From:	Kendra Hanley
Sent:	Friday, November 22, 2013 4:56 PM
To:	Chengjian Che; Matt Humphrey; Ana Rute Martins Baptista
Cc:	Bob Dolin; Christopher Millet; Lindsey Wisham; Kimberly Smuk; Anu Gupta
Subject:	RE: Assistance with stenosis data element eMeasure

Chris, Rute, Matt and Cheng,
I wanted to send a very belated thanks to you all for your feedback on the stenosis data element issue.
We really appreciate your guidance on this issue!
Have a great weekend and Happy (early) Thanksgiving!
Kendra

From: Chengjian Che [mailto:chengjian.che@lantanagroup.com]
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 11:46 AM
To: Matt Humphrey; Kendra Hanley; Ana Rute Martins Baptista
Cc: Bob Dolin; Christopher Millet; Lindsey Wisham
Subject: RE: Assistance with stenosis data element eMeasure

Thanks Matt, it makes sense. The current QDM only describes attributes w/o cardinality and conformance constraints and therefore, we have to use the logical operators to fulfill those requirements. I think the way you recommended is best to eliminate ambiguities.

Cheng

From: Matt Humphrey [mailto:MHumphrey@telligen.org]
Sent: Monday, November 11, 2013 9:31 AM
To: 'Kendra Hanley'; Ana Rute Martins Baptista
Cc: Bob Dolin; Chengjian Che; Christopher Millet; Lindsey Wisham
Subject: RE: Assistance with stenosis data element eMeasure

Let's make it 6 cents!
Whatever solution you adopt, I would make a strong argument for only using one attribute per QDM element per line of logic. Regardless of what is actually supported, I will always argue the following:

A relationship B (c, d)

A and B are QDM elements while c and d are attributes of B. We must say that we are always talking about either the QDM element (B) or the attribute when one exists. The above would be valid if we are talking about B and not its attributes, and therefore it means:

A relationship B

However, and I would argue this is the required meaning, if we are talking about B's attributes then it is not clear which attribute we are speaking about. Does A relationship B (c, d) mean A relationship B.c or A relationship B.d? There is no way to specify.

This makes it explicit:

AND: A relationship Occ B.c
AND: Occ B.d

Matt

>>> "Martins Baptista, Ana Rute" <AMartinsBaptista@jointcommission.org> 11/8/2013 3:34 PM >>>
Hi Kendra:

Have you considered modeling the arteries as part of the diagnostic test name instead of using the anatomical structure attribute? I would assume that information has to be part of the test order (e.g. MRI of the brain).

As far as the result goes, I think the main issue is to convey that the 50% relates to a reduction in the diameter of the artery. I see two options here:
1. Don't model the quantitative finding of the reduction the diameter and go with a "stenosis" finding instead. This would only work if you are confident that no one would document stenosis without reaching the 50% threshold.
2. Use two results as Chris suggested, but instead of using the term "stenosis", use a lovely SNOMED-CT concept that is so incredibly appropriate it almost seems too good to be true: [397442008] % diameter reduction

You're the proud owner of 4 cents now ☺ Have a great weekend, everyone!

-Rute

From: Christopher Millet [mailto:cmillet@qualityforum.org]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 2:01 PM
To: 'Kendra Hanley'; 'Bob Dolin'; 'chengjian.che@lantanagroup.com'; 'Matt Humphrey'; 'Lindsey Wisham <LWisham@telligen.org> (LWisham@telligen.org)'; Martins Baptista, Ana Rute
Subject: RE: Assistance with stenosis data element eMeasure

Hi Kendra,

Here are my 2 cents:

The problem with option b is that the value set defines the QDM category of the QDM element. So in option b, the category would be Diagnostic Study but the value set would contain codes for stenosis. I think a slightly altered version of option a should be allowed, something along the lines of:
OR:
        AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: US (result: stenosis, anatomical structure: peripheral arteries)
        AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: US (result: >50%)
        …(repeat for the MRI and CT criteria)

I believe the Occurrence A should allow you to tie two different result criteria(1. The stenosis value set criteria, and 2. The > 50% criteria) to the same instance of the diagnostic study. We should also run this by someone who can speak to this from perspective of Cypress and Certification to make sure we are all interpreting it the same way.

Chris

From: Kendra Hanley [mailto:Kendra.Hanley@ama-assn.org]
Sent: Friday, November 08, 2013 2:39 PM
To: Bob Dolin; Christopher Millet; chengjian.che@lantanagroup.com; Matt Humphrey; Lindsey Wisham <LWisham@telligen.org> (LWisham@telligen.org); Martins Baptista, Ana Rute
Subject: Assistance with stenosis data element eMeasure

Dear eMeasure colleagues,

We are working on the development of an eMeasure and are encountering some challenges with one of the data elements needed for the measure.
We would appreciate any input/guidance you have on how to specify the following concept—using QDM and HQMF logic structure.

We are looking to capture patients who have stenosis of a peripheral artery. The measure indicates "patients with abnormal non-invasive test demonstrating stenosis in any peripheral artery."
The tests include: ultrasound, magnetic resonance, or computed tomography imaging
Stenosis is considered to be >50% diameter stenosis of any of the following arteries: aorta, iliac, femoral, popliteal, tibial, peroneal

Assumption:
MRI/MRA,CT/CTA & Ultrasound are the only diagnostic imaging methods to identify stenosis of a peripheral artery.

Option A---What We Want to Specify, in logic structure but don't believe this is allowable in HQMF structure:

OR:
 AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: US (result: stenosis) (result: >50%) (anatomical structure: peripheral arteries)
 AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: MRI (result: stenosis) (result: >50%) (anatomical structure: peripheral arteries)
 AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: CT (result: stenosis) (result: >50%) (anatomical structure: peripheral arteries)

Option B--An alternate approach that we think will work in HQMF logic structure [meaning, we recognize HQMF/MAT limitations around attributes]:

OR:
 AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: Stenosis (result: >50%)
 AND: Occ A Diagnostic Study, Result: Stenosis (anatomical structure: peripheral arteries)

The downside of Option B is that we use QDM "Diagnostic Study, Result", but aren't explicit to the type of study. Is this a problem?
 Is it acceptable to only include the result (ie, stenosis) with a qualifier of (result > 50%), with a second line of logic that further constrains the artery where the stenosis is present?

 Questions:
1. In your opinion, does Option B capture what we're looking for in this example? Does Option B create any QDM/HQMF modeling violations?
2. Can the logic we think is feasible be entered into the MAT?
3. Are there alternatives you can recommend that will express what we need for this measure?

Thanks for your input!
Regards,

Kendra, Kim, Anu
PCPI Team

Kendra Hanley, MS
Project Manager
Measure Implementation and Informatics
AMA-convened PCPI®
AMA Plaza
330 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 39300
Chicago, IL 60611-5885

(312) 464-4982
kendra.hanley@ama-assn.org