

MULTIPLE CHRONIC CONDITIONS MEASURES GROUP OVERVIEW

2016 PQRS OPTIONS FOR MEASURES GROUPS:

2016 PQRS MEASURES IN MULTIPLE CHRONIC CONDITIONS MEASURES GROUP:

#47	Care Plan
#110	Preventive Care and Screening: Influenza Immunization
#128	Preventive Care and Screening: Body Mass Index (BMI) Screening and Follow-Up Plan
#130	Documentation of Current Medications in the Medical Record
#131	Pain Assessment and Follow-Up
#134	Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Clinical Depression and Follow-Up Plan
#154	Falls: Risk Assessment
#155	Falls: Plan of Care
#238	Use of High-Risk Medications in the Elderly

INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING:

- It is not necessary to submit the measures group-specific intent G-code for registry-based submissions. However, the measures group-specific intent G-code has been created for registry only measures groups for use by registries that utilize claims data.

G9669: I intend to report the Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group

- Report the patient sample method:
20 Patient Sample Method via registries: 20 unique patients (a majority of which must be Medicare Part B FFS patients) meeting patient sample criteria for the measures group during the reporting period (January 1 through December 31, 2016).
- Patient sample criteria for the Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group are patients aged 66 years and older with at least of the two conditions as listed in the Chronic Conditions Data Warehouse (CCW) which can be accessed at [Chronic Conditions Data Warehouse \(CCW\)](#) accompanied by a specific patient encounter:

One of the following patient encounter codes: 99487, 99490

For purposes of the 2016 Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group submission of specific diagnosis codes are not required.

- To satisfactorily report the Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group requires reporting a numerator option on **all applicable** measures, for each patient within the eligible professional's patient sample, a minimum of once during the reporting period.
- Measure #110 only needs to be reported a minimum of once during the reporting period when the patient's visit included in the patient sample population is between January and March for the 2015-2016 influenza season OR between October and December for the 2016-2017 influenza season. When the patient's office visit is between April and September, Measure #110 is not applicable and will not affect the eligible provider's reporting or performance rate.
- Measure #128 does not need to be reported (is not applicable) if the patient is considered not eligible for BMI calculation or follow-up plan – A patient is not eligible if one or more of the following reasons are documented:
 - Patient is receiving palliative care
 - Patient is pregnant

- Patient refuses BMI measurement (refuses height and/or weight)
 - Any other reason documented in the medical record by the provider why BMI measurement was not appropriate
 - Patient is in an urgent or emergent medical situation where time is of the essence, and to delay treatment would jeopardize the patient's health status
- When reporting measure #131, the documented follow-up plan must be related to the presence of pain, example: "Patient referred to pain management specialist for back pain" or "Return in two weeks for re-assessment of pain".
 - Measure #134 does not need to be reported (is not applicable) if the patient has an active diagnosis of Depression or a diagnosed Bipolar Disorder.
 - Measure #155 only needs to be reported when patients are identified in Measure #154 as having a falls risk assessment which indicates the patient has documentation of two or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year (1100F).
 - Instructions for qualifying numerator option reporting for each of the measures within the Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group are displayed on the next several pages. The following composite Quality Data Code (QDC) has been created for registries that utilize claims data. This QDC may be reported in lieu of individual QDCs when all quality clinical actions for all applicable measures within the group have been performed.

Composite QDC G9670: All quality actions for the applicable measures in the Multiple Chronic Conditions Measures Group have been performed for this patient

- This measures group contains one or more inverse measures. An inverse measure is a measure that represents a poor clinical quality action as meeting performance for the measure. For these measures, a lower performance rate indicates a higher quality of clinical care. Composite codes for measures groups that contain inverse measures are only utilized when the appropriate quality clinical care is given.
- The composite code for this measures group may be reported when codes in the summary table below are applicable for reporting of each measure within the measures group.

Table 17 - QDC Options

Measure	#47	#110	#128	#130	#131	#134	#154	#155	#238*
QDC options for acceptable use of the composite QDC	1123F or 1124F	G8482	G8420 or G8417 or G8418	G8427	G8730 or G8731	G8431 or G8510	3288F and 1100F	0518F	G9366

*Indicates an inverse measure.

- Measure Group Reporting Calculations:

Measures groups containing a measure with a 0% performance rate will not be counted as satisfactorily reporting the measures group. The recommended clinical quality action must be performed on at least one patient for each applicable measure within the measures group reported by the eligible professional.

Performance exclusion QDCs are not counted in the performance denominator. If the eligible professional submits all performance exclusion QDCs, the performance rate would be 0/0 (null) and would be considered satisfactorily reporting.

If a measure within a measures group is not applicable to a patient, the patient would not be counted in the performance denominator for that measure (e.g., Preventive Care Measures Group - Measure #39: Screening for Osteoporosis for Women Aged 65-85 Years of Age would not be applicable to male patients according to the patient sample criteria). If the measure is not applicable for all patients within the sample, the performance rate would be 0/0 (null) and would be considered satisfactorily reporting.

When a lower rate indicates better performance, such as Measure #238, a 0% performance rate will be counted as satisfactorily reporting (100% performance rate would not be considered satisfactorily reporting).

- **NOTE:** The detailed instructions in this specification apply exclusively to the reporting and analysis of the included measures under the measures group option.

***Measure #47 (NQF 0326): Care Plan -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Communication and Care Coordination**

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 65 years and older who have an advance care plan or surrogate decision maker documented in the medical record or documentation in the medical record that an advance care plan was discussed but the patient did not wish or was not able to name a surrogate decision maker or provide an advance care plan

NUMERATOR:

Patients who have an advance care plan or surrogate decision maker documented in the medical record or documentation in the medical record that an advance care plan was discussed but patient did not wish or was not able to name a surrogate decision maker or provide an advance care plan

Numerator Instructions: If patient's cultural and/or spiritual beliefs preclude a discussion of advance care planning, report **1124F**.

Definition:

Documentation that Patient did not Wish or was not able to Name a Surrogate Decision Maker or Provide an Advance Care Plan – May also include, as appropriate, the following:

- That the patient's cultural and/or spiritual beliefs preclude a discussion of advance care planning, as it would be viewed as harmful to the patient's beliefs and thus harmful to the physician-patient relationship.

NUMERATOR NOTE: *The CPT Category II codes used for this measure indicate: Advance Care Planning was discussed and documented. The act of using the Category II codes on a claim (or equivalent medical record documentation) indicates the provider confirmed that the Advance Care Plan was in the medical record (that is, at the point in time the code was assigned, the Advance Care Plan in the medical record was valid) or that advance care planning was discussed. The codes (or equivalent medical record documentation) are required annually to ensure that the provider either confirms annually that the plan in the medical record is still appropriate or starts a new discussion.*

The provider does not need to review the Advance Care Plan annually with the patient to meet the numerator criteria; documentation of a previously developed advanced care plan that is still valid in the medical record meets numerator criteria.

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

Advance Care Planning discussed and documented; advance care plan or surrogate decision maker documented in the medical record (**1123F**)

OR

Performance Met:

Advance Care Planning discussed and documented in the medical record; patient did not wish or was not able to name a surrogate decision maker or provide an advance care plan (**1124F**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

Advance care planning not documented, reason not otherwise specified (**1123F with 8P**)

▲ Measure #110 (NQF 0041): Preventive Care and Screening: Influenza Immunization -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Community/Population Health

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 6 months and older seen for a visit between October 1 and March 31 who received an influenza immunization OR who reported previous receipt of an influenza immunization

NUMERATOR:

Patients who received an influenza immunization OR who reported previous receipt of an influenza immunization

Numerator Instructions:

- If reporting this measure between January 1, 2016 and March 31, 2016, quality-data code **G8482** should be reported when the influenza immunization is administered to the patient during the months of August, September, October, November, and December of 2015 or January, February, and March of 2016 for the flu season ending March 31, 2016.
- If reporting this measure between October 1, 2016 and December 31, 2016, quality-data code **G8482** should be reported when the influenza immunization is administered to the patient during the months of August, September, October, November, and December of 2016 for the flu season ending March 31, 2017.
- Influenza immunizations administered during the month of August or September of a given flu season (either 2015-2016 flu season OR 2016-2017 flu season) can be reported when a visit occurs during the flu season (October 1 - March 31). In these cases, **G8482** should be reported.

Definition:

Previous Receipt - Receipt of the current season's influenza immunization from another provider OR from same provider prior to the visit to which the measure is applied (typically, prior vaccination would include influenza vaccine given since August 1st).

NUMERATOR NOTE: *The numerator for this measure can be met by reporting either administration of an influenza vaccination or that the patient reported previous receipt of the current season's influenza immunization. If the performance of the numerator is not met, a clinician can report a valid performance exclusion for having not administered an influenza vaccination. For clinicians reporting a performance exclusion for this measure, there should be a clear rationale and documented reason for not administering an influenza immunization if the patient did not indicate previous receipt, which could include a medical reason (e.g., patient allergy), patient reason (e.g., patient declined), or system reason (e.g., vaccination not available). The system reason should be indicated only for cases of disruption or shortage of influenza vaccination supply.*

Numerator Options:

<u>OR</u>	Performance Met:	Influenza immunization administered or previously received (G8482)
	Other Performance Exclusion:	Influenza immunization was not administered for reasons documented by clinician (e.g., patient allergy or other medical reasons, patient declined or other patient reasons, vaccine not available or other system reasons) (G8483)
<u>OR</u>	Performance Not Met:	Influenza immunization was not administered, reason not given (G8484)

Measure #128 (NQF 0421): Preventive Care and Screening: Body Mass Index (BMI) Screening and Follow-Up Plan -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Community/Population Health

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 18 years and older with a BMI documented during the current encounter or during the previous six months AND with a BMI outside of normal parameters, a follow-up plan is documented during the encounter or during the previous six months of the current encounter

Normal Parameters: Age 65 years and older BMI ≥ 23 and < 30 kg/m²

Age 18 – 64 years BMI ≥ 18.5 and < 25 kg/m²

NUMERATOR:

Patients with a documented BMI during the encounter or during the previous six months, AND when the BMI is outside of normal parameters, a follow-up plan is documented during the encounter or during the previous six months of the current encounter

Numerator Instructions:

- **Height and Weight** – An eligible professional or their staff is required to measure both height and weight. Both height and weight must be measured within six months of the current encounter and may be obtained from separate encounters. Self-reported values cannot be used.
- **Follow-Up Plan** – If the most recent documented BMI is outside of normal parameters, then a follow-up plan is documented during the encounter or during the previous six months of the current encounter. The documented follow-up plan must be based on the most recent documented BMI outside of normal parameters, example: “Patient referred to nutrition counseling for BMI above normal parameters.” (See Definitions for examples of a follow-up plan treatments)
- **Performance Met for G8417 & G8418**
 - If the provider documents a BMI and a follow-up plan at the current visit **OR**
 - If the patient has a documented BMI within the previous six months of the current encounter, the provider documents a follow-up plan at the current visit **OR**
 - If the patient has a documented BMI within the previous six months of the current encounter **AND** the patient has a documented follow-up plan for a BMI outside normal parameters within the previous six months of the current visit

Definitions:

BMI – Body mass index (BMI), is a number calculated using the Quetelet index: weight divided by height squared (W/H²) and is commonly used to classify weight categories. BMI can be calculated using:

Metric Units: BMI = Weight (kg) / (Height (m) x Height (m))

OR

English Units: BMI = Weight (lbs) / (Height (in) x Height (in)) x 703

Follow-Up Plan – Proposed outline of treatment to be conducted as a result of a BMI out of normal parameters. A follow-up plan may include but is not limited to:

- Documentation of education
- Referral (e.g., a registered dietitian/nutritionist, occupational therapist, physical therapist, primary care provider, exercise physiologist, mental health professional, or surgeon)
- Pharmacological interventions
- Dietary supplements

- Exercise counseling
- Nutrition counseling

Not Eligible for BMI Calculation or Follow-Up Plan – A patient is not eligible if one or more of the following reasons are documented:

- Patient is receiving palliative care
- Patient is pregnant
- Patient refuses BMI measurement (refuses height and/or weight)
- Any other reason documented in the medical record by the provider why BMI measurement was not appropriate
- Patient is in an urgent or emergent medical situation where time is of the essence, and to delay treatment would jeopardize the patient's health status

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

BMI is documented within normal parameters and no follow-up plan is required (**G8420**)

OR

Performance Met:

BMI is documented above normal parameters and a follow-up plan is documented (**G8417**)

OR

Performance Met:

BMI is documented below normal parameters and a follow-up plan is documented (**G8418**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

BMI not documented and no reason is given (**G8421**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

BMI documented outside normal parameters, no follow-up plan documented, no reason given (**G8419**)

♣ **Measure #130 (NQF 0419): Documentation of Current Medications in the Medical Record --
National Quality Strategy Domain: Patient Safety**

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of visits for patients aged 18 years and older for which the eligible professional attests to documenting a list of current medications using all immediate resources available on the date of the encounter. This list ***must*** include ALL known prescriptions, over-the-counters, herbals, and vitamin/mineral/dietary (nutritional) supplements AND ***must*** contain the medications' name, dosage, frequency and route of administration

NUMERATOR:

Eligible professional attests to documenting, updating or reviewing a patient's current medications using all immediate resources available on the date of encounter. This list ***must*** include ALL known prescriptions, over-the-counters, herbals, and vitamin/mineral/dietary (nutritional) supplements AND ***must*** contain the medications' name, dosages, frequency and route of administration

Definitions:

Current Medications – Medications the patient is presently taking including all prescriptions, over-the-counters, herbals and vitamin/mineral/dietary (nutritional) supplements with each medication's name, dosage, frequency and administered route.

Route - Documentation of the way the medication enters the body (some examples include but are not limited to: oral, sublingual, subcutaneous injections, and/or topical).

Not Eligible - A patient is not eligible if the following reason is documented:

- Patient is in an urgent or emergent medical situation where time is of the essence and to delay treatment would jeopardize the patient's health status.

NUMERATOR NOTE: *The eligible professional must document in the medical record they obtained, updated, or reviewed a medication list on the date of the encounter. Eligible professionals reporting this measure may document medication information received from the patient, authorized representative(s), caregiver(s) or other available healthcare resources. G8427 should be reported if the eligible professional documented that the patient is not currently taking any medications.*

Numerator Options:

<u>Performance Met:</u>	Eligible professional attests to documenting in the medical record they obtained, updated, or reviewed the patient's current medications (G8427)
<u>OR</u>	
<u>Other Performance Exclusion:</u>	Eligible professional attests to documenting in the medical record the patient is not eligible for a current list of medications being obtained, updated, or reviewed by the eligible professional (G8430)
<u>OR</u>	
<u>Performance Not Met:</u>	Current list of medications not documented as obtained, updated, or reviewed by the eligible professional, reason not given (G8428)

Measure #131 (NQF 0420): Pain Assessment and Follow-Up -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Communication and Care Coordination

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of visits for patients aged 18 years and older with documentation of a pain assessment using a standardized tool(s) on each visit AND documentation of a follow-up plan when pain is present

NUMERATOR:

Patient visits with a documented pain assessment using a standardized tool(s) AND documentation of a follow-up plan when pain is present

Definitions:

Pain Assessment - Documentation of a clinical assessment for the presence or absence of pain using a standardized tool is required. A multi-dimensional clinical assessment of pain using a standardized tool may include characteristics of pain; such as: location, intensity, description, and onset/duration.

Standardized Tool – An assessment tool that has been appropriately normed and validated for the population in which it is used. Examples of tools for pain assessment, include, but are not limited to: Brief Pain Inventory (BPI), Faces Pain Scale (FPS), McGill Pain Questionnaire (MPQ), Multidimensional Pain Inventory (MPI), Neuropathic Pain Scale (NPS), Numeric Rating Scale (NRS), Oswestry Disability Index (ODI), Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RMDQ), Verbal Descriptor Scale (VDS), Verbal Numeric Rating Scale (VNRS) and Visual Analog Scale (VAS).

Follow-Up Plan – A documented outline of care for a positive pain assessment is required. This must include a planned follow-up appointment or a referral, a notification to other care providers as applicable OR indicate the initial treatment plan is still in effect. These plans may include pharmacologic and/or educational interventions.

Not Eligible – A patient is not eligible if one or more of the following reason(s) is documented:

- Severe mental and/or physical incapacity where the person is unable to express himself/herself in a manner understood by others. For example, cases where pain cannot be accurately assessed through use of nationally recognized standardized pain assessment tools
- Patient is in an urgent or emergent situation where time is of the essence and to delay treatment would jeopardize the patient's health status

NUMERATOR NOTE: *The standardized tool used to assess the patient's pain must be documented in the medical record (exception: A provider may use a fraction such as 5/10 for Numeric Rating Scale without documenting this actual tool name when assessing pain for intensity).*

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

Pain assessment documented as positive using a standardized tool AND a follow-up plan is documented
(G8730)

OR

Performance Met:

Pain assessment using a standardized tool is documented as negative, no follow-up plan required
(G8731)

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

Pain assessment NOT documented as being performed, documentation the patient is not eligible for a pain assessment using a standardized tool **(G8442)**

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

Pain assessment documented as positive, follow-up plan not documented, documentation the patient is not eligible (**G8939**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

No documentation of pain assessment, reason not given (**G8732**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

Pain assessment documented as positive using a standardized tool, follow-up plan not documented, reason not given (**G8509**)

Measure #134 (NQF 0418): Preventive Care and Screening: Screening for Clinical Depression and Follow-Up Plan -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Community/Population Health

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 12 years and older screened for clinical depression on the date of the encounter using an age appropriate standardized depression screening tool AND if positive, a follow-up plan is documented on the date of the positive screen

NUMERATOR:

Patients screened for clinical depression on the date of the encounter using an age appropriate standardized tool AND, if positive, a follow-up plan is documented on the date of the positive screen

Numerator Instructions: The name of the age appropriate standardized depression screening tool utilized must be documented in the medical record. The depression screening must be reviewed and addressed in the office of the provider filing the code on the date of the encounter.

Definitions:

Screening – Completion of a clinical or diagnostic tool used to identify people at risk of developing or having a certain disease or condition, even in the absence of symptoms.

Standardized Depression Screening Tool – A normalized and validated depression screening tool developed for the patient population in which it is being utilized. The name of the age appropriate standardized depression screening tool utilized must be documented in the medical record.

Examples of depression screening tools include but are not limited to:

- **Adolescent Screening Tools (12-17 years)**
Patient Health Questionnaire for Adolescents (PHQ-A), Beck Depression Inventory-Primary Care Version (BDI-PC), Mood Feeling Questionnaire (MFQ), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), and PRIME MD-PHQ2
- **Adult Screening Tools (18 years and older)**
Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), Beck Depression Inventory (BDI or BDI-II), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), Depression Scale (DEPS), Duke Anxiety-Depression Scale (DADS), Geriatric Depression Scale (GDS), Cornell Scale Screening, and PRIME MD-PHQ2

Follow-Up Plan – Documented follow-up for a positive depression screening ***must*** include one or more of the following:

- Additional evaluation for depression
- Suicide Risk Assessment
- Referral to a practitioner who is qualified to diagnose and treat depression
- Pharmacological interventions
- Other interventions or follow-up for the diagnosis or treatment of depression

Not Eligible – A patient is not eligible if one or more of the following conditions are documented:

- Patient refuses to participate
- Patient is in an urgent or emergent situation where time is of the essence and to delay treatment would jeopardize the patient's health status
- Situations where the patient's functional capacity or motivation to improve may impact the accuracy of results of standardized depression assessment tools. For example: certain court appointed cases or cases of delirium
- Patient has an active diagnosis of Depression
- Patient has a diagnosed Bipolar Disorder

NUMERATOR NOTE: *The follow-up plan must be related to a positive depression screening, example: "Patient referred for psychiatric evaluation due to positive depression screening."*

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

Screening for clinical depression is documented as being positive AND a follow-up plan is documented (**G8431**)

OR

Performance Met:

Screening for clinical depression is documented as negative, a follow-up plan is not required (**G8510**)

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

Screening for clinical depression not documented, documentation stating the patient is not eligible (**G8433**)

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

Screening for clinical depression documented as positive, a follow-up plan not documented, documentation stating the patient is not eligible (**G8940**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

Clinical depression screening not documented, reason not given (**G8432**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

Screening for clinical depression documented as positive, follow-up plan not documented, reason not given (**G8511**)

*** Measure #154 (NQF: 0101): Falls: Risk Assessment -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Patient Safety**

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 65 years and older with a history of falls who had a risk assessment for falls completed within 12 months

NUMERATOR:

Patients who had a risk assessment for falls completed within 12 months

Numerator Instructions: All components do not need to be completed during one patient visit, but should be documented in the medical record as having been performed within the past 12 months.

Definitions:

Fall – A sudden, unintentional change in position causing an individual to land at a lower level, on an object, the floor, or the ground, other than as a consequence of sudden onset of paralysis, epileptic seizure, or overwhelming external force.

Risk Assessment – Comprised of balance/gait AND one or more of the following: postural blood pressure, vision, home fall hazards, and documentation on whether medications are a contributing factor or not to falls within the past 12 months.

Balance/gait Assessment – Medical record must include documentation of observed transfer and walking or use of a standardized scale (e.g., Get Up & Go, Berg, Tinetti) or documentation of referral for assessment of balance/gait.

Postural blood pressure – Documentation of blood pressure values in supine and then standing positions.

Vision Assessment – Medical record must include documentation that patient is functioning well with vision or not functioning well with vision based on discussion with the patient or use of a standardized scale or assessment tool (e.g., Snellen) or documentation of referral for assessment of vision.

Home fall hazards Assessment – Medical record must include documentation of counseling on home falls hazards or documentation of inquiry of home fall hazards or referral for evaluation of home fall hazards.

Medications Assessment – Medical record must include documentation of whether the patient's current medications may or may not contribute to falls.

NUMERATOR NOTE: History of falls is defined as 2 or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year. Documentation of patient reported history of falls is sufficient.

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

AND

Falls risk assessment documented (**3288F**)

Patient screened for future fall risk; documentation of two or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year (**1100F**)

OR

Medical Performance Exclusion:

Documentation of medical reason(s) for not completing a risk assessment for falls (ie, patient is not ambulatory, bed ridden, immobile, confined to chair, wheelchair bound, dependent on helper pushing wheelchair, independent in wheelchair or minimal help in wheelchair) (**3288F with 1P**)

AND

Patient screened for future fall risk; documentation of two or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year **(1100F)**

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

Patient screened for future fall risk; documentation of no falls in the past year or only one fall without injury in the past year **(1101F)**

OR

Other Performance Exclusion:

No documentation of falls status **(1101F with 8P)**

OR

Performance Not Met:

Falls risk assessment not completed, reason not otherwise specified **(3288F with 8P)**

AND

Patient screened for future fall risk; documentation of two or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year **(1100F)**

*** Measure #155 (NQF: 0101): Falls: Plan of Care -- National Quality Strategy Domain: Communication and Care Coordination**

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients aged 65 years and older with a history of falls who had a plan of care for falls documented within 12 months

NUMERATOR:

Patients with a plan of care for falls documented within 12 months

Numerator Instructions: All components do not need to be completed during one patient visit, but should be documented in the medical record as having been performed within the past 12 months.

Definitions:

Plan of Care – Must include: 1) consideration of vitamin D supplementation AND 2) balance, strength, and gait training.

Consideration of Vitamin D Supplementation – Documentation that vitamin D supplementation was advised or considered or documentation that patient was referred to his/her physician for vitamin D supplementation advice.

Balance, Strength, and Gait Training – Medical record must include: documentation that balance, strength, and gait training/instructions were provided OR referral to an exercise program, which includes at least one of the three components: balance, strength or gait OR referral to physical therapy.

Fall – A sudden, unintentional change in position causing an individual to land at a lower level, on an object, the floor, or the ground, other than as a consequence of sudden onset of paralysis, epileptic seizure, or overwhelming external force.

NUMERATOR NOTE: History of falls is defined as 2 or more falls in the past year or any fall with injury in the past year. Documentation of patient reported history of falls is sufficient.

Numerator Options:

OR

Performance Met:

Falls plan of care documented **(0518F)**

Medical Performance Exclusion:

Documentation of medical reason(s) for no plan of care for falls (ie, patient is not ambulatory, bed ridden, immobile, confined to chair, wheelchair bound, dependent on helper pushing wheelchair, independent in wheelchair or minimal help in wheelchair)
(0518F with 1P)

OR

Performance Not Met:

Plan of care not documented, reason not otherwise specified **(0518F with 8P)**

**◆ Measure #238 (NQF 0022): Use of High-Risk Medications in the Elderly --
National Quality Strategy Domain: Patient Safety**

DESCRIPTION:

Percentage of patients 66 years of age and older who were ordered high-risk medications. Two rates are reported

- 1) Percentage of patients who were ordered at least one high-risk medication
- 2) Percentage of patients who were ordered at least two different high-risk medications

For purposes of the Multiple Chronic Care Conditions Measures Group this measure will be calculated with 1 performance rates:

- 1) Percentage of patients who were ordered at least one high-risk medication

NUMERATOR:

Percentage of patients who were ordered at least one high-risk medication during the measurement period

Numerator Instructions:

INVERSE MEASURE - A lower calculated performance rate for this measure indicates better clinical care or control. The “Performance Not Met” numerator option for this measure is the representation of the better clinical quality or control. Reporting that numerator option will produce a performance rate that trends closer to 0%, as quality increases. For inverse measures a rate of 100% means all of the denominator eligible patients did not receive the appropriate care or were not in proper control, and therefore an inverse measure at 100% does not qualify for reporting purposes, however any reporting rate less than 100% does qualify.

A high-risk medication is identified by either of the following:

- A prescription for medications classified as high risk at any dose and for any duration listed in Table 18
- Prescriptions for medications classified as high risk at any dose with greater than a 90 day cumulative medication duration listed in Table 19

Definitions:

Cumulative Medication Duration - an individual’s total number of medication days over a specific period; the period counts multiple prescriptions with gaps in between, but does not count the gaps during which a medication was not dispensed.

To determine the cumulative medication duration, determine first the number of the Medication Days for each prescription in the period: the number of doses divided by the dose frequency per day. Then add the Medication Days for each prescription without counting any days between the prescriptions.

Table 18 - High-Risk Medications at any dose or duration

Description	Prescription
Anticholinergics (excludes TCAs), first-generation antihistamines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brompheniramine • Carbinoxamine • Chlorpheniramine • Clemastine • Cyproheptadine • Dexbrompheniramine • Dexchlorpheniramine • Diphenhydramine (oral) • Doxylamine • Hydroxyzine • Promethazine • Triprolidine

Description	Prescription	
Anticholinergics (excludes TCAs), anti-Parkinson agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benztropine (oral) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trihexyphenidyl
Antithrombotics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dipyridamole, oral short-acting (does not apply to the extended-release combination with aspirin) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ticlopidine
Cardiovascular, alpha agonists, central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guanabenz • Guanfacine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methyldopa
Cardiovascular, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disopyramide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nifedipine, immediate release
Central nervous system, tertiary TCAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amitriptyline • Clomipramine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Imipramine • Trimipramine
Central nervous system, barbiturates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amobarbital • Butabarbital • Butalbital • Mephobarbital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pentobarbital • Phenobarbital • Secobarbital
Central nervous system, vasodilators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ergot mesylates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isoxsuprine
Central nervous system, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thioridazine • Chloral Hydrate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meprobamate
Endocrine system, estrogens with or without progestins; include only oral and topical patch products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conjugated estrogen • Esterified estrogen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estradiol • Estropipate
Endocrine system, sulfonylureas, long-duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chlorpropamide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glyburide
Endocrine system, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desiccated thyroid 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Megestrol
Gastrointestinal system, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trimethobenzamide 	
Pain medications, skeletal muscle relaxants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carisoprodol • Chlorzoxazone • Cyclobenzaprine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metaxalone • Methocarbamol • Orphenadrine

Description	Prescription
Pain medications, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indomethacin • Ketorolac, includes parenteral • Meperidine • Pentazocine

Table 19 - High-Risk Medications With Days Supply Criteria

Description	Prescription	Days Supply Criteria
Anti-Infectives, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nitrofurantoin • Nitrofurantoin macrocrystals • Nitrofurantoin macrocrystals-monohydrate 	>90 days
Nonbenzodiazepine hypnotics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eszopiclone • Zaleplon • Zolpidem 	>90 days

NUMERATOR NOTE: Some high-risk medications are not included in this specific measure but should be avoided above a specified average daily dose. These medications are listed in table DAE-C. To calculate an average daily dose multiply the quantity of pills ordered by the dose of each pill and divide by the days supply. For example, a prescription for a 30-days supply of digoxin containing 15 pills, 0.250 mg each pill, has an average daily dose of 0.125 mg.

Table 20 - DAE-C: High-Risk Medications With Average Daily Dose Criteria

Description	Prescription	Average Daily Dose Criteria
Alpha agonists, central	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reserpine 	>0.1 mg/day
Cardiovascular, other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digoxin 	>0.125 mg/day
Tertiary TCAs (as single agent or as part of combination products)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doexpin 	>6 mg/day

Numerator Options:

Performance Met:

One high-risk medication ordered (**G9365**)

OR

Performance Not Met:

One high-risk medication not ordered (**G9366**)

MULTIPLE CHRONIC CONDITIONS MEASURES GROUP RATIONALE AND CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS

MEASURE #47 – CARE PLAN

RATIONALE:

It is essential that the patient's wishes regarding medical treatment be established as much as possible prior to incapacity. The Work Group has determined that the measure should remain as specified with no required timeframe based on a review of the literature. Studies have shown that people do change their preferences often with regard to advanced care planning, but it primarily occurs after a major medical event or other health status change. In the stable patient, it would be very difficult to define the correct interval. It was felt by the Work Group that the error rate in simply not having addressed the issue at all is so much more substantial (Teno, 1997) than the risk that an established plan has become outdated that we should not define a specific timeframe at this time. As this measure is tested and reviewed, we will continue to evaluate if and when a specific timeframe should be included.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

Advance directives are designed to respect patient's autonomy and determine his/her wishes about future life-sustaining medical treatment if unable to indicate wishes. Key interventions and treatment decisions to include in advance directives are: resuscitation procedures, mechanical respiration, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, dialysis, simple diagnostic tests, pain control, blood products, transfusions, and intentional deep sedation.

Oral statements

- Conversations with relatives, friends, and clinicians are most common form; should be thoroughly documented in medical record for later reference.
- Properly verified oral statements carry same ethical and legal weight as those recorded in writing.

Instructional advance directives (DNR orders, living wills)

- Written instructions regarding the initiation, continuation, withholding, or withdrawal of particular forms of life-sustaining medical treatment.
- May be revoked or altered at any time by the patient.
- Clinicians who comply with such directives are provided legal immunity for such actions.

Durable power of attorney for health care or health care proxy

- A written document that enables a capable person to appoint someone else to make future medical treatment choices for him or her in the event of decisional incapacity. (AGS)

The National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization provides the Caring Connection web site, which provides resources and information on end-of-life care, including a national repository of state-by-state advance directives.

MEASURE #110 – PREVENTIVE CARE AND SCREENING: INFLUENZA IMMUNIZATION

RATIONALE:

Annual influenza vaccination is the most effective method for preventing influenza virus infection and its complications. Influenza vaccine is recommended for all persons aged ≥ 6 months who do not have contraindications to vaccination.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

The following evidence statements are quoted verbatim from the referenced clinical guidelines.

Routine annual influenza vaccination is recommended for all persons aged ≥ 6 months who do not have contraindications. Vaccination optimally should occur before onset of influenza activity in the community. Health care providers should offer vaccination soon after vaccine becomes available (by October, if possible). Vaccination should be offered as long as influenza viruses are circulating. (CDC/ACIP, 2014)

MEASURE #128 - PREVENTIVE CARE AND SCREENING: BODY MASS INDEX (BMI) SCREENING AND FOLLOW-UP PLAN

RATIONALE:

Normal Parameters for Age 65 Years and Older

Winter et al. (2014) performed a meta-analysis looking at the relationship between BMI and all-cause mortality among adults 65 and older. They identified a higher risk of mortality among those with a BMI <23 kg/m² and recommended monitoring weight status in this group to address any modifiable causes of weight loss promptly with due consideration of individual comorbidities. Dahl et al. (2013) reported that old persons (70-79) who were overweight had a lower mortality risk than old persons who were of normal weight, even after controlling for weight change and multimorbidity. The study also shows that persons who increased or decreased in BMI had a greater mortality risk than those who had a stable BMI, particularly those aged 70 to 79. Their results provide support to the belief that the World Health Organization guidelines for BMI are overly restrictive in old age.

BMI Above Upper Parameters

Obesity continues to be a costly public health concern in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2010) reported in 2009, no state met the Healthy People 2010 obesity target of 15 percent and the self-reported overall prevalence of obesity among adults had increased 1.1 percentage points in 2007 to 26.7 percent (2010). Ogden, Carroll, Kit and Flegal (2013) reported the prevalence of BMI-defined obesity in adults is high and continues to exceed 30% in most sex-age groups (34.9% overall). They also stated the overall prevalence of obesity did not differ between men and women in 2011–2012; however, among non-Hispanic black adults, 56.6% of women were obese compared with 37.1% of men. In addition to the continued high prevalence rate for adults in general, Flegal, Carroll & Kit (2012) report a significant increase for men and for non-Hispanic black and Mexican American women over the 12-year period from 1999 through 2010 (2012). Moyer (2012) reported: Obesity is associated with such health problems as an increased risk for coronary artery disease, type 2 diabetes, various types of cancer, gallstones and disability. These comorbid medical conditions are associated with higher use of health care services and costs among obese patients (p. 373).

Obesity is also associated with an increased risk of death, particularly in adults younger than age 65 years and has been shown to reduce life expectancy by 6 to 20 years depending on age and race (LeBlanc et al., 2011). Masters, et al. (2013) also showed mortality due to obesity varied by race and gender. They estimated adult deaths between 1986 and 2006 associated with overweight and obesity was 5.0% and 15.6% for Black and White men, and 26.8% and 21.7% for Black and White women, respectively. They also found a stronger association than previous research demonstrated between obesity and mortality risk at older ages.

Finkelstein, Trogon, Cohen and Dietz (2009) found that in 2006, across all payers, per capita medical spending for the obese is \$1,429 higher per year, (42 percent) than for someone of normal weight. Using 2008 dollars, this was estimated to be equivalent to \$147 billion dollars in medical care costs related to obesity.

Padula, Allen and Nair (2014) examined data from a commercial claims and encounters database to estimate the cost for obesity and associated comorbidities among working-age adults who had a claim with a primary or secondary diagnosis of obesity in 2006-2007. The mean net expenditure for inpatient and outpatient claims was \$1,907 per patient per visit. The increases in cost for comorbidities ranged from \$527 for obesity with CHF to \$15,733 for the combination of obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypertension and depression.

In addition to a high prevalence rate of obesity, less than 50% of obese adults in 2010 received advice to exercise or perform physical activity (Barnes & Schoenborn, 2012).

BMI Below Normal Parameters

In the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) Health E-Stat, Fryer and Ogden (2012) reported that poor nutrition or underlying health conditions can result in underweight. Results from the 2007-2010 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES), using measured heights and weights, indicate an estimated 1.7% of U.S. adults are underweight with women more likely to be underweight than men (2012).

In a cohort study conducted by Borrell and Lalitha (2014), data from NHANES III (1988-1994) was linked to the National Death Index mortality file with follow-up to 2006, and showed that when compared to their normal weight counterparts (BMI 18.5-25 kg/m²), underweight (BMI <18.5 kg/m²) had significantly higher death rates (Hazard Ratio= 2.27; 95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.78, 2.90).

Ranhoff, Gjoen and Mowe (2005) recommended using BMI < 23 kg/m² for the elderly to identify positive results with malnutrition screens and poor nutritional status.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

Although multiple clinical recommendations addressing obesity have been developed by professional organizations, societies and associations, two recommendations have been identified which exemplify the intent of the measure and address the numerator and denominator.

The US Preventive Health Services Task Force (USPSTF) recommends screening all adults (aged 18 years and older) for obesity. Clinicians should offer or refer patients with a BMI of 30 or higher to intensive, multicomponent behavioral interventions. This is a B recommendation (Moyer, 2012).

As cited in Wilkinson et al. (2013), Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI) Preventive Services for Adults, Obesity Screening (Level II) Recommendation provides the following guidance:

- Record height, weight and calculate body mass index at least annually
 - Clinicians should consider waist circumference measurement to estimate disease risk for patients who have BMI scores indicative of overweight or obesity class I. For adult patients with a BMI of specific waist circumference cutoffs should be used in conjunction with BMI to identify increased disease risk.
- A BMI greater or equal to 30 is defined as obese
- A BMI of 25-29 is defined as overweight
- Intensive intervention for obese individuals, based on BMI, is recommended by the U.S. Preventive Services to help control weight.

Similarly, the 2013 joint report/guideline from the American Heart Association, American College of Cardiology and The Obesity Society also recommend measuring height and weight and calculating BMI at annual visits or more frequently, using the current cutpoints for overweight (BMI>25.0-29.9 kg/m²) and obesity (BMI ≥30 kg/m²) to identify adults who may be at elevated risk of CVD and the current cutpoints for obesity to identify adults who may be at elevated risk of mortality from all causes. They also recommend counseling overweight and obese individuals on their increased risk for CVD, type 2 diabetes, all-cause mortality and need for lifestyle changes.

MEASURE #130 – DOCUMENTATION OF CURRENT MEDICATIONS IN THE MEDICAL RECORD

RATIONALE:

In the American Medical Association's (AMA) *Physician's Role in Medication Reconciliation* (2007), critical patient information, including medical and medication histories, current medications the patient is receiving and taking, and sources of medications, is essential to the delivery of safe medical care. However, interruptions in the continuity of care and information gaps in patient health records are common and significantly affect patient outcomes. Consequently, clinical judgments may be based on incomplete, inaccurate, poorly documented or unavailable information about the patient and his or her medication.

As identified by The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in the National Healthcare Disparities report (2013), "different providers may prescribe medications for the same patient. Patients are responsible for keeping track of all their medications, but medication information can be confusing, especially for patients on multiple

medications. When care is not well coordinated and some providers do not know about all of a patient's medications, patients are at greater risk for adverse events related to drug interactions, overdosing, or underdosing."

In addition, providers need to periodically review all of a patient's medications to ensure that they are taking what is needed and only what is needed. Medication reconciliation has been shown to reduce both medication errors and adverse drug events (Whittington & Cohen, 2004).

Medication safety efforts have primarily focused on hospitals; however, the majority of health care services are provided in the outpatient setting where two-thirds of physician visits result in writing at least one prescription (Stock et al., 2009). Chronically ill patients are increasingly being treated as outpatients, many of whom take multiple medications requiring close monitoring (Nassaralla et al., 2007).

Adverse drug events (ADE) prove to be more fatal in outpatient settings (1 of 131 outpatient deaths) than in hospitals (1 of 854 inpatient deaths) (Nassaralla et al., 2007). According to the first study to utilize nationally-representative data to examine annual rates of ADEs in the ambulatory care setting "Adverse Drug events in U.S. Adult Ambulatory Medical Care," ADE rates increase with age, adults 25-44 years old had a rate of 1.3 per 10,000 person per year, those 45-64 had a rate of 2.2 per 10,000 per year, and those 65 years and older had the highest rate, at 3.8 ADEs per 10,000 persons per year. This study estimates that 13.5 million ADE related visits occurred between 2005-2007, estimating that approximately 4.5 million ambulatory ADE visits occur each year. These 4.5 million visits are associated with approximately 400,000 hospitalizations annually. According to the Institute of Medicine (IOM), in the US, as many as 98,000 deaths per year are attributable to preventable adverse events that occur in the hospitals setting with annual costs of between \$17 billion and \$29 billion. (Sarkar et al., 2011)

Additionally, findings of The Commonwealth Fund (2010) studies identified 11% to 28% of the 4.3 million visit related ADEs (VADE) in 2001 might have been prevented with improved systems of care and better patient education, yielding an estimate of 473,000 to 1.2 million potentially preventable VADEs annually and potential cost-savings of \$946 million to \$2.4 billion.

According to the AMA's published report, *The Physician's Role in Medication Reconciliation*, the rate of medication errors during hospitalization was estimated to be 52 per 100 admissions, or 70 per 1,000 patient days in 2005. Emerging research suggests the scope of medication-related errors in ambulatory settings is as extensive as or more extensive than during hospitalization. Ambulatory visits result in a prescription for medication 50 to 70% of the time. One study estimated the rate of ADEs in the ambulatory setting to be 27 per 100 patients. It is estimated that between 2004 and 2005, in the United States 701,547 patients were treated for ADEs in emergency departments and 117,318 patients were hospitalized for injuries caused by an ADE. Individuals aged 65 years and older are more likely than any other population group to require treatment in the emergency department for ADEs. (AMA, 2007).

A Systematic Review on "Prevalence of Adverse Drug Events in Ambulatory Care" finds that "In the ambulatory care setting, adverse drug events (ADEs) have been reported to occur at a rate of 25%. Approximately 39% of these ADEs were preventable. Since many ADEs are associated with medication errors, and thus potentially preventable, understanding the nature of medication errors in ambulatory care settings can direct attention toward improvement of medication safety in ambulatory care." Data extracted and synthesized across studies indicated the median preventable ADE rates in ambulatory care-based studies were 16.5%. (Tache et al., 2011).

The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality's (AHRQ) National's Healthcare Disparities Report (2011) identified the rate of adverse drug events (ADE) among Medicare beneficiaries in ambulatory settings 50 per 1,000 person-years. In 2005, AHRQ reported data on adults age 65 and over who received potentially inappropriate prescription medicines in the calendar year, by race, ethnicity, income, education, insurance status, and sex. The disparities were identified as follows: older Asians were more likely than older Whites to have inappropriate drug use (20.3% compared with 17.3%); Older Hispanics were less likely than older non-Hispanic Whites to have inappropriate drug use (13.5% compared with 17.6%); Older women were more likely than older men to have inappropriate drug use (20.2% compared with 14.3%); there were no statistically significant differences by income or education.

Weeks et al. (2010) noted fragmented medication records across the health care continuum, inaccurate reporting of medication regimens by patients, and provider failure to acquire all of the necessary elements of medication information from the patient or record, present significant obstacles to obtaining an accurate medication list in the ambulatory care setting. Because these obstacles require solutions demonstrating improvements in access to information and communication, the Institute of Medicine and others have encouraged the incorporation of IT solutions in the medication reconciliation process. In a survey administered to office-based physicians with high rates of EMR use, Weeks et al. found there is an opportunity for universal medication lists utilizing health IT.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

The Joint Commission's 2015 Ambulatory Care National Patient Safety Goals guide providers to maintain and communicate accurate patient medication information. Specifically, the section "Use Medicines Safely NPSG.03.06.01" states the following: "Maintain and communicate accurate patient medication information. The types of information that clinicians use to reconcile medications include (among others) medication name, dose, frequency, route, and purpose. Organizations should identify the information that needs to be collected to reconcile current and newly ordered medications and to safely prescribe medications in the future." (Joint Commission, 2015, retrieved at: [Joint Commission's 2015 Ambulatory Care National Patient Safety Goals guide](#)).

The National Quality Forum's 2010 update of the Safe Practices for Better Healthcare, states healthcare organizations must develop, reconcile, and communicate an accurate patient medication list throughout the continuum of care. Improving the safety of healthcare delivery saves lives, helps avoid unnecessary complications, and increases the confidence that receiving medical care actually makes patients better, not worse. Every healthcare stakeholder group should insist that provider organizations demonstrate their commitment to reducing healthcare error and improving safety by putting into place evidence-based safe practices.

The AMA's published report, *The Physician's Role in Medication Reconciliation*, identified the best practice medication reconciliation team as one that is multidisciplinary and--in all settings of care--will include physicians, pharmacists, nurses, ancillary health care professionals and clerical staff. The team's variable requisite knowledge, skills, experiences, and perspectives are needed to make medication reconciliation work as safely and smoothly as possible. Team members may have access to vital information or data needed to optimize medication safety. Because physicians are ultimately responsible for the medication reconciliation process and subsequently accountable for medication management, physician leadership and involvement in all phases of developing and initiating a medication reconciliation process or model is important to its success.

MEASURE #131 – PAIN ASSESSMENT AND FOLLOW-UP

RATIONALE:

Chronic pain is defined as pain without biological values that has persisted beyond the normal time and despite the usual customary efforts to diagnose and treat the original condition and injury. If a patient's pain has persisted for six weeks (or longer than the anticipated healing time), a thorough evaluation for the course of the chronic pain is warranted (ICSI, 2013).

Chronic pain affects approximately 100 million adults in the USA. (Gaskin, 2012). It is clear the enormous pain-related costs represent both a great challenge and an opportunity in terms of improving the quality and cost-effectiveness of care (Mayday Fund, 2009).

Research also shows gender differences in the experience and treatment of pain. Most chronic pain conditions are more prevalent among women; however, women's pain complaints tend to be poorly assessed and undertreated (Green, 2003; Chronic Pain Research Alliance 2011, Weimer 2013). Although women may have higher baseline pain, differences in pain levels may not persist at one month (Peterson, 2012).

A growing body of research reveals even more extensive gaps in pain assessment and treatment among racial and ethnic populations, with minorities receiving less care for pain than non-Hispanic whites (Burgess, 2013; Green, 2003; Green, 2007; Green et al., 2011; Todd et al., 2004; Todd et al., 2007). Differences in pain care occur across all

types of pain (e.g., acute, chronic, cancer-related) and medical settings (e.g., emergency departments and primary care) (Green, 2003; Green, 2007; Todd et al., 2007). Even when income, insurance status and access to health care are accounted for, minorities are still less likely than whites to receive necessary pain treatments (Green, 2003; Green, 2007; Paulson et al., 2007). Black race is associated with neighborhood socio-economic status (SES) and race plays a role in pain outcomes beyond SES (Green, 2012)

“When assessing and treating pain, practitioner sex, race, age, and duration of experience were all significantly associated with pain management decisions. These findings suggest that pain assessment and treatment decisions may be impacted by the health care providers’ demographic characteristics, effects which may contribute to pain management disparities.”(Bartley et al., 2015).

“A standard minimum pain assessment for back-pain patients should integrate pain intensity (e.g. VAS/NRS), pain affect (e.g. five-point VRS) and pain-related disability. Depending on more detailed research questions, more sophisticated questionnaires on pain affect (e.g. MPQ), coping strategies and fear-avoidance behavior should be used. This allows for a more comprehensive assessment of pain and factors influencing pain perception.” (Haefeli M., Elfering. A.,2005).

The American Pain Foundation (2009) identified pertinent facts related to the impact of pain as follows:

- Approximately 76.5 million Americans suffer from pain.
- Pain affects more Americans than diabetes, heart disease and cancer combined. It is the number one reason people seek medical care.
- Uncontrolled pain is a leading cause of disability and diminishes quality of life for patients, survivors, and their loved ones. It interferes with all aspects of daily activity, including sleep, work, social and sexual relations.
- Under-treated pain drives up costs – estimated at \$100 billion annually in healthcare expenses, lost income, and lost productivity– extending length of hospital stays, as well as increasing emergency room trips and unplanned clinic visits.
- Medically underserved populations endure a disproportionate pain burden in all health care settings.
- Disparities exist among racial and ethnic minorities in pain perception, assessment, and treatment for all types of pain, whether chronic or acute.

The Institute Of Medicine’s (IOM) *Relieving Pain in America: A Blueprint for Transforming Prevention, Care, Education and Research* (2011) report suggests that chronic pain rates will continue to increase as a result of:

- More Americans will experience a disease in which chronic pain is associated (diabetes, cardiovascular disease, etc.).
- Increase in obesity which is associated with chronic conditions that have painful symptoms.
- Progress in lifesaving techniques for catastrophic injuries for people who would have previously died leads to a group of young people at risk for lifelong chronic pain.
- Surgical patients are at risk for acute and chronic pain.
- The public has a better understanding of chronic pain syndromes and new treatments and therefore may seek help when they may not have sought help in the past.

There are no current estimates of the total cost of poorly controlled pain in today’s dollars. Viewed from the perspective of health care inflation at levels of more than 40% during the past decade (President’s Council of Economic Advisors, 2009), the cost of health care due to pain is estimated to be between \$261 to \$300 billion. The value of lost productivity based on estimates of days of work missed is \$11.6 to 12.7 billion, hours of work lost is 95.2 to \$96.5 billion and lower wages is \$190.6 to \$226.3 billion.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

Chronic pain assessment should include determining the mechanisms of pain through documentation of pain location, intensity, quality and onset/duration; functional ability and goals; and psychological/social factors such as depression or substance abuse.

A patient-centered, multifactorial, comprehensive care plan is necessary; one that includes biopsychosocial factors, as well as spiritual and cultural issues. It is important to have an interdisciplinary team approach which includes the primary care physician and specialty areas of psychology and physical rehabilitation.

The Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI, 2013) Assessment and Management of Chronic Pain Guideline, Sixth Edition is based on a very broad foundation of evidence addressing a wide range of clinical conditions. It was chosen because it addresses the key factors of the comprehensive plan of care which incorporates self-management and active input from the patient and primary care clinician, pain assessment outcomes and referral to a pain medicine specialist or pain medicine specialty clinic.

The Institute for Clinical Systems Improvement (ICSI, 2012) Adult Acute and Sub-acute Low Back Pain guideline provides guidelines for physical therapists for low back pain assessment criteria, reducing or eliminating imaging for diagnosis of non-specific low back pain in patients 18 years and older, first-line treatment which emphasizes patient education and a core treatment plan that includes encouraging activity, use of heat, no imaging, cautious and responsible use of opioids, anti-inflammatory and analgesic over-the-counter medications and return to work assessment, advising patients with acute or subacute low back pain to stay active and the use of opioids.

Low Back Pain: Clinical Guidelines Linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health from the Orthopedic Section of the American Physical Therapy Association (Delitto, 2012) provides evidence to classify musculoskeletal conditions, specify interventions and identify appropriate outcome measures.

“Initial physical therapy management was not associated with increased health care costs or utilization of specific services following a new primary care LBP consultation” (Fritz, 2013, p. 1).

Anchored numerical scales are recommended for tracking routine progress, particularly pain interference with important activities. Regional or condition functional outcome scales should be routinely used at baseline and periodic follow-ups. More frequent follow-up is recommended with higher frequency care. (Washington State Department of Labor and Industries, 2014)

MEASURE #134 - PREVENTIVE CARE AND SCREENING: SCREENING FOR CLINICAL DEPRESSION AND FOLLOW-UP PLAN

RATIONALE:

The World Health Organization (WHO), as seen in Pratt & Brody (2008), found that major depression was the leading cause of disability worldwide. Depression causes suffering, decreases quality of life, and causes impairment in social and occupational functioning. It is associated with increased health care costs as well as with higher rates of many chronic medical conditions. Studies have shown that a higher number of depression symptoms are associated with poor health and impaired functioning, whether or not the criteria for a diagnosis of major depression are met. Persons 40-59 years of age had higher rates of depression than any other age group. Persons 12-17, 18-39 and 60 years of age and older had similar rates of depression. Depression was more common in females than in males. Non-Hispanic black persons had higher rates of depression than non-Hispanic white persons. In the 18-39 and 40-59 age groups, those with income below the federal poverty level had higher rates of depression than those with higher income. Among persons 12-17 and 60 years of age and older, rates of depression did not vary significantly by poverty status.

Overall, approximately 80% of persons with depression reported some level of difficulty in functioning because of their depressive symptoms. In addition, 35% of males and 22% of females with depression reported that their depressive symptoms make it very or extremely difficult for them to work, get things done at home, or get along with

other people. More than one-half of all persons with mild depressive symptoms also reported some difficulty in daily functioning attributable to their symptoms.

15–20 percent of adults older than age 65 in the United States have experienced depression (Geriatric Mental Health Foundation, 2008). 7 million adults aged 65 years and older are affected by depression (Steinman, 2007). Chronically ill Medicare beneficiaries with accompanying depression have significantly higher health care costs than those with chronic diseases alone (Unützer, 2009). People aged 65 years and older accounted for 16 percent of suicide deaths in 2004 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007).

The negative outcomes associated with early onset depression, make it crucial to identify and treat depression in its early stages. As reported in Borner (2010), a study conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO) concluded that in North America, primary care and family physicians are likely to provide the first line of treatment for depressive disorders. Others consistently report a 10% prevalence rate of depression in primary care patients. But studies have shown that primary care physicians fail to recognize up to 50% of depressed patients, purportedly because of time constraints and a lack of brief, sensitive, easy-to administer psychiatric screening instruments. Coyle et al. (2003), suggested that the picture is more grim for adolescents, and that more than 70% of children and adolescents suffering from serious mood disorders go unrecognized or inadequately treated. Healthy People 2020 recommends routine screening for mental health problems as a part of primary care for both children and adults (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2014).

Major depressive disorder (MDD) is a debilitating condition that has been increasingly recognized among youth, particularly adolescents. The prevalence of current or recent depression among children is 3% and among adolescents is 6%. The lifetime prevalence of MDD among adolescents may be as high as 20%. Adolescent-onset MDD is associated with an increased risk of death by suicide, suicide attempts, and recurrence of major depression by young adulthood. MDD is also associated with early pregnancy, decreased school performance, and impaired work, social, and family functioning during young adulthood (Williams et al., 2009). Every fifth adolescent may have a history of depression by age 18. The increase in the onset of depression occurs around puberty. According to Zalsman et al., (2006) as reported in Borner et al. (2010), depression ranks among the most commonly reported mental health problems in adolescent girls.

The economic burden of depression is substantial for individuals as well as society. Costs to an individual may include suffering, possible side effects from treatment, fees for mental health and medical visits and medications, time away from work and lost wages, transportation, and reduced quality of personal relationships. Costs to society may include loss of life, reduced productivity (because of both diminished capacity while at work and absenteeism from work), and increased costs of mental health and medical care. In 2000, the United States spent an estimated \$83.1 billion in direct and indirect costs of depression (USPSTF, 2009).

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

Adolescent Recommendation (12-18 years)

The USPSTF recommends screening of adolescents (12-18 years of age) for major depressive disorder (MDD) when systems are in place to ensure accurate diagnosis, psychotherapy (cognitive-behavioral or interpersonal), and follow-up (AHRQ, 2010, p.141).

Clinicians and health care systems should try to consistently screen adolescents ages 12-18 for major depressive disorder, but only when systems are in place to ensure accurate diagnosis, careful selection of treatment, and close follow-up (ICSI, 2013, p.16).

Adult Recommendation (18 years and older)

The USPSTF recommends screening adults for depression when staff-assisted depression care supports are in place to assure accurate diagnosis, effective treatment, and follow-up (AHRQ, 2010, p.136).

A system that has embedded the elements of best practice and has capacity to effectively manage the volume should consider routine screening of all patients, based on the recommendations of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (ICSI, 2013, p.7). Clinicians should use a standardized instrument to screen for depression if it is suspected based on risk factors or presentation. Clinicians should assess and treat for depression in patients with some comorbidities. Clinicians should acknowledge the impact of culture and cultural differences on physician and mental health. Clinicians should screen and monitor depression in pregnant and post-partum women (ICSI, 2013, p.4).

MEASURE #154 – FALLS: RISK ASSESSMENT

RATIONALE:

Screening for specific medical conditions may direct the therapy. Although the clinical guidelines and supporting evidence calls for an evaluation of many factors, it was felt that for the purposes of measuring performance and facilitating implementation this initial measure must be limited in scope. For this reason, the work group defined an evaluation of balance and gait as a core component that must be completed on all patients with a history of falls as well as four additional evaluations – at least one of which must be completed within the 12 month period. Data elements required for the measure can be captured and the measure is actionable by the physician.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

Older people who present for medical attention because of a fall, or report recurrent falls in the past year, or demonstrate abnormalities of gait and/or balance should be offered a multifactorial falls risk assessment. This assessment should be performed by a health care professional with appropriate skills and experience, normally in the setting of a specialist falls service. This assessment should be part of an individualized, multifactorial intervention. (NICE) (Grade C)

Multifactorial assessment may include the following:

- identification of falls history
- assessment of gait, balance and mobility, and muscle weakness
- assessment of osteoporosis risk
- assessment of the older person's perceived functional ability and fear relating to falling
- assessment of visual impairment
- assessment of cognitive impairment and neurological examination
- assessment of urinary incontinence
- assessment of home hazards
- cardiovascular examination and medication review (NICE) (Grade C)

A falls risk assessment should be performed for older persons who present for medical attention because of a fall, report recurrent falls in the past year, report difficulties in walking or balance or fear of falling, or demonstrate unsteadiness or difficulty performing a gait and balance test.

The falls risk evaluation should be performed by a clinician with appropriate skills and experience. [C]

MEASURE #155 – FALLS: PLAN OF CARE

RATIONALE:

Interventions to prevent future falls should be documented for the patient with 2 or more falls or injurious falls.

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

The USPSTF recommends exercise or physical therapy and vitamin D supplementation to prevent falls in community-dwelling adults aged 65 years or older who are at increased risk for falls.

Grade: B Recommendation.

The AGS 2010 Clinical Practice Guidelines Recommend:

Multifactorial/Multicomponent Interventions to Address Identified Risk(s) and Prevent Falls

1. A strategy to reduce the risk of falls should include multifactorial assessment of known fall risk factors and management of the risk factors identified. [A]
2. The components most commonly included in efficacious interventions were:
 - a. Adaptation or modification of home environment [A]
 - b. Withdrawal or minimization of psychoactive medications [B]
 - c. Withdrawal or minimization of other medications [C]
 - d. Management of postural hypotension [C]
 - e. Management of foot problems and footwear [C]
 - f. Exercise, particularly balance, strength, and gait training [A]
3. All older adults who are at risk of falling should be offered an exercise program incorporating balance, gait, and strength training. Flexibility and endurance training should also be offered, but not as sole components of the program. [A]
4. Multifactorial/multicomponent intervention should include an education component complementing and addressing issues specific to the intervention being provided, tailored to individual cognitive function and language. [C]
5. The health professional or team conducting the fall risk assessment should directly implement the interventions or should assure that the interventions are carried out by other qualified healthcare professionals. [A]

MEASURE #238 - USE OF HIGH-RISK MEDICATIONS IN THE ELDERLY

RATIONALE:

Seniors receiving inappropriate medications are more likely to report poorer health status at follow-up, compared to seniors who receive appropriate medications (Fu, Liu, and Christensen 2004). In 2005, rates of potentially inappropriate medication use in the elderly were as large or larger than in a 1996 national sample, highlighting the need for progress in this area (Simon et al. 2005). While some adverse drug events are not preventable, studies estimate that between 30 and 80 percent of adverse drug events in the elderly are preventable (MacKinnon and Hepler 2003).

Reducing the number of inappropriate prescriptions can lead to improved patient safety and significant cost savings. Conservative estimates of extra costs due to potentially inappropriate medications in the elderly average \$7.2 billion a year (Fu, Liu, and Christensen 2004). Medication use by older adults will likely increase further as the U.S. population ages, new drugs are developed, and new therapeutic and preventive uses for medications are discovered (Rothberg et al. 2008). By the year 2030, nearly one in five U.S. residents is expected to be aged 65 years or older; this age group is projected to more than double in number from 38.7 million in 2008 to more than 88.5 million in 2050. Likewise, the population aged 85 years or older is expected to increase almost four-fold, from 5.4 million to 19 million between 2008 and 2050. As the elderly population continues to grow, the number of older adults who present with multiple medical conditions for which several medications are prescribed continues to increase, resulting in polypharmacy (Gray and Gardner 2009).

CLINICAL RECOMMENDATION STATEMENTS:

The measure is based on the literature and key clinical expert consensus processes by Beers in 1997, Zahn in 2001 and an updated process by Fick in 2003, which identified drugs of concern in the elderly based on various high-risk criteria. NCQA's Medication Management expert panel selected a subset of drugs that should be used with caution in the elderly for inclusion in the proposed measure based upon these two lists. NCQA analyzed the prevalence of drugs prescribed according to the Beers and Zhan classifications and determined that drugs identified by Zhan that are classified as never or rarely appropriate would form the basis for the list (Fick 2003).

Certain medications (MacKinnon 2003) are associated with increased risk of harms from drug side-effects and drug toxicity and pose a concern for patient safety. There is clinical consensus that these drugs pose increased risks in the elderly (Kaufman 2005). Studies link prescription drug use by the elderly with adverse drug events that contribute to

hospitalization, increased length of hospital stay, increased duration of illness, nursing home placement and falls and fractures that are further associated with physical, functional and social decline in the elderly (AHRQ 2009).