,480	TIN	\$4,485	\$6,405	\$8,505	\$11,021	\$14,157
		TIN-NPI	\$3,703	\$5,517	\$7,758	\$10,443	\$13,957

Validity | accuracy in measuring what we intend



Results show the measure assesses the intended costs, which include routine treatment and management plus the added costs of potentially avoidable costs related to complications and worsening of symptoms. As expected, episodes with adverse events have higher risk adjusted costs.

Compared to the average risk adjusted episode cost (\$8,293):



Episodes with **major procedures**, like amputations, have **more than 2x higher** risk adjusted episode costs (\$17,257)



Episodes with clinically-related **emergency department visits** have **~120% higher** risk adjusted episode costs (\$19,457)

Social Risk Factor (SRF) Testing | evaluating appropriateness for risk adjustment

SRF testing helps evaluate the balance between wanting to ensure fairness for clinicians treating higher shares of vulnerable patients and preventing masking poor clinician performance that disadvantages patients. There are many possible variables to use when testing and adjusting for SRFs such as whether a person is dually enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid.

- ✓ Testing confirmed that using dual enrollment in Medicare and Medicaid in risk adjustment more consistently predicts episode spending than other social risk factors, like race/ethnicity or community-level socioeconomic status variables.

This measure adjusts for episodes where patients have dual enrollment status because...

- ✓ Without risk adjusting for dual status, most clinicians perform equally well on dual and non-dual episodes (92%), but more clinicians perform significantly worse on dual episodes (7%) than perform significantly better (1%)
- ✓ Most clinicians see their scores shift by less than 1 percentile after adjusting for dual status (52%), but many have scores that shift by 1 percentile or more (46%) and small percentage shift by 5 percentile or more (1%)

Reliability | consistency in repeat measurements

At a 20 episode testing threshold, the mean reliability is **high**. This measure assesses meaningful differences in clinician performance.

Groups 0.81

Individual Clinicians 0.79



Results across all tests should be considered together rather than in isolation. Excerpted results are shared above; refer to the Measure Justification Form on the [CMS.gov Cost Measures Information Page](https://www.cms.gov/Cost-Measures-Information-Page) for full details and additional results.