

Asthma/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD)

Measure Justification Form

June 2021



Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Project Title and Overview	4
1.2	Measure Name.....	4
1.3	Type of Measure	4
2.0	Measure Testing: Importance	5
2.1	Evidence to Support the Measure Focus	5
2.1.1	Measure Description	5
2.1.2	Evidence for Measure Focus	5
2.2	Performance Gap.....	8
2.2.1	Rationale.....	8
2.2.2	Performance Scores	10
3.0	Scientific Acceptability	11
3.1	Data Sample Description	11
3.1.1	Type of Data Used for Testing.....	11
3.1.2	Specific Dataset Used for Testing	11
3.1.3	Dates of the Data Used in Testing.....	11
3.1.4	Levels of Analysis Tested.....	11
3.1.5	Entities Included in the Testing and Analysis	11
3.1.6	Patient Cohort Included in the Testing and Analysis	12
3.1.7	Social Risk Factors Included in Analysis	13
3.2	Reliability Testing.....	14
3.2.1	Level of Reliability Testing	14
3.2.2	Method of Reliability Testing.....	14
3.2.3	Statistical Results from Reliability Testing.....	15
3.2.4	Interpretation.....	15
3.3	Validity Testing.....	15
3.3.1	Level of Validity Testing	15
3.3.2	Method of Validity Testing	15
3.3.3	Statistical Results from Validity Testing.....	16
3.3.4	Interpretation.....	17
3.4	Exclusions Analysis.....	17
3.4.1	Method of Testing Exclusions.....	17
3.4.2	Statistical Results from Testing Exclusions	18
3.4.3	Interpretation.....	19
3.5	Risk Adjustment or Stratification	21
3.5.1	Method of Controlling for Differences	21
3.5.2	Conceptual, Clinical, and Statistical Methods.....	22
3.5.3	Conceptual Model of Impact of Social Risks	23
3.5.4	Statistical Results.....	23
3.5.5	Analyses and Interpretation in Selection of Social Risk Factors	24
3.5.6	Methods for Statistical Model or Stratification Development	25
3.5.7	Statistical Risk Model Discrimination Statistics	25
3.5.8	Statistical Risk Model Calibration Statistics.....	25
3.5.9	Statistical Risk Model Calibration – Risk Decile	25
3.5.10	Interpretation.....	25
3.6	Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance	26
3.6.1	Method	26
3.6.2	Statistical Results.....	26
3.6.3	Interpretation.....	29
3.7	Missing Data Analysis and Minimizing Bias.....	30
3.7.1	Method	30
3.7.2	Missing Data Analysis.....	30
3.7.3	Interpretation.....	30

4.0 Feasibility	31
4.1 Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.....	31
4.2 Electronic Sources	31
4.3 Data Collection Strategy	31
4.3.1 Data Collection Strategy Difficulties.....	31
5.0 Usability and Use	32
5.1 Use.....	32
5.1.1 Current and Planned Use	32
5.1.2 Feedback on the Measure and Development Process.....	32
5.2 Usability.....	36
5.2.1 Improvement.....	36
5.2.2 Unexpected Findings	36
5.2.3 Unexpected Benefits.....	36
Other Additional Information	37

1.0 Introduction

This Measure Justification Form (MJF) provides results for the testing and evaluation of the Asthma/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) measure. The form is intended to provide detailed information about the testing conducted on this measure, and accompanies the Measure Methodology¹ and measure Codes List² file, which together, comprise the specifications for this cost measure.

1.1 Project Title and Overview

The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has contracted with Acumen, LLC to develop care episode and patient condition groups for use in cost measures to meet the requirements of the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (MACRA). The contract name is “Physician Cost Measure and Patient Relationship Codes (PCMP).” The contract number is 75FCMC18D0015, Task Order 75FCMC19F0004.

1.2 Measure Name

Asthma/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) Episode-Based Cost Measure

1.3 Type of Measure

Cost/Resource Use

¹ CMS, “Asthma/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Measure Methodology,” MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Payment-Program/Quality-Payment-Program/Give-Feedback>.

² CMS, “Asthma/Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Measure Codes List” MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Payment-Program/Quality-Payment-Program/Give-Feedback>.

2.0 Measure Testing: Importance

2.1 Evidence to Support the Measure Focus

2.1.1 Measure Description

The Asthma/COPD cost measure evaluates a clinician's or clinician group's risk-adjusted cost to Medicare for patients receiving medical care to manage asthma or COPD. The measure score is a clinician's or clinician group's weighted average of risk-adjusted cost for each attributed episode, where each episode is weighted by the number of assigned days during the episode. This chronic measure includes services that are clinically related and under the reasonable influence of the attributed clinician or clinician group. Services are assigned during an Asthma/COPD episode, which is a portion of the overall time period of a clinician's or clinician group's responsibility for managing a patient's asthma or COPD. Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B during the performance period are eligible for the measure.

2.1.2 Evidence for Measure Focus

The Asthma/COPD measure was developed for use in the Merit-based Incentive Payment System (MIPS) to meet the requirements of the Social Security Act section 1848(r), added by the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (MACRA). MIPS aims to reward high-value care by measuring clinician performance through four areas: quality, improvement activities, promoting interoperability, and cost. Each category assesses different aspects of care, and the categories are weighted such that they are combined into one composite score. CMS is introducing MIPS Value Pathways (MVPs) as a way to align and connect quality measures, cost measures, and improvement activities across performance categories of MIPS for different specialties or conditions. MVPs aim to provide a holistic assessment of clinician value for a specific type of care to achieve better healthcare outcomes and lower costs for patients. The use of cost measures is required by statute, and their purpose is to assess resource use. To be effective, they should capture costs related to a clinician's care decisions and account for factors outside of their influence.

This measure provides clinicians with information about their costs of care that they can use to understand the costs associated with their decision-making. Clinicians play an important role in variation in health care expenditures due to their ability to affect costs.³ A cost measure offers opportunity for improvement if clinicians can exercise influence on the intensity or frequency of a significant share of costs during the episode, or if clinicians can achieve lower spending and better care quality through changes in clinical practice.

According to the literature and feedback received through stakeholder input activities to date, this measure represents an area where there are opportunities for improvement. Various educational programs and interventions have been associated with reduced readmissions, hospitalizations, and complications among patients with asthma or COPD.^{4,5} Opportunities to reduce costs and improve the chronic care and clinical outcomes of asthma or COPD exist

³ David Cutler et al., "Physician Beliefs and Patient Preferences: A New Look at Regional Variation in Health Care Spending," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 11, no. 1 (February 1, 2019): 192–221, <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20150421>.

⁴ Castro, Mario, Nina A. Zimmermann, Sue Crocker, Joseph Bradley, Charles Leven, and Kenneth B. Schechtman. "Asthma Intervention Program Prevents Readmissions in High Healthcare Users." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 168, no. 9 (2003): 1095–99.

⁵ Hussey, Peter S., Eric C. Schneider, Robert S. Rudin, D. Steven Fox, Julie Lai, and Craig Evan Pollack. "Continuity and the Costs of Care for Chronic Disease." *JAMA Internal Medicine* 174, no. 5 (2014): 742–48.

primarily in maintenance pharmacotherapy, proper use of inhalers, pulmonary rehabilitation, and smoking cessation.

Advances in pharmacotherapy have led to the development of guidelines to improve the management and outcomes of patients with COPD.^{6,7,8} However, it is estimated that 71% of Medicare patients with COPD are not prescribed long-term maintenance pharmacotherapy.⁹ Research has also shown other measures of under-treatment of COPD patients in the Medicare population, with suboptimal treatment for smoking cessation (behavioral therapy or prescriptions for medications), bronchodilator therapy post hospitalization, and pneumococcal and influenza vaccinations.¹⁰ In addition to potential under-prescription, medication adherence has also been documented as suboptimal, with only 50% of Medicare patients adhering to medications, signaling that patients may not be benefiting from prescribed therapies.¹¹ This highlights an important opportunity for clinicians to prescribe treatment, such as appropriate inhaler devices, and encourage medication adherence during the management of COPD patients.

Current guidelines suggest that inhaled bronchodilators are the mainstay of COPD management and therapy,¹² and patients with either asthma or COPD can benefit from them.¹³ However, research has shown that over 50% of patients with asthma or COPD do not handle inhaler devices as prescribed or instructed,¹⁴ and up to 92% of patients experience critical errors that may impact the drug's effectiveness.¹⁵ This has important implications as poor inhaler techniques and non-adherence to inhaled therapy limit the therapeutic benefit of medication for patients with asthma or COPD.^{16,17} Existing literature suggests that the primary care physician has an important role in selecting appropriate inhaler devices for patients with asthma or COPD to optimize outcomes, while also encouraging patients to be involved in the decision-making

⁶ Celli, Bartolome R., William MacNee, Alvar Agusti, Antonio Anzueto, B. Berg, A. Sonia Buist, Peter M. Calverley, et al. "Standards for the Diagnosis and Treatment of Patients with COPD: A Summary of the ATS/ERS Position Paper." *European Respiratory Journal* 23, no. 6 (2004): 932.

⁷ National Collaborating Centre for Chronic Conditions. "Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease. National Clinical Guideline on Management of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in Adults in Primary and Secondary Care." *Thorax* 59 Suppl 1, no. Suppl 1 (2004): 1-232.

⁸ Pauwels, Romain A., A. Sonia Buist, Peter M. Calverley, Christine R. Jenkins, and Suzanne S. Hurd. "Global Strategy for the Diagnosis, Management, and Prevention of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 163, no. 5 (2001): 1256-76.

⁹ Make, Barry, Michael P. Dutro, Ryne Paulose-Ram, Jenö P. Marton, and Douglas W. Mapel. "Undertreatment of COPD: A Retrospective Analysis of Us Managed Care and Medicare Patients." *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 7 (2012): 1-9.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Guarascio, Anthony J., Shauntá M. Ray, Christopher K. Finch, and Timothy H. Self. "The Clinical and Economic Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the USA." *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research* 5 (2013): 235-45.

¹³ Donohue, James F. "Therapeutic Responses in Asthma and COPD: Bronchodilators." *CHEST* 126, no. 2 (2004): 125S-37S.

¹⁴ Molimard, Mathieu, Chantal Raherison, Severine Lignot, Aurelie Balestra, Stephanie Lamarque, Anais Chartier, Cecile Droz-Perroteau, et al. "Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease Exacerbation and Inhaler Device Handling: Real-Life Assessment of 2935 Patients." 49, no. 2 (2017): 1601794.

¹⁵ Chrystyn, Henry, Job van der Palen, Raj Sharma, Neil Barnes, Bruno Delafont, Anadi Mahajan, and Mike Thomas. "Device Errors in Asthma and COPD: Systematic Literature Review and Meta-Analysis." *NPJ Primary Care Respiratory Medicine* 27, no. 1 (2017): 22-22.

¹⁶ Kaplan, Alan, and David Price. "Matching Inhaler Devices with Patients: The Role of the Primary Care Physician." *Canadian Respiratory Journal* 2018 (2018): 9473051-51.

¹⁷ Dudvarski Ilic, Aleksandra, Vladimir Zugic, Biljana Zvezdin, Ivan Kopitovic, Ivan Cekerevac, Vojislav Cupurdija, Nela Perhoc, Vesna Veljkovic, and Aleksandra Barac. "Influence of Inhaler Technique on Asthma and COPD Control: A Multicenter Experience." *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 11 (2016): 2509-17.

process to improve patient education.¹⁸ Promoting medication adherence and instructing patients on proper inhaler techniques through educational and training methods could facilitate a successful relationship between clinicians and patients and optimize health outcomes.¹⁹

Treatments that promote physical activity and exercise have been shown to improve patient outcomes for individuals with asthma or COPD.²⁰ Various studies have looked at different components of pulmonary rehabilitation treatments (i.e., intensity) and patient selection (i.e., weight or disease severity) among COPD patients,^{21,22,23,24} and have indicated the benefits of pulmonary rehabilitation in improving exercise capacity and muscle function. One study showed that comprehensive pulmonary rehabilitation programs are beneficial in both early and late stages of COPD.²⁵ For asthmatic patients, one study found that pulmonary rehabilitation can reduce the number of exacerbations and clinical visits while improving symptoms and pulmonary function.²⁶ A clinician's role in prescribing pulmonary rehabilitation has potential implications for cost savings and improved performance given the benefits of pulmonary rehabilitation.²⁷

Smoking is a main causative factor for COPD.²⁸ Despite evidence showing the benefits of interventions promoting smoking cessation, it is estimated that 30 to 40% of COPD patients continue to smoke.²⁹ This is concerning given that COPD patients who smoke have a higher prevalence of respiratory symptoms and higher death rates compared to non-smokers.^{30,31}

¹⁸ Kaplan, Alan, and David Price. "Matching Inhaler Devices with Patients: The Role of the Primary Care Physician." *Canadian Respiratory Journal* 2018 (2018): 9473051-51.

¹⁹ Sethi, Sanjay. "Effective Management of COPD in Primary Care: Challenges and Opportunities." *American Journal of Managed Care* (2018).

²⁰ Corbridge, Susan J., and Sharmilee M. Nyenhuis. "Promoting Physical Activity and Exercise in Patients with Asthma and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners* 13, no. 1 (2017): 41-46.

²¹ Franssen, Frits M. E., Roelinka Broekhuizen, Paul P. Janssen, Emiel F. M. Wouters, and Annemie M. W. J. Schols. "Effects of Whole-Body Exercise Training on Body Composition and Functional Capacity in Normal-Weight Patients with COPD." *CHEST* 125, no. 6 (2004): 2021-28.

²² Hsieh, Meng-Jer, Chou-Chin Lan, Ning-Hung Chen, Chung-Chi Huang, Yao-Kuang Wu, Hsio-Ying Cho, and Ying-Huang Tsai. "Effects of High-Intensity Exercise Training in a Pulmonary Rehabilitation Programme for Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *Respirology* 12, no. 3 (2007): 381-88.

²³ Lan, Chou-Chin, Mei-Chen Yang, Chih-Hsin Lee, Yi-Chih Huang, Chun-Yao Huang, Kuo-Liang Huang, and Yao-Kuang Wu. "Pulmonary Rehabilitation Improves Exercise Capacity and Quality of Life in Underweight Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *Respirology* 16, no. 2 (2011): 276-83.

²⁴ Ngaage, Dumbor L., Kirsteen Hasney, and Micheal E. Cowen. "The Functional Impact of an Individualized, Graded, Outpatient Pulmonary Rehabilitation in End-Stage Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *Heart & Lung: The Journal of Cardiopulmonary and Acute Care* 33, no. 6 (2004): 381-89.

²⁵ Ergün, Pinar, Dicle Kaymaz, Ersin Günay, Yurdanur Erdoğan, Ulkü Yılmaz Turay, Neşe Demir, Ebru Canak, et al. "Comprehensive out-Patient Pulmonary Rehabilitation: Treatment Outcomes in Early and Late Stages of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *Annals of Thoracic Medicine* 6, no. 2 (2011): 70-76.

²⁶ Linhas, Rita, Raquel Marçôa, Inês Ladeira, Ricardo Lima, Regina Monteiro, Ivone Pascoal, and Aurora Carvalho. "Effects of Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Asthma Patients." *European Respiratory Journal* 50, no. suppl 61 (2017): PA757.

²⁷ Lan, Chou-Chin, Wen-Hua Chu, Mei-Chen Yang, Chih-Hsin Lee, Yao-Kuang Wu, and Chin-Pyng Wu. "Benefits of Pulmonary Rehabilitation in Patients with COPD and Normal Exercise Capacity." 58, no. 9 (2013): 1482-88.

²⁸ Laniado-Laborín, Rafael. "Smoking and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD). Parallel Epidemics of the 21 Century." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 6, no. 1 (2009): 209-24.

²⁹ Kwak, Min Ji, Jongoh Kim, Viraj Bhise, Tong Han Chung, and Gabriela Sanchez Petitto. "National Trends in Smoking Cessation Medication Prescriptions for Smokers with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the United States, 2007-2012." *Journal of Preventive Medicine and Public Health* 51, no. 5 (2018): 257-62.

³⁰ Vestbo, Jørgen, Suzanne S. Hurd, Alvar G. Agustí, Paul W. Jones, Claus Vogelmeier, Antonio Anzueto, Peter J. Barnes, et al. "Global Strategy for the Diagnosis, Management, and Prevention of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 187, no. 4 (2013): 347-65.

³¹ Lee, Peter N., and John S. Fry. "Systematic Review of the Evidence Relating Fev1 Decline to Giving up Smoking." *BMC Medicine* 8 (2010): 84-84.

Clinicians have an opportunity to promote smoking cessation among their patients in an effort to improve clinical outcomes and reduce cost of care. Existing literature suggests that smoking cessation among COPD patients is an important therapeutic intervention that “slows the accelerated rate of lung function decline and improves survival compared with continued smoking,” even in severe COPD cases.³² For asthmatic patients, smoking cessation improves asthma symptoms and lung function,³³ particularly when coupled with other therapies.³⁴ One study found that subjects with asthma who quit smoking saw improvements in lung function compared to those with asthma who continued smoking.³⁵ To optimize the management of asthma or COPD, clinicians should approach smoking cessation interventions by utilizing both behavioral (patient counseling and support) and pharmacological therapy for comprehensive treatment of asthma or COPD and improved outcomes.³⁶ Additionally, patients with asthma or COPD and who smoke are at a higher risk of pneumococcal disease and influenza. As such, clinicians should target these individuals for pneumococcal and influenza vaccinations to prevent asthma or COPD exacerbations.^{37,38}

Overall, currently available research identifies areas of intervention primarily under the influence of clinicians, where evidence-based action can be taken to achieve better long-term health outcomes in the Medicare population.

2.2 Performance Gap

2.2.1 Rationale

Research has shown that both asthma and COPD are highly prevalent, costly conditions within the United States population, and their overall disease burden and financial impact continue to rise.^{39,40} COPD is the third leading cause of death in the United States.⁴¹ In 2014, 15.7 million Americans were diagnosed with COPD, yet this number could be an underestimation since many people with low lung function are not aware they have COPD.⁴² The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that COPD-related costs grew by nearly \$17 billion in the past

³² Godtfredsen, Nina S., T. H. Lam, Trevor T. Hansel, M. E. Leon, N. Gray, C. Dresler, D. M. Burns, Eva Prescott, and Jorgen Vestbo. "COPD-Related Morbidity and Mortality After Smoking Cessation: Status of the Evidence." *European Respiratory Journal* 32, no. 4 (2008): 844-53.

³³ Gratziou, Ch, A. Florou, E. Ischaki, K. Eleftheriou, A. Sachlas, S. Bersimis, and S. Zakynthinos. "Smoking Cessation Effectiveness in Smokers with COPD and Asthma Under Real Life Conditions." *Respiratory Medicine* 108, no. 4 (2014): 577-83.

³⁴ Perret, Jennifer L., Billie Bonevski, Christine F. McDonald, and Michael J. Abramson. "Smoking Cessation Strategies for Patients with Asthma: Improving Patient Outcomes." *Journal of Asthma and Allergy* 9 (2016): 117-28.

³⁵ Chaudhuri, Rekha, Eric Livingston, Alex D. McMahon, Jane Lafferty, Iona Fraser, Mark Spears, Charles P. McSharry, and Neil C. Thomson. "Effects of Smoking Cessation on Lung Function and Airway Inflammation in Smokers with Asthma." *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 174, no. 2 (2006): 127-33.

³⁶ Guarascio, Anthony J., Shauntá M. Ray, Christopher K. Finch, and Timothy H. Self. "The Clinical and Economic Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the USA." *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research* 5 (2013): 235-45.

³⁷ Torres, Antoni, Francesco Blasi, Nathalie Dartois, and Murat Akova. "Which Individuals Are at Increased Risk of Pneumococcal Disease and Why? Impact of COPD, Asthma, Smoking, Diabetes, and/or Chronic Heart Disease on Community-Acquired Pneumonia and Invasive Pneumococcal Disease." *Thorax* 70, no. 10 (2015): 984.

³⁸ Froes, Filipe, Nicolas Roche, and Francesco Blasi. "Pneumococcal Vaccination and Chronic Respiratory Diseases." *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 12 (2017): 3457-68.

³⁹ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Basics About COPD." <https://www.cdc.gov/copd/basics-about.html>.

⁴⁰ Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America. "Cost of Asthma on Society." <https://www.aafa.org/cost-of-asthma-on-society/>.

⁴¹ American Lung Association. "How Serious Is COPD." <https://www.lung.org/lung-health-and-diseases/lung-disease-lookup/copd/learn-about-copd/how-serious-is-copd.html>.

⁴² Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "Basics About COPD." <https://www.cdc.gov/copd/basics-about.html>.

decade in the United States, equating to an overall increase of 53%.^{43,44} Specifically, Medicare paid 51% of these COPD-related costs.⁴⁵ One study found that the mean total health care costs were \$20,500 higher among Medicare patients with COPD compared to those without COPD.⁴⁶ Among the many factors that contribute to rising health care costs associated with COPD, increasing hospitalization and readmission rates are among the highest cost drivers.⁴⁷ COPD is the fourth leading cause of 30-day readmissions, where nearly one-fifth of patients hospitalized for an acute exacerbation of COPD were readmitted within 30 days of discharge.^{48,49, 50}

More than 25 million Americans live with asthma,⁵¹ and it has been estimated that 5% of all Medicare patients have an asthma diagnosis.⁵² The total cost incurred for treatment of asthma was \$81.9 billion in 2013.⁵³ Recent estimates attribute more than 10 million lost work days among employed adults and nearly 2 million emergency department (ED) visits over a single year to asthma.⁵⁴ Much like COPD, the burden of asthma falls heavily on adults aged 65 years and older, who have the highest mortality rate for the condition compared to any other age group.

Despite the differences in etiology, symptoms, and responses to therapy between asthma and COPD, these diseases overlap in disease presentation and pathophysiologic characteristics.^{55,56} There is also a substantial 15 to 20% overlap in the reported prevalence of comorbid cases of asthma and COPD.⁵⁷ This overlapping relationship places an important role on clinicians to follow appropriate guidelines and utilize proper management strategies to classify and treat patients accurately.⁵⁸ Given the high impact in terms of patient population and Medicare

⁴³ Ford, Earl S., Louise B. Murphy, Olga Khavjou, Wayne H. Giles, James B. Holt, and Janet B. Croft. "Total and State-Specific Medical and Absenteeism Costs of COPD among Adults Aged 18 Years in the United States for 2010 and Projections Through 2020." *CHEST* 147, no. 1 (2015): 31-45.

⁴⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "COPD Costs." <https://www.cdc.gov/copd/infographics/copd-costs.html>.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Menzin, Joseph, Luke Boulanger, Jeno Marton, Lisa Guadagno, Homa Dastani, Riad Dirani, Amy Phillips, and Hemal Shah. "The Economic Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) in a U.S. Medicare Population." *Respiratory Medicine* 102, no. 9 (2008): 1248-56.

⁴⁷ Parikh, Raj, Trushil G. Shah, and Rajive Tandon. "COPD Exacerbation Care Bundle Improves Standard of Care, Length of Stay, and Readmission Rates." *International Journal of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease* 11 (2016): 577-83.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Jencks, Stephen F., Mark V. Williams, and Eric A. Coleman. "Rehospitalizations Among Patients in the Medicare Fee-for-Service Program." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 360, no. 14 (2009): 1418-28.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America. "Asthma Facts and Figures." <https://www.aafa.org/asthma-facts/>.

⁵² Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. "Health Disparities in the Medicare Population: Asthma." <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/2016-05-cms-omh-data-snapshot-asthma-508pdf>.

⁵³ Nurmagambetov, Tursynbek, Robin Kuwahara, and Paul Garbe. "The Economic Burden of Asthma in the United States, 2008–2013." *Annals of the American Thoracic Society* 15, no. 3 (2018): 348-56.

⁵⁴ American Lung Association. "Asthma in Adults Fact Sheet." <https://www.lung.org/lung-health-and-diseases/lung-disease-lookup/asthma/learn-about-asthma/asthma-adults-facts-sheet.html>.

⁵⁵ Guarascio, Anthony J., Shauntá M. Ray, Christopher K. Finch, and Timothy H. Self. "The Clinical and Economic Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the USA." *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research* 5 (2013): 235-45.

⁵⁶ Cukic, Vesna, Vladimir Lovre, Dejan Dragisic, and Aida Ustamujic. "Asthma and Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) - Differences and Similarities." *Materia Socio-Medica* 24, no. 2 (2012): 100-05.

⁵⁷ Global Initiative for Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease. "Diagnosis of Diseases of Chronic Airflow Limitation: Asthma, COPD, and Asthma-Copd Overlap Syndrome (ACOS)." https://goldcopd.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/GOLD_ACOS_2015.pdf.

⁵⁸ Guarascio, Anthony J., Shauntá M. Ray, Christopher K. Finch, and Timothy H. Self. "The Clinical and Economic Burden of Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease in the USA." *ClinicoEconomics and Outcomes Research* 5 (2013): 235-45.

spending, the Asthma/COPD measure represents an opportunity for improvement on overall cost performance.

The Asthma/COPD episode-based cost measure was recommended for development by an expert clinician committee—the Chronic Condition and Disease Management Clinical Subcommittee. Based on the initial recommendations from the Clinical Subcommittee, the subsequent measure-specific Clinician Expert Workgroup provided extensive, detailed input on this measure.

2.2.2 Performance Scores

To demonstrate the performance gap captured in the measure, Table 1 below presents a distribution of performance scores for 19,876 clinician group practices (identified by Taxpayer Identification Number, or TIN) and 33,797 practitioners (identified by a unique TIN and National Provider Identifier pair, or TIN-NPI) attributed at least 20 episodes in 2019. These counts represent attributed clinicians and clinician groups billing Part B Physician/Supplier claims under a MIPS eligible clinician specialty, and do not reflect other MIPS eligibility criteria (e.g., Advanced Alternative Payment Model (APM) participation).

Table 1. Distribution of Observed over Expected (O/E) Ratio

Metric	TIN	TIN-NPI
Mean O/E ratio	0.97	0.96
O/E ratio Interquartile Range (IQR)	0.35	0.39
O/E ratio Percentile		
10 th	0.63	0.60
25 th	0.78	0.75
50 th	0.96	0.94
75 th	1.12	1.13
90 th	1.31	1.33

3.0 Scientific Acceptability

3.1 Data Sample Description

3.1.1 Type of Data Used for Testing

Medicare administrative claims, Long-Term Minimum Data Set (MDS), Medicare Enrollment Database (EDB), Common Medicare Environment (CME), and United States Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS).

3.1.2 Specific Dataset Used for Testing

The Asthma/COPD measure uses Medicare Part A, Part B, and Part D claims data maintained by CMS. Parts A, B, and D claims data are used to build episodes of care, calculate episode costs, and construct risk adjusters. To ensure that the measure accurately reflects Medicare costs, Part D branded drug costs were adjusted to account for drug rebates. More detailed information on the Part D payment standardization methodology and the Part D rebate adjustment methodology is available from the [CMS Research Data Assistance Center](#).⁵⁹

Episode costs are payment standardized and risk adjusted to ensure accurate comparison of cost across clinicians. Payment standardization adjusts the allowed amount for a Medicare service to limit observed differences in costs to those that may result from health care delivery choices. Data from the EDB are used to determine beneficiary-level (or patient-level) exclusions and secondary risk adjusters, specifically Medicare Parts A, B, and C enrollment, primary payer, disability status, end-stage renal disease (ESRD), patient birth dates, and patient death dates. The risk adjustment model also accounts for expected differences in payment for services provided to patients in long-term care based on data from the MDS. Specifically, the MDS is used to create the long-term care indicator variable in risk adjustment.

For measure testing, data from the ACS and CME are used in analyses evaluating social risk factors in risk adjustment.

3.1.3 Dates of the Data Used in Testing

Asthma/COPD episodes ending from January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019.

3.1.4 Levels of Analysis Tested

Individual clinician (identified by combination of TIN and NPI) and clinician group/practice (identified by TIN).

3.1.5 Entities Included in the Testing and Analysis

After applying exclusions and the case minimum, the overall population for testing and analyses included 19,876 clinician group practices and 33,797 practitioners who were attributed 20 or more Asthma/COPD episodes across all 50 states and the District of Columbia during the measurement period. The most frequent settings in which an Asthma/COPD episode was triggered included:

- Ambulatory/office-based care
- Skilled nursing facility (SNF)
- Hospital outpatient department (HOD)

⁵⁹ CMS, Research Data Assistance Center, <https://resdac.org/articles/cms-price-payment-standardization-overview/>.

3.1.6 Patient Cohort Included in the Testing and Analysis

2,402,578 Medicare patients, with a mean age of 72.83 (from 2,961,029 episodes) were included in the measure testing and analysis.

The patient population for the Asthma/COPD measure calculation consists of Medicare beneficiaries enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B (but not Part C) who receive medical care to manage asthma or COPD that triggers an Asthma/COPD episode. An Asthma/COPD episode is identified by a “trigger event,” which is the occurrence of 2 Part B Physician/Supplier (Carrier) claims billed by the same clinician group practice within 180 days of one another. These claims include:

- A trigger claim, which is a “primary care” Evaluation & Management (E&M) code with a relevant asthma or COPD diagnosis; and
- A confirming claim, which is either another “primary care” E&M code with a relevant asthma or COPD diagnosis, or a chronic condition-related Current Procedural Terminology/Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System (CPT/HCPSC) code for related services with a relevant asthma or COPD diagnosis.

Patients and their episodes were excluded from the sample if they met a set of exclusion criteria (listed below) meant to ensure completeness of data and to focus the measure on a clinically homogeneous cohort of patients receiving medical care to manage asthma or COPD.

The exclusion criteria are:

- The patient does not have Medicare as their primary payer for the entire episode window, as well as the 120-day lookback period prior to the episode window.
- The patient was not continuously enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B, and not enrolled in Part C, for the entirety of the episode window and the 120-day lookback period.
- The patient resided outside of the United States or its territories during the episode window.
- The patient was not found in the Medicare EDB.
- The patient has an episode window shorter than one year.
- The episode is an outlier case in the regression.
- The episode has no attributed clinician (only applied at the TIN-NPI level).
- The episode does not fall in any defined measure sub-groups (Asthma, COPD, Both Asthma and COPD).⁶⁰
- The patient had a prior long-term care hospital (LTCH) stay.
- The patient had cystic fibrosis.
- The patient had interstitial pulmonary fibrosis.
- The patient had prior lung cancer.
- The patient had prior lung surgery.
- The patient had prior lung transplant.
- The patient had stem cell transplant.
- The patient had sickle cell disease.

To determine whether the Asthma/COPD measure’s exclusion criteria distort patient characteristics on episodes, we produced and analyzed distributions of patient characteristics (age, race, sex, dual eligibility status, income, unemployment, hierarchical condition categories

⁶⁰ Sub-groups represent more granular, mutually exclusive and exhaustive patient populations defined by clinical criteria collected from claims found during a year of the patient’s data.

[HCCs]) for (i) episodes with exclusion criteria, (ii) episodes without exclusion criteria, (iii) patients with exclusion criteria, and (iv) patients without exclusion criteria.

This analysis shows that the Asthma/COPD measure's exclusion criteria have only a minimal effect on the percentage of patients in any particular demographic category. The difference between patients being excluded and included in the measure is 4.13 or less percentage points across each of the characteristics in the analysis at TIN level testing, and 5.70 or less percentage points at TIN-NPI level testing. To illustrate, the percentage of patients aged 65 to 69 is 20.43% without applying the exclusion criteria, compared to 19.95% after applying the exclusion criteria at the TIN level. Furthermore, the difference in the percentage of patients across race categories with and without the exclusion criteria is 2.45 or less percentage points at both the TIN and TIN-NPI level testing. When it comes to sex, there is a difference of 0.74 or less percentage points between the included and excluded populations with regards to the share of male and female patients (for TIN and TIN-NPI level testing). These results indicate that there is minimal shift in patient characteristics as a result of using the exclusion criteria listed above at both TIN and TIN-NPI level testing.

3.1.7 Social Risk Factors Included in Analysis

The social risk factors analyzed were variables from the ACS, EDB, and CME. ACS variables are either at the Census Block Group or Zone Improvement Plan (ZIP) code level. Social risk variables analyzed include the following:

- Race (EDB)
 - Asian, Black, Hispanic, North American Native, White, and Other
- Sex (EDB)
 - Female, male
- Dual status (CME)
 - Full dual, partial dual, non-dual to indicate whether a patient is dually enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid
- Income (ACS)
 - Low Income: median income < 33rd percentile nationally
 - Medium Income: median income in the interval spanning the 33rd percentile to the 66th percentile nationally
 - High Income: median income > 66th percentile
- Education (ACS)
 - Education < High School: when % with < high school education is the highest for a given Census Block Group
 - Education = High School: when % with only high school is the highest
 - Education > High School: when % with > high school is the highest
- Employment (ACS)
 - Unemployment Rate > 10%
 - Unemployment Rate <= 10%
- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Socioeconomic Status (SES) Index (ACS)
 - Continuous variable (composite score of multiple community-level metrics, such as property values, density of living spaces, and poverty level) that can theoretically range from 0 to 100⁶¹

⁶¹ Refer to Section 3, page 42 of [this AHRQ publication](#) for the scoring algorithm used to calculate the AHRQ SES index variable.

3.2 Reliability Testing

3.2.1 Level of Reliability Testing

The following levels of reliability were tested: critical data elements used in the measure and performance measure score (e.g., signal-to-noise analysis).

3.2.2 Method of Reliability Testing

Data Element Reliability

The Asthma/COPD measure is constructed using CMS claims data, as described in Section 3.1.2. CMS has implemented several auditing programs to assess overall claims code accuracy, ensure appropriate billing, and recoup any overpayments. CMS routinely conducts data analysis to identify potential problem areas and detect fraud, and audits important data fields used in this measure, including diagnosis and procedure codes and other elements that are consequential to payment. Specifically, CMS works with Zone Program Integrity Contractors, and formerly Program Safeguard Contractors, to ensure program integrity; the agency also uses Recovery Audit Contractors to identify and correct for underpayments and overpayments.

CMS also uses the Comprehensive Error Rate Testing (CERT) Program to ensure that Medicare payments are correct in accordance with coverage, coding, and billing rules. Between 2005 and 2019, CERT estimates that proper payment, which includes payments that met Medicare coverage, coding, and billing rules, ranged from 87.3% to 96.4% of total payments each year.⁶² The fiscal year 2020 Medicare fee-for-service program proper payment rate was 93.7%.⁶³ CMS continues to perform successful corrective actions and give providers additional education to ensure accurate billing.

To ensure claims completeness and inclusion of any corrections, the measure was developed and tested using data with a three month claims run-out from the end of the measurement period.

Measure Reliability

Measure reliability is the degree to which repeated measurements of the same entity agree with each other. For measures of clinician performance, the measured entity is the TIN or TIN-NPI, and reliability is the extent to which repeated measurements of the TIN or TIN-NPI give similar results. To estimate measure reliability, we used a signal-to-noise analysis.

This approach seeks to determine the extent to which variation in the measure is due to true, underlying clinician performance, rather than random variation (i.e., statistical noise) within clinicians due to the sample of cases observed. To achieve this, we calculate reliability scores as:

$$R_j = \frac{\sigma_b^2}{\sigma_b^2 + \sigma_{w_j}^2}$$

Where:

$\sigma_{w_j}^2$ is the within-group variance of the mean measure score of clinician j

σ_b^2 is the between-group variance of clinicians within the episode group

⁶² Comprehensive Error Rate Testing (CERT) Program. "Appendices Medicare Fee-for-Service 2020 Improper Payments Report". Table A6. <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/2020-medicare-fee-service-supplemental-improper-payment-data.pdf-1>.

⁶³ Ibid.

That is, reliability is calculated as the ratio of between-group variance to the sum of between-group variance and within-group variance. Reliability closer to a value of one indicates that the between-group variance is relatively large compared to the within-group variance, which suggests that the measure is effectively capturing the systematic differences between the clinician and their peer cohort.

3.2.3 Statistical Results from Reliability Testing

Measure Reliability

At the proposed case minimum of 20 episodes, the mean reliability for TINs is 0.67 and for TIN-NPIs is 0.60. The majority of TINs and TIN-NPIs meet or exceed 0.4 reliability at the 20 episode case minimum, with 88.2% of TINs and 81.7% of TIN-NPIs meeting or exceeding the 0.4 threshold.

3.2.4 Interpretation

Measure Reliability

The mean reliability of the Asthma/COPD measure exceeds 0.4 at the proposed case minimum of 20 episodes for both TINs and TIN-NPIs partly due to the large number of episodes attributed to clinicians at lower volume thresholds. CMS generally considers 0.4 as the threshold indicating 'moderate' reliability, which is supported by previous work into reliability and the threshold was finalized in the CY 2017 Quality Payment Program final rule.^{64,65} See the CY2021 Physician Fee Schedule (PFS) proposed rule for further discussion of cost measure reliability thresholds.

Though higher volume thresholds typically yield even higher reliability results, it is at the cost of further reducing the number of clinicians and clinician groups that are eligible to receive a measure score. The Asthma/COPD measure case minimum of 20 episodes was selected in part to strike a balance between these considerations.

3.3 Validity Testing

3.3.1 Level of Validity Testing

Our performance measure score validity testing included systematic assessment of both face validity and empirical validity testing.

3.3.2 Method of Validity Testing

Face Validity

The Asthma/COPD measure was developed through a structured, iterative process for gathering detailed input from recognized clinician experts on the measure. Experts in this clinical area evaluated specifications to ensure that each aspect of the measure (e.g., assigned services) was intentionally capturing only the costs of care within the reasonable influence of the attributed clinician for a defined patient population (i.e., the ability of the measure score to differentiate good from poor performance).

In developing this measure, Acumen incorporated input from:

- (i) a Chronic Condition Disease Management Clinical Subcommittee;
- (ii) an Asthma/COPD Clinician Expert Workgroup;

⁶⁴ Mathematica, Inc., "Memorandum: Reporting Period and Reliability of AHRQ, CMS 30-Day and HAC Quality Measures – Revised," http://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/hospital-value-based-purchasing/Downloads/HVBP_Measure_Reliability-.pdf.

⁶⁵ CMS, "CY 2017 Quality Payment Program final rule," [81 FR 77169-77170](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/11/01/2016-23268).

- (iii) a Technical Expert Panel (TEP); and
- (iv) person and family partners.

This process is detailed in the Episode-Based Cost Measures Development Process document posted on the [MACRA Feedback Page](#).⁶⁶

One of the key roles of the measure-specific Clinician Expert Workgroup was to develop service assignment rules for the cost measure. These service assignment rules are intended to ensure clinicians are evaluated on services and costs that are clinically related to the attributed clinician's role in managing asthma or COPD, thus limiting cost variation unrelated to clinician care this measure. Services performed in the following service categories are considered for assignment to the episode: outpatient (OP) facility and clinician services; ED; acute inpatient (IP) – medical; acute IP – surgical; inpatient rehabilitation facility (IRF); LTCH; durable medical equipment, prosthetics, orthotics, and supplies (DME); home health (HH); SNF; and Part D prescription drugs.

Empirical Validity Testing

We evaluated the empirical validity of the Asthma/COPD measure by examining correlation with known indicators of resource or service utilization based on a literature review, specifically complications related to asthma or COPD. For this analysis, we compared the ratio of observed over expected (O/E) spending at the provider level for Asthma/COPD episodes with and without complications. The analysis sought to confirm the expectation that the Asthma/COPD measure captures variation in service utilization as an indicator of clinician cost performance. We expect episodes with downstream acute readmissions or post-acute care (IRF, LTCH, HH, and SNF) would have higher O/E cost ratios, since complications like these should yield higher cost, even after accounting for patient clinical characteristics via risk adjustment. Conversely, episodes without these downstream costs should have lower O/E cost ratios, demonstrating that the measure can differentiate good from poor cost performance.

3.3.3 Statistical Results from Validity Testing

Table 2 below presents the results from the validity analysis. The mean O/E cost ratio for all episodes is 0.97. The mean O/E cost ratio for episodes with downstream acute readmission is 3.11, compared with 0.69 for episodes without downstream acute readmission. Similarly, the mean O/E cost ratio for episodes with post-acute care is 2.73, compared with 0.83 for episodes without post-acute care. Additionally, there is greater variation in the O/E cost ratio among episodes with downstream acute readmission and post-acute care.

Table 2: Distribution of Observed to Expected Ratios

Episode Type	Observed / Expected Ratio										
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Percentile								
			1st	5th	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	95th	99th
All Final Episodes	0.97	1.27	0.04	0.09	0.14	0.26	0.55	1.15	2.24	3.36	6.43
Episodes with Downstream Acute (Re)admission	3.11	2.01	0.66	0.97	1.20	1.74	2.62	3.90	5.58	6.99	10.46
Episodes without Downstream Acute (Re)admission	0.69	0.78	0.04	0.09	0.13	0.23	0.47	0.89	1.45	1.91	3.51

⁶⁶ CMS, "2020 Episode-Based Cost Measures Field Testing Wave 3 Measure Development Process," MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/macra-cmft-ebcm-process-2020.pdf>.

Episode Type	Observed / Expected Ratio										
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Percentile								
			1st	5th	10th	25th	50th	75th	90th	95th	99th
Episodes with Post-Acute Care (IRF LTCH HH SN)	2.73	2.11	0.28	0.50	0.69	1.22	2.24	3.63	5.30	6.79	10.35
Episodes without Post-Acute Care (IRF LTCH HH SN)	0.83	1.06	0.04	0.09	0.13	0.24	0.50	1.00	1.80	2.62	5.36

3.3.4 Interpretation

As expected, the average O/E cost ratios for episodes with complications (i.e., downstream acute readmissions and post-acute care) are higher than for episodes without downstream complications. These results demonstrate that the Asthma/COPD measure is able to accurately capture higher resource use, and suggests that episodes with complications (the frequency or severity of which could be reasonably expected to be influenced by the treatment of the attributed clinician or clinician group) will yield higher costs, even after risk adjustment.

3.4 Exclusions Analysis

3.4.1 Method of Testing Exclusions

Exclusions are used in the Asthma/COPD measure to ensure a comparable patient population within the scope of the measure's focus on the chronic management of asthma or COPD and that episodes provide meaningful information to attributed clinicians. Exclusions are also used as part of data processing so that sufficient data are available to accurately determine episode spending and calculate risk adjustment for each episode. For the exclusions analysis discussed in this section, we focused on exclusions added to ensure a homogenous patient population. These exclusions, along with their rationales, are listed below:

- Episodes where the patient's episode window length is less than one year.
 - These episodes were excluded because the methodology for the chronic measures requires at least one year of claims data to measure clinician cost performance during an open attribution window for a performance period. Additionally, this exclusion may capture episodes during which a patient died, given that there may be insufficient data for these episodes. However, episodes with a death event are still included as long as the episode window is at least one year long.
- Episodes where there is not an attributed clinician.
 - These episodes were excluded because the episode does not have any TIN-NPIs that billed at least 30% of "primary care" E&M codes with a relevant asthma or COPD diagnosis and/or chronic condition-related CPT/HCPSC codes for related services with a relevant asthma or COPD diagnosis on Part B Physician/Supplier (Carrier) claim lines during the episode within the attributed TIN. This exclusion only applies to episodes at the TIN-NPI level, while attributed TIN would continue to be attributed these episodes.
- Episodes where the patient is not in a defined measure sub-group.
 - These episodes were excluded because the patient's asthma or COPD diagnosis could not be determined based on their available claims data. Episodes are sub-grouped into Asthma, COPD, and Both Asthma and COPD to ensure clinical comparability so that the measure fairly compares clinicians with a similar patient case-mix.

- The following episode populations were excluded because they each make up a small group of the final episode population, are expected to be more clinically complex, and the variance in costs for these high-risk patient cohorts are expected to be higher and would likely not be adequately accounted for by risk adjustment:
 - Episodes where the patient had interstitial pulmonary fibrosis;
 - Episodes where the patient had prior lung cancer;
 - Episodes where the patient had a prior LTCH stay;
 - Episodes where the patient had a stem cell transplant;
 - Episodes where the patient had a prior lung transplant;
 - Episodes where the patient had sickle cell disease;
 - Episodes where the patient had cystic fibrosis; and
 - Episodes where the patient had prior lung surgery.
- Episodes classified as outlier cases.
 - To account for limitations of risk adjustment, episodes predicted to have expected costs that are substantially different from observed costs are excluded as outliers. Specifically, episodes with residuals from the risk adjustment model below the 1st percentile and above the 99th percentile are considered outliers and removed from measure calculation.

Given the rationales for these exclusions, we would expect these excluded episodes to have a different risk profile than the included episodes, such as a higher mean cost, or a different distribution of costs (e.g., a long tail of high-cost episodes). For the exclusions, we examined the number of episodes and patients affected, as well as the distributions of observed cost and ratio of observed over expected spending (calculated by applying existing risk factor coefficients to the excluded episodes) for excluded episodes. We then compared the cost characteristics of the excluded episodes to those of final episodes included in measure calculation to assess the distinctness between the 2 patient cohorts. A full list of the exclusions used for the Asthma/COPD measure is provided in the Measure Codes List available on the [MACRA Feedback Page](#).⁶⁷

3.4.2 Statistical Results from Testing Exclusions

Table 3 below presents observed cost statistics and O/E cost ratios for the Asthma/COPD measure exclusions. Cost statistics are also provided for the set of final episodes included in the Asthma/COPD measure for comparison, with a testing volume threshold of 20 episodes at the TIN and TIN-NPI levels. For the standard exclusions in the table below (i.e., episode length less than one year, no attributed clinician, no defined episode sub-group), these patient cohorts are excluded from the measure in order to assess episodes in the intended setting and by the measure's intended attribution approach.

⁶⁷ CMS, MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Payment-Program/Quality-Payment-Program/Give-Feedback>.

Table 3: Cost Statistics for Measure Exclusions*

Exclusion	Episodes		Observed Cost			O/E Cost Ratio		
	#	%	Mean	Percentile		Mean	Percentile	
				10 th	90 th		10 th	90 th
All Episodes Meeting Triggering Logic	3,534,273	100.00%	\$7,677	\$447	\$18,488	1.31	0.14	2.86
Episode Length Less Than One Year	171,927	4.86%	\$38,744	\$1,647	\$100,268	5.00	0.25	12.17
No Attributed Clinician (TIN-NPI Level)	401,618	11.36%	\$10,396	\$607	\$25,518	1.56	0.17	3.48
No Defined Measure Sub-Group	1,747	0.05%	\$1,377	\$131	\$3,300	1.00	1.00	1.00
Interstitial Pulmonary Fibrosis	138,248	3.91%	\$15,128	\$910	\$36,257	1.70	0.17	3.91
Prior Lung Cancer	115,757	3.28%	\$15,231	\$1,145	\$34,711	1.91	0.22	4.18
Prior LTCH Stay	12,461	0.35%	\$42,363	\$1,559	\$109,213	2.62	0.13	6.50
Stem Cell Transplant	3,084	0.09%	\$15,472	\$742	\$33,210	2.27	0.18	4.88
Prior Lung Transplant	2,116	0.06%	\$13,668	\$1,047	\$25,957	1.66	0.18	3.15
Sickle Cell Disease	1,991	0.06%	\$11,515	\$622	\$24,570	1.53	0.15	3.18
Cystic Fibrosis	1,284	0.04%	\$19,140	\$1,044	\$49,025	3.35	0.23	8.32
Prior Lung Surgery	1,218	0.03%	\$14,042	\$1,119	\$26,676	1.44	0.16	3.00
Outlier Cases	59,208	1.68%	\$19,264	\$812	\$42,319	4.59	0.08	12.07
Final Episodes (TIN)	2,688,034	76.06%	\$4,691	\$410	\$12,030	0.93	0.13	2.15
Final Episodes (TIN-NPI)	1,672,109	47.31%	\$4,530	\$419	\$11,461	0.91	0.13	2.08

*This table does not include all measure exclusions.

3.4.3 Interpretation

The statistical results indicate that the majority of excluded episodes differ substantially in both mean observed cost and mean O/E cost ratio and have larger variation compared to the final set of episodes. These results support the exclusion of these episodes to ensure a comparable patient cohort that will yield meaningful information to attributed clinicians. Further discussion of the results for exclusions applied based on the clinical validity of the study population are provided below.

Episodes where the patient had interstitial pulmonary fibrosis: These episodes present more cost and have a higher O/E cost ratio than the final set of episodes. The mean observed cost (\$15,128) is more than 3 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). This is also observed at the 90th percentile. The mean O/E cost ratio of these episodes is 1.70 compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level. Furthermore, these episodes have wider variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.17 at the 10th percentile and 3.91 at the 90th percentile, compared to the final episodes.

Episodes where the patient had prior lung cancer: These episodes present more cost and have a higher O/E cost ratio than the final set of episodes. These episodes have a mean observed cost (\$15,231) that is more than 3 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). This is also observed at the 90th percentile. The mean O/E cost ratio of these episodes is 1.91 compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level testing and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI levels. Finally, these episodes have wider variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.22 at the 10th percentile and 4.18 at the 90th percentile, as compared to the final episode population.

Episodes where the patient had a prior LTCH stay: These episodes present more cost and variation in the O/E cost ratio than the final set of episodes. The mean observed cost of these episodes (\$42,363) is approximately 8 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level), and this difference becomes more distinct at the 90th percentile with an observed cost of \$109,213 compared to approximately \$12,000 for the final episodes at the TIN and TIN-NPI levels. In addition, the mean O/E cost ratio is 2.62 (compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level), and the O/E cost ratio shows substantial variation (compared to the variation in the final episodes), ranging from 0.13 at the 10th percentile to 6.50 at the 90th percentile.

Episodes where the patient had a stem cell transplant: These episodes have a mean observed cost (\$15,472) that is more than 3 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). The mean O/E cost ratio of these episodes is 2.27 compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level. There is also substantial variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.18 at the 10th percentile and 4.88 at the 90th percentile.

Episodes where the patient had a prior lung transplant: These episodes present more cost, with a mean observed cost (\$13,668) that is more than 3 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). The mean O/E cost ratio of these episodes is 1.66 compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level. There is substantial variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.18 at the 10th percentile and 3.15 at the 90th percentile.

Episodes where the patient had sickle cell disease: These episodes have a mean observed cost (\$11,515) that is more than twice that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). This is also observed at the 90th percentile. The mean O/E cost ratio of these episodes is 1.53 compared to the final episodes at 0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level. There is also substantial variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.15 at the 10th percentile and 3.18 at the 90th percentile.

Episodes where the patient had cystic fibrosis: These episodes have a mean O/E cost ratio (3.35) that is substantially larger than for final episodes (0.93 at the TIN level and 0.91 at the TIN-NPI level). The difference in patient cohort becomes more pronounced at the 90th percentile, where the O/E cost ratio is 8.32, compared to 2.15 and 2.08 for final episodes at the TIN and TIN-NPI level, respectively.

Episodes where the patient had prior lung surgery: These episodes present more cost, with a mean observed cost (\$14,402) that is nearly 3 times that of the final set of episodes (\$4,691 at the TIN level and \$4,530 at the TIN-NPI level). There is also a substantial variation in the O/E cost ratio, ranging from 0.16 at the 10th percentile and 3.00 at the 90th percentile.

Episodes classified as outlier cases: The mean observed cost of these episodes is approximately 4 times greater than for the final set of episodes at both the TIN and TIN-NPI level testing. The O/E cost ratio ranges from 0.08 at the 10th percentile to 12.07 at the 90th percentile, indicating that the risk adjustment model is currently unable to account for the patient characteristics associated with these high- and low- cost outlier episodes. Excluding outliers based on risk-adjusted cost eliminates the episodes that deviate most from expected spending levels based on patient characteristics.

3.5 Risk Adjustment or Stratification

3.5.1 Method of Controlling for Differences

Differences in case mix are controlled for using a statistical risk model with 137 risk factors and stratification by 6 risk categories. These 6 risk categories account for the 3 episode sub-groups stratified by Part D enrollment status (either enrolled or not enrolled in Medicare Part D during the episode window).

The risk adjustment model for the Asthma/COPD measure broadly follows the CMS-HCC risk adjustment methodology, which is derived from Medicare Parts A and B claims and is used in the Medicare Advantage (MA) program. Patient age is included as 1 of 12 age categorical variables derived from the MA risk adjustment model's age/sex variables. Severity of illness is measured using HCCs, indicators of enrollment and long-term care status, and disease interactions. The risk adjustment model also includes dual Medicare and Medicaid eligibility status and variables for factors identified by the expert clinician workgroup as affecting resource use.

The model includes 79 HCC indicators derived from the patients' Parts A and B claims during the period 120 days prior to the episode trigger claim and are specified in the CMS-HCC Version 22 (V22) 2016 model. Episodes for patients without a full 120-day lookback period are excluded from the measure. This 120-day period is used to measure patient health status and ensures that each patient's claims record contains sufficient fee-for-service data both for measuring spending levels and for risk adjustment purposes.

In addition, the risk adjustment model includes status indicator variables for whether the patient qualifies for Medicare through Disability or ESRD. The model also includes an indicator of whether the patient recently required long-term care, defined as 90 days in a long-term care facility without being discharged to community for 14 days. Patients who need to reside in long-term care facilities typically require more intensive care than patients who live in the community. These enrollment and long-term care status variables are non-diagnostic indicators of severity of illness.

The model also accounts for disease interactions between HCCs and/or enrollment status variables included in the MA model. These interactions are included because certain combinations of comorbidities increase costs more than is predicted by the HCC indicators alone.

Furthermore, the risk adjustment model includes measure-specific factors intended to further isolate costs that attributed clinicians can reasonably influence, informed by expert clinician input and empirical analyses. The following variables were added to avoid potential unintended consequences:

- Whether the patient:
 - Had prior long-term systemic steroid use;
 - Had obstructive sleep apnea;
 - Had dementia;
 - Had a recent all-cause admission;
 - Had anxiety;
 - Had respiratory failure;
 - Had prior intubation for respiratory issue;
 - Was in a wheelchair;
 - Was obese;
 - Used home oxygen;
 - Used a home hospital bed;

- Received prior pulmonary rehabilitation; and
 - Smoked.
- Whether the patient had a recent asthma or COPD admission, specifically:
 - Had 1 recent asthma or COPD admission;
 - Had 2 to 3 recent asthma or COPD admissions; and
 - Had 4 and more recent asthma or COPD admissions.
- Whether the patient has a recent asthma or COPD emergency room (ER)/observation visit, specifically:
 - Had 1 recent asthma or COPD ER/observation visit;
 - Had 2 to 3 recent asthma or COPD ER/observation visits; and
 - Had 4 and more recent asthma or COPD ER/observation visits.

The risk adjustment approach for this measure uses an ordinary least squares linear regression model for each sub-group and Medicare Part D enrollment status combination to ensure fair comparison. The episode group's annualized observed costs are winsorized at the 1st and 99th percentiles prior to the regression for each model to handle extreme observations. Then, the predicted, or expected, cost is winsorized at 0.5th percentile to make sure episodes with unusually small predicted cost, which would lead to abnormally large O/E cost ratios, do not dominate certain clinicians' final score. The winsorized expected costs are renormalized to ensure the average expected episode cost is the same before and after winsorizing. Then, as presented in the exclusions analysis above, extremely low- or high-cost outlier episodes with residuals below the 1st percentile or above the 99th percentile are excluded to reduce the effect of episodes that deviate the most from their expected values in absolute terms. The expected cost after excluding these outliers is again renormalized to ensure that average expected costs are the same after outlier removal.

Finally, the risk adjustment model outlined above is stratified for each of the 3 Asthma/COPD measure sub-groups below:

- Asthma
- COPD
- Both Asthma and COPD

Once patients have been sub-grouped, episode sub-groups are stratified by a patient's Medicare Part D enrollment status (either enrolled or not enrolled in Part D). This means that for each measure-specific sub-group, a separate risk adjustment model is run for patients with and without Part D enrollment. This is done to account for differences in patient populations and their associated cost with and without Part D enrollment, and stratifying by Part D enrollment improves the model fit compared to not stratifying by enrollment status.

Full details of the risk adjustment model are in the Measure Codes List File.⁶⁸

3.5.2 Conceptual, Clinical, and Statistical Methods

We selected the CMS-HCC model based on previous studies evaluating its appropriateness for use in risk adjusting Medicare claims data. This model was developed specifically for use in the Medicare population, meaning that it accounts for conditions found in the Medicare population and is calibrated on Medicare fee-for-service beneficiaries. In addition, the CMS-HCC model is routinely updated for changes in coding practices (e.g., the transition from the 9th revision of the International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems, or ICD-9, to ICD-10 codes) and is exhaustive on these code sets. Because the CMS-HCC model has

⁶⁸ CMS, MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Payment-Program/Quality-Payment-Program/Give-Feedback>.

already been extensively tested, we focus our testing on how the CMS-HCC model was adapted to the Asthma/COPD measure methodology.

The Clinician Expert Workgroup provided input on measure-specific risk adjusters after reviewing empirical analyses on subpopulations of interest to assess whether and if so, how, particular factors should be accounted for in the model. These could include patient characteristics, factors outside of the reasonable influence of the clinician, or any other factors that would help prevent unintended consequences. These additional risk adjusters are listed in the section above.

As previously noted, the risk adjustment model is run on episodes stratified into episode sub-groups, which may qualify as "ordering" of risk factors. Episode sub-groups were also determined based on the workgroup's input, with the goal of ensuring clinical comparability among episodes so that the cost measure fairly compares clinicians with similar patient case-mix. The episode sub-groups are listed in the above section. Patients with the majority of their diagnosis (equal to or greater than 85%) belonging to asthma or COPD were separated into different episode sub-groups (Asthma sub-group or COPD sub-group), since these are considered different patient cohorts with different cost patterns and risk profiles, and patients with both asthma and COPD as their prevalent diagnoses are defined as the third episode sub-group (Both Asthma and COPD sub-group) considering the complexity of both existing conditions.

3.5.3 Conceptual Model of Impact of Social Risks

Our conceptual model of the impact of social risk factors is informed by both published external research and our own data analysis.^{69,70,71}

3.5.4 Statistical Results

The literature has extensively tested the use of the HCC model as applied to Medicare claims data. Although the variables in the HCC model were chosen to predict annual cost, CMS has also used this risk adjustment model in a number of other settings (e.g., Accountable Care Organizations (ACOs), previous physician Quality and Resource Use Reports (QRUR) programs, and other measures such as the National Quality Forum (NQF) #3512: Knee Arthroplasty, NQF #3509: Routine Cataract Removal with Intraocular Lens (IOL) Implantation, NQF #3510: Screening/Surveillance Colonoscopy, and NQF #2158: MSPB Hospital cost measures). Recalling that the risk model relies on the existing CMS-HCC model, testing results for factors included in the CMS-HCC V22 2016 model can be found in the Evaluation of the CMS-HCC Risk-Adjustment Model report⁷² and the Report to Congress: Risk Adjustment in Medicare Advantage.⁷³ For measure-specific factors not included in the CMS-HCC model, we sought expert clinician input through the workgroup, which provided recommendations on additional risk adjusters and episode sub-groups.

⁶⁹ Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Planning and Evaluation. Report to Congress: Social Risk Factors and Performance Under Medicare's Value-Based Purchasing Programs. Washington, D.C. December 2016.

⁷⁰ Chen LM, Epstein AM, Orav EJ, Filice CE, Samson LW, Joynt Maddox KE. Association of Practice-Level Social and Medical Risk With Performance in the Medicare Physician Value-Based Payment Modifier Program. JAMA. 2017;318(5):453-461

⁷¹ Medicare Payment Advisory Commission. Beneficiaries Dually Eligible for Medicare and Medicaid. 2018; <https://www.macpac.gov/publication/data-book-beneficiaries-dually-eligible-for-medicare-and-medicaid-3/>.

⁷² Pope, Gregory C., John Kautter, et al., "Evaluation of the CMS-HCC Risk-Adjustment Model: Final Report." RTI International: March 2011.

⁷³ CMS, "Report to Congress: Risk Adjustment in Medicare Advantage," <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Health-Plans/MedicareAdvtgSpecRateStats/Downloads/RTC-Dec2018.pdf>.

3.5.5 Analyses and Interpretation in Selection of Social Risk Factors

Acumen analyzed sex, dual status, income, education, and unemployment as social risk factors (more information on these variables can be found in Section 3.1.7). Patient sex and dual status were obtained from the EDB and CME. Information on income, education, and unemployment was obtained from ACS data and linked to episodes by census block group where possible to provide a more granular level of analysis than ZIP code. Patients without geographic information necessary to obtain ACS data were excluded, representing less than 2% of episodes.

The percentage of female patients range from 49.29 to 72.21% across the 3 episode sub-groups, stratified by Part D enrollment, in this measure. The Asthma sub-group has a larger percentage of female patients, which is supported by current literature suggesting there are sex effects and differences in the incidence and severity of asthma, where women have a higher prevalence and more severe cases of asthma.⁷⁴ The COPD sub-group has a lower percentage of female patients, which could be explained by potential under-diagnosis of COPD among women.⁷⁵ The majority of the patients (51.60 to 99.47%) have non-dual status. Income level is categorized into high, medium, and low from the continuous average income variable in ACS; therefore, each category has 33% of observations. While 1.32 to 3.15% of patients are classified below a high school education level, the overwhelming majority of episodes are classified at a high school level or greater. Finally, 16.51 to 20.11% of patients have high unemployment designation (>10%).

Acumen examined the impact of including social risk factors into our risk adjustment model by running goodness of fit tests when different risk factors are added and compared to the base risk adjustment model, where the base risk adjustment model refers to the full standard set of risk adjustment variables from the CMS-HCC V22 2016 model, disability status, ESRD status, interaction variables, recent long-term care use, and measure-specific clinical risk adjusters. Acumen ran a step-wise regression to include the following additional social risk factors on top of the adapted CMS-HCC model:

- Sex
- Dual status
- Sex + dual status
- Sex + dual status + race
- Sex + dual status + income + education + unemployment
- Sex + dual status + AHRQ SES index score
- Sex + dual status + race + income + education + unemployment
- Sex + dual status + race + AHRQ SES index score

The step-wise regressions help evaluate individual as well as joint significance of the social risk factors. We examined the impact of including social risk factors into our risk adjustment model with T-test of individual significance and F-test of joint significance.

Our analysis of the correlation between Asthma/COPD measure scores calculated with and without the social risk factors found that measure scores calculated with and without these social factors were highly correlated. At the TIN and TIN-NPI levels, Spearman correlations coefficient were 0.99.

⁷⁴ Zein, Joe G., Serpil C. Erzurum. "Asthma is Different in Women." *Current Allergy and Asthma Reports* 15, no. 6 (2015): 28.

⁷⁵ Chapman, Kenneth R. "Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: Are Women More Susceptible Than Men?" *Clinics in Chest Medicine* 25, no. 2 (2004): 331-341.

3.5.6 Methods for Statistical Model or Stratification Development

To analyze the validity of the current risk adjustment model, we examined 2 analyses: (1) R-squared and adjusted R-squared for the regression models, and (2) predictive ratios and O/E cost ratios to examine the fit of the models at different levels of patient complexity.

- 1) R-squared and adjusted R-squared were calculated for the measure. These results should be evaluated in the context of the measure's service assignment rules which are intended to ensure only clinically associated costs are grouped to episodes. This is an important distinction from all-cost measures as service assignment leaves less variation for the risk adjustment model to explain. In this context, a low R-squared may indicate the effectiveness of the service assignment rules. These results are provided in Section 3.5.7.
- 2) Predictive ratios and O/E cost ratios were calculated for each "risk decile" for the episode group. A "risk decile" is based on the risk scores, which indicate how costly episodes are expected to be, as predicted through risk adjustment. After arranging episodes into deciles based on their risk score, we calculated the predictive ratios and average O/E cost ratios for each decile. The predictive ratio aims to examine the fit of the model at different levels of patient complexity to examine the model's ability to predict both very low and high cost episodes, and is calculated using the formula of average (expected cost)/average (observed cost) for all episodes in each decile. Similarly, the O/E cost ratio demonstrates the model's prediction accuracy, and is calculated using the formula of average (observed cost/expected cost) for all episodes in each decile. These are discussed in Sections 3.5.8 and 3.5.9.

3.5.7 Statistical Risk Model Discrimination Statistics

The overall R-squared for the Asthma/COPD cost measure, calculated by dividing explained sum of squares by total sum of squares is 0.21. The adjusted R-squared is 0.21. More information on discrimination testing for the CMS-HCC model can be found at Pope et al. 2011.⁷⁶

3.5.8 Statistical Risk Model Calibration Statistics

We interpret calibration as how accurately the risk model's predictions match the actual episode cost. We calculate the average O/E cost ratio for each risk decile to demonstrate the model's prediction accuracy. Across all episodes, the average O/E cost ratio is 1.00, with average ratios ranging from 1.00 (10th risk decile) to 1.02 (1st decile). In risk deciles below the 5th risk decile, average O/E cost ratios range from 1.00 to 1.02, while the 5th to 10th risk deciles have average ratios ranging from 0.99 to 1.01. Full results are available in the National Summary Data Report (NSDR) addendum on the [MACRA Feedback Page](#).⁷⁷

3.5.9 Statistical Risk Model Calibration – Risk Decile

Analysis of predictive ratios by risk decile for the measure shows that the model has consistent predictive ratios across risk score deciles, with each decile having a predictive ratio between 0.98 and 1.02. The average predictive ratio is 1.00.

3.5.10 Interpretation

The R-squared values for the model, which measure how much variation in the observed cost is accounted for by the model, are higher than the values presented in similar analyses of risk

⁷⁶ Pope, Gregory C., John Kautter, et al., "Evaluation of the CMS-HCC Risk-Adjustment Model: Final Report." RTI International: March 2011.

⁷⁷ CMS, MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Payment-Program/Quality-Payment-Program/Give-Feedback>.

adjustment models.⁷⁸ As noted in Section 3.5.6, these results should be interpreted alongside service assignment rules, which remove clinically unrelated services, so the resulting variation is reflective of variation related to factors within a clinician's reasonable influence.

As demonstrated in Sections 3.5.8 and 3.5.9, the average O/E cost ratios and the predictive ratios for all risk deciles are very close to one. Predictive ratios close to one indicate that expected spending is accurately predicting observed spending, regardless of overall risk level.

3.6 Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance

3.6.1 Method

Our method of determining clinically meaningful differences in episode-based cost measure performance consists of stratifying clinician measure O/E cost ratios by meaningful characteristics and investigating the clinician O/E cost ratio distribution by percentile. The cost measure score numerator is the sum of the O/E cost ratio for all episodes attributed to a clinician. This sum is then multiplied by the national average observed episode cost to generate a dollar figure. The denominator is the total number of episodes from the attributed to a clinician. Using O/E cost ratios allows for direct comparisons of performance at the episode sub-group level since a dollar figure cannot be calculated for those episodes using the national average observed episode cost. Stratification is performed for each of the following characteristics: urban/rural, census division, census region, risk score, and the number of episodes attributed to the clinician or clinician group. We analyze the distribution of measure O/E cost ratios for clinicians defined by these characteristics.

The purpose of this analysis is to ensure that there is a sufficiently large difference in measure O/E cost ratios among clinicians to determine a meaningful difference in performance. In addition, this analysis looks to confirm that the measure behaves as expected with respect to meaningful clinician characteristics.

3.6.2 Statistical Results

Key findings show that, generally, there is a large performance difference among clinicians in the Asthma/COPD measure:

- (i) The 99th percentile of the measure O/E cost ratio is over 4 times the measure O/E cost ratio at the 1st percentile for both the TIN level and TIN-NPI levels; and
- (ii) The O/E cost ratio at the 90th percentile is approximately 107.94% and 121.67% greater than the O/E cost ratio at the 10th percentile at both the TIN and TIN-NPI levels, respectively.

These results, in conjunction with the measure reliability results presented in Section 3.2.3 that show most of the variation is among providers, indicate there is a large potential for Medicare cost savings.

In terms of regional difference in clinician O/E cost ratios, clinicians in urban areas seem to perform comparable to those in rural areas. Similarly, the mean O/E cost ratios for clinicians across the 4 census regions (excluding 'Unknown') are within a 0.05 or less range (i.e., 0.94-0.99 at the TIN level and 0.94-0.98 at the TIN-NPI level), indicating minimal to no variation. The mean O/E cost ratios for clinicians across 9 census divisions (excluding 'Unknown') are within a

⁷⁸ Pope, Gregory C., John Kautter, Melvin J. Ingber, Sara Freeman, Rishi Sekar, and Cordon Newhart. "Evaluation of the CMS-HCC Risk-Adjustment Model: Final Report." RTI International: March 2011.

0.11 range at the TIN level (0.93-1.04) and within a 0.09 range at the TIN-NPI level (0.94-1.03), indicating some/moderate variation.

In terms of other clinician characteristics, analysis of clinicians by number of episodes indicates that clinicians with more episodes perform similarly to those with fewer episodes. We also analyzed clinicians by risk score decile, as variation by risk score decile could indicate that the risk adjustment model is over- or under-correcting for clinicians with systematically riskier patients. Measure O/E cost ratios show some/moderate variation by risk score decile, with a range in mean TIN O/E cost ratio of 0.91 to 1.09 and a range in mean TIN-NPI O/E cost ratio of 0.89 to 1.06.

Tables 4-A and 4-B below present the distribution of cost measure O/E cost ratios by a range of clinician/clinician group characteristics, allowing a comparison of O/E cost ratio distributions for these breakdowns. The measure O/E cost ratios are presented at the TIN level (Table 4-A) and the TIN-NPI level (Table 4-B).

Table 4-A: Asthma/COPD TIN Level Cost Measure O/E Cost Ratios

Characteristic	# of TINs	Mean O/E Ratio	O/E Percentile				
			1st	10th	50th	90th	99th
All TINs	19,876	0.97	0.40	0.63	0.96	1.31	1.78
Episode Sub-group							
Asthma	18,607	0.95	0.12	0.38	0.84	1.54	3.37
Both Asthma and COPD	19,593	0.98	0.19	0.45	0.89	1.55	2.92
COPD	19,707	0.98	0.28	0.55	0.95	1.40	2.26
Urban/Rural							
Urban	15,882	0.97	0.40	0.62	0.96	1.31	1.79
Rural	3,991	0.95	0.43	0.63	0.93	1.27	1.72
Unknown	3	0.90	0.78	0.78	0.80	1.11	1.11
Census Region							
Northeast	3,697	0.97	0.38	0.63	0.96	1.31	1.74
Midwest	3,465	0.99	0.44	0.64	0.99	1.32	1.74
South	8,827	0.97	0.43	0.64	0.95	1.31	1.81
West	3,813	0.94	0.37	0.60	0.92	1.29	1.76
Unknown	74	0.65	0.19	0.40	0.59	1.04	1.85
Census Division							
New England	854	1.04	0.44	0.70	1.04	1.35	1.74
Middle Atlantic	2,843	0.95	0.37	0.61	0.94	1.29	1.74
East North Central	2,673	0.98	0.44	0.63	0.98	1.31	1.74
West North Central	792	1.02	0.43	0.68	1.01	1.34	1.72
South Atlantic	4,745	0.96	0.44	0.63	0.94	1.29	1.82
East South Central	1,621	0.95	0.42	0.63	0.94	1.26	1.68
West South Central	2,461	1.01	0.43	0.65	0.98	1.37	1.84
Mountain	1,277	0.97	0.47	0.64	0.94	1.31	1.85
Pacific	2,536	0.93	0.34	0.58	0.91	1.28	1.72
Unknown	74	0.65	0.19	0.40	0.59	1.04	1.85
TIN risk score decile							
1st	1,987	0.93	0.35	0.55	0.91	1.33	1.84
2nd	1,988	0.91	0.38	0.55	0.87	1.30	1.85

Characteristic	# of TINs	Mean O/E Ratio	O/E Percentile				
			1st	10th	50th	90th	99th
3rd	1,988	0.92	0.40	0.61	0.89	1.27	1.80
4th	1,987	0.93	0.41	0.61	0.92	1.25	1.67
5th	1,988	0.95	0.42	0.64	0.94	1.25	1.70
6th	1,988	0.96	0.43	0.64	0.96	1.27	1.82
7th	1,987	0.96	0.42	0.64	0.95	1.26	1.67
8th	1,988	1.00	0.42	0.67	0.99	1.30	1.77
9th	1,988	1.02	0.44	0.69	1.01	1.33	1.74
10th	1,987	1.09	0.51	0.75	1.07	1.42	1.90
Number of episodes							
10-19 Episodes	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-39 Episodes	8,537	0.96	0.39	0.58	0.92	1.38	1.90
40-59 Episodes	3,463	0.94	0.39	0.61	0.92	1.30	1.73
60-79 Episodes	1,886	0.94	0.40	0.63	0.92	1.27	1.61
80-99 Episodes	1,145	0.96	0.43	0.67	0.95	1.26	1.59
100-199 Episodes	2,279	0.98	0.46	0.70	0.98	1.26	1.51
200-299 Episodes	835	1.01	0.54	0.79	1.00	1.24	1.47
300+ Episodes	1,731	1.03	0.70	0.87	1.03	1.19	1.36

Table 4-B: Asthma/COPD TIN-NPI Cost Measure O/E Ratios

Characteristic	# of TIN-NPIs	Mean O/E Ratio	O/E Percentile				
			1st	10th	50th	90th	99th
All TIN-NPIs	33,797	0.96	0.40	0.60	0.94	1.33	1.82
Episode Sub-group							
Asthma	31,600	0.95	0.12	0.36	0.81	1.64	3.46
Both Asthma and COPD	33,145	0.96	0.16	0.39	0.84	1.62	3.19
COPD	33,417	0.97	0.28	0.53	0.92	1.42	2.28
Urban/Rural							
Urban	27,791	0.97	0.40	0.60	0.94	1.34	1.82
Rural	6,004	0.93	0.42	0.59	0.90	1.29	1.77
Unknown	2	0.96	0.80	0.80	0.96	1.11	1.11
Census Region							
Northeast	6,260	0.97	0.37	0.60	0.95	1.34	1.82
Midwest	6,919	0.98	0.41	0.62	0.96	1.36	1.85
South	15,175	0.95	0.42	0.61	0.92	1.32	1.80
West	5,369	0.94	0.38	0.58	0.92	1.33	1.80
Unknown	74	0.62	0.19	0.39	0.56	1.03	1.83
Census Division							
New England	1,769	1.03	0.42	0.67	1.01	1.41	1.95
Middle Atlantic	4,491	0.95	0.37	0.58	0.92	1.32	1.80
East North Central	5,145	0.98	0.41	0.61	0.96	1.35	1.85
West North Central	1,774	1.00	0.43	0.64	0.99	1.38	1.88

Characteristic	# of TIN-NPIs	Mean O/E Ratio	O/E Percentile				
			1st	10th	50th	90th	99th
South Atlantic	8,607	0.94	0.43	0.60	0.91	1.31	1.79
East South Central	2,838	0.94	0.40	0.59	0.91	1.29	1.79
West South Central	3,730	0.98	0.42	0.62	0.96	1.36	1.84
Mountain	1,932	0.95	0.43	0.62	0.93	1.31	1.78
Pacific	3,437	0.94	0.36	0.57	0.91	1.34	1.80
Unknown	74	0.62	0.19	0.39	0.56	1.03	1.83
TIN-NPI risk score decile							
1st	3,379	0.94	0.35	0.54	0.91	1.37	1.90
2nd	3,380	0.89	0.37	0.54	0.84	1.30	1.88
3rd	3,380	0.89	0.40	0.57	0.85	1.27	1.86
4th	3,380	0.91	0.39	0.58	0.88	1.28	1.79
5th	3,379	0.93	0.41	0.60	0.90	1.29	1.72
6th	3,380	0.96	0.42	0.61	0.94	1.30	1.80
7th	3,380	0.98	0.43	0.63	0.96	1.33	1.78
8th	3,380	1.00	0.43	0.67	0.99	1.35	1.76
9th	3,380	1.02	0.45	0.68	1.02	1.36	1.80
10th	3,379	1.06	0.47	0.71	1.03	1.41	1.85
Number of episodes							
10-19 Episodes	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
20-39 Episodes	20,594	0.95	0.39	0.58	0.90	1.36	1.90
40-59 Episodes	6,011	0.95	0.40	0.62	0.92	1.30	1.74
60-79 Episodes	2,572	0.96	0.42	0.62	0.95	1.30	1.64
80-99 Episodes	1,416	1.01	0.45	0.68	1.01	1.32	1.61
100-199 Episodes	2,439	1.04	0.45	0.75	1.05	1.30	1.51
200-299 Episodes	545	1.05	0.51	0.83	1.05	1.26	1.55
300+ Episodes	220	1.02	0.40	0.84	1.01	1.22	1.49

3.6.3 Interpretation

The results in Tables 4-A and 4-B above indicate that there is no notable variation in the mean cost measure O/E cost ratio across episode sub-groups and the urban/rural divide at both the TIN and TIN-NPI levels. For each characteristic, the largest difference in the mean O/E cost ratio across categories was 0.07 or less. Census division and episode volume showed some moderate variation in mean O/E cost ratio at the TIN and TIN-NPI levels with variation in the mean O/E cost ratios of ranging from 0.09 to 0.11. Generally, this indicates that the risk adjustment model is functioning as intended overall; it is adjusting cost performance such that there are no substantive differences across the categories for these characteristics. For sub-groups, the model is run separately for each episode sub-group to account for a more fair comparison across episodes in the Asthma, COPD, and both Asthma and COPD sub-groups. These results also support that there is meaningful variation in cost performance, even after risk adjustment, across these characteristics. Overall, these results indicate that there is large potential for saving Medicare spending and that there are generally no systemic differences across geographic region, episode sub-groups, and case volume.

For TIN or TIN-NPI risk score decile, the difference in mean O/E cost ratio across categories was 0.18 at the TIN level (range: 0.91 to 1.09) and 0.17 at the TIN-NPI level (range: 0.89 to

1.06). The lower values within the ranges of measure scores by risk score decile generally appear in the lower risk deciles at the TIN and TIN-NPI levels, and the higher values appear in the higher risk deciles at the TIN and TIN-NPI levels. This means that at both reporting levels, as the TIN or TIN-NPI risk score decile increases, the mean O/E cost ratio also increases. This variation indicates that the current risk adjustment model may not adequately capture the impact of certain risk factors on clinician or clinician group performance, particularly among clinicians or clinician groups with especially low- and high-risk patient populations.

3.7 Missing Data Analysis and Minimizing Bias

3.7.1 Method

Since CMS uses Medicare claims data to calculate the Asthma/COPD measure, Acumen expects a high degree of data completeness. To further ensure that we have complete and accurate data for each patient who opens an episode, Acumen excludes episodes where the patient was not found in the Medicare EDB, the patient resided outside of the United States or its territories during the episode window.

The Asthma/COPD measure also excludes episodes where the patient is enrolled in Medicare Part C or has a primary payer other than Medicare in the 120-day lookback period and episode window. In such situations, Medicare Parts A and B claims data may not capture the complete clinical profile for the patient needed to capture the clinical risk of the patient in risk adjustment. Furthermore, Parts A and B claims data may not capture all Medicare resource use if some portion of the patient's care is covered under Medicare Part C.

3.7.2 Missing Data Analysis

Table 5 below presents the frequency of missing data across the 4 categories of missing data which caused episodes to be excluded from the Asthma/COPD measure. Frequency is presented in terms of the number of episodes excluded due to missing data, as well as the number of TINs and TIN-NPIs who had at least one episode excluded due to missing data. The missing data categories are:

- Patient was not found in the Medicare EDB
- Patient has a primary payer other than Medicare during the episode window or in the 120-day lookback period
- Patient was not enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B, or was enrolled in Part C, during the 120-day lookback period and episode window
- Patient resided outside of the United States or its territories during the episode window

Table 5: Missing Data Categories for the Asthma/COPD Measure

Exclusion	# Episodes	# TINs	# TIN-NPIs
Not Found in Medicare EDB	*	*	*
Other Primary Payer	481,265	37,047	121,770
Not Continuously Enrolled	487,619	37,251	122,137
Resided Outside of U.S. or Territories	4,530	2,692	3,582

*Indicates that there were fewer than 11 episodes.

3.7.3 Interpretation

As the Asthma/COPD measure is calculated with Medicare claims data, Acumen expects a high degree of data completeness, which is supported by the limited frequency (relative to the overall scale of this measure) of missing data as noted above. Acumen takes measures to ensure that missing or inaccurate information in claims data is not included in the cost measure.

4.0 Feasibility

4.1 Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes

The data elements used in this measure are generated, collected and/or used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care (e.g., blood pressure, laboratory values, diagnosis, depression score). The data collected during care provision are then translated into the appropriate coding system (e.g. ICD-10 diagnoses, MS-DRGs) for use in Medicare claims.

4.2 Electronic Sources

All data elements are in defined fields in electronic claims.

4.3 Data Collection Strategy

4.3.1 Data Collection Strategy Difficulties

Lessons and associated modifications may be categorized into three types: data collection procedures, handling of missing data, and sampling data associated with beneficiaries who died during an episode of care.

4.3.1.1 Data Collection

Acumen receives claims data directly from the Common Working File (CWF) maintained at the CMS Baltimore Data Center. Medicare claims are submitted by healthcare providers to a Medicare Administrative Contractor (MAC), and are subsequently added to the CWF. However, these claims may be denied or disputed by the MAC, leading to changes to historical CWF data. In rare circumstances, finalizing claims may take many months, or even years. As a result, it is not practical to wait until all claims for a given month are finalized before calculating this measure. As such, there is a trade-off between efficiency (accessing the data in a timely manner) and accuracy (waiting until most claims are finalized) when determining the length of the time (i.e., the “claims run-out” period) after which to pull claims data. To determine the appropriate claims run-out period, Acumen has performed testing on the delay between claim service dates and claims data finalization. Based on this analysis, Acumen uses a run-out period of three months after the end of the calendar year to collect data for development and testing purposes. If this measure is used in a CMS program, calculation and reporting would be done in line with that program’s reporting practices.

4.3.1.2 Missing Data

This measure requires complete beneficiary information, and a small number of episodes with missing data are excluded to ensure completeness of data and accurate comparability across episodes. For example, episodes where the beneficiary was not enrolled in Medicare Parts A and B for the 120 days prior to the episode start date are not included in this measure. This enables the risk adjustment model to accurately adjust for the beneficiary’s comorbidities using data from the previous 120 days of Medicare claims. Additionally, the risk adjustment model includes a categorical variable for beneficiary age bracket, so episodes for which the beneficiary’s date of birth cannot be located are not included in this measure.

4.3.1.3 Sampling

During measure testing, Acumen noted that episodes in which the beneficiary died prior to the episode end date exhibited different cost distributions compared to other episodes. To avoid this effect’s potential impact on clinician scores, this measure does not include episodes for which the beneficiary’s date of death occurs prior to the end of the episode window.

5.0 Usability and Use

5.1 Use

5.1.1 Current and Planned Use

The measure was developed for potential use in MIPS, under a contract with CMS.

5.1.2 Feedback on the Measure and Development Process

5.1.2.1 Technical Assistance Provided During Development or Implementation

Development: Field Testing

Acumen and CMS conducted a national field test of 5 episode-based cost measures developed in 2019 and 2020, including the Asthma/COPD measure, for a 5-week comment period (August 17 to September 18, 2020). We provided a Field Test Report to a sample of clinician groups and clinicians.⁷⁹ Field Test Reports were provided for each measure that a clinician or clinician group was attributed 10 or more acute inpatient medical condition and procedural episodes or 20 chronic condition episodes. This testing sample was selected to balance coverage and reliability, since a key goal of field testing was to test the measures with as many stakeholders as possible. This sampling technique was used for field testing only and is not indicative of the case minimums used for any potential program implementation.

All stakeholders, including those who did not qualify to receive a Field Test Report, could review a series of mock reports that were representative of each measure and reporting type. Other public documentation posted during field testing included: measure specifications for each measure (comprising a Draft Cost Measure Methodology document and a Draft Measure Codes List file), a Measure Development Process document, a Frequently Asked Questions document, and a Fact Sheet.⁸⁰ During field testing, Acumen conducted education and outreach activities for stakeholders including multiple office hours sessions with specialty societies, a publicly posted field testing webinar recording, and Quality Payment Program Help Desk support.

5.1.2.2 Technical Assistance with Results

Field Testing

During the feedback period, 1,558 Field Test Reports for episode-based cost measures were downloaded by 1,013 clinician groups (TINs) and 545 clinicians (TIN-NPIs). Stakeholder comments from field testing were summarized for the Clinician Expert Workgroup to consider in recommending refinements to the measures based on the testing data and feedback.

The following sections offer more details on the contents of each report and describe the education and outreach efforts associated with the field testing feedback period.

Data Provided During Field Testing

Each Field Test Report contained:

- Detailed performance results for the attributed measure, including metrics of cost measure score and a breakdown of episode cost compared to the national average and TIN/TIN-NPIs with a similar patient case mix (or risk profile)
- Drill-down detail for each measure, including more detailed information on potential cost drivers in the TIN/TIN-NPI's episodes. For example:

⁷⁹ The field test reports were available for download from the Quality Payment Program website: <https://qpp.cms.gov/login>.

⁸⁰ The Measure Development Process, Frequently Asked Questions, and Fact Sheet documents are posted on the MACRA Feedback Page: <https://www.cms.gov/Medicare/Quality-Initiatives-Patient-Assessment-Instruments/Value-Based-Programs/MACRA-MIPS-and-APMs/MACRA-Feedback.html>.

- Analysis of utilization and cost for the measure by specific service categories (e.g., outpatient evaluation and management services, procedures, and therapy, hospital inpatient services, emergency room services, post-acute services)
- Breakdown of costs for Physician/Supplier Part B and inpatient claims (e.g., top 5 most billed services and by risk bracket)
- Accompanying episode-level Comma Separated Value (CSV) file with detailed information for all episodes attributed to the TIN/TIN-NPI. This file provides detailed information on every episode used to calculate your measure score, which includes winsorized observed cost, risk-adjusted cost, facilities and clinicians rendering care, the share of cost by service setting, and the patient relationship code (PRC) on the trigger/reaffirming claim line

Mock Field Test Reports for each measure type that was field tested in 2020 were available for download by eligible clinicians and clinician groups from the CMS MACRA Feedback webpage.⁸¹

Education and Outreach

Acumen directly conducted outreach via email to tens of thousands of stakeholders using the stakeholder contact list developed through previous education and outreach and clinician engagement efforts, as well as CMS, Quality Payment Program listservs.

Acumen and CMS hosted two office hours sessions between July and August 2020, to provide an overview of field testing to specialty societies, discuss what information their members would be particularly interested in, and answer any questions. Across both office hours sessions, there were over 35 attendees from targeted specialty societies.

Acumen worked closely with Quality Payment Program Service Center to respond to stakeholder inquiries during field testing and continued to answer questions after the feedback period ended.

Acumen and CMS posted the MACRA Wave 3 Cost Measures Field Testing Webinar to the Quality Payment Program Webinar Library at the start of the field testing period.⁸² The webinar recording, slides, and transcript were available for stakeholders to review throughout field testing. The webinar presentation outlined: (i) the cost measure field testing project (ii) the measure development and re-evaluation processes, and (iii) field testing activities. The webinar recording was viewed approximately 450 times during the field testing period.

5.1.2.3 Feedback on Measure Performance and Implementation

Field Testing

For the duration of field testing, stakeholders were invited to provide feedback by completing an online survey or submitting a comment letter. In total, Acumen received 24 survey responses and 13 comment letters, including from specialty societies representing large numbers of potentially attributed clinicians. An additional 22 comments from person and family representatives were received through the Cost Measures Questionnaire for Person and Family Input distributed by Acumen's project partner, PFCCpartners, to their Patient Family Advisory (PFA) network.

⁸¹ CMS, "Mock Field Test Reports," MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/files/zip/macra-2020-cmft-mock-reports.zip>.

⁸² MACRA Wave 3 Cost Measures Field Testing Webinar materials are available on the Quality Payment Program Webinar Library: <https://qpp.cms.gov/about/webinars>.

Survey responses and comment letters were collected via an online survey, which contained general and detailed questions on the reports themselves, questions on the supplemental documentation, and questions on the measure specifications.

Pre-Rulemaking

CMS received 29 comments on the 5 episode-based cost measures included in the Measures Under Consideration List released in December 2020. This included 7 comments for the Asthma/COPD measure. After the Measure Applications Partnership (MAP) Clinician Expert Workgroup meeting in January 2021, there was another public comment period on their preliminary recommendations, which received 25 comments across the 5 measures, with 5 comments specific to the Asthma/COPD measure.⁸³ These public comment periods were facilitated by NQF. Stakeholders were able to submit their comments via the NQF website.

5.1.2.4 Feedback from Providers Being Measured

Field Testing

The Field Testing Feedback Summary Report presents stakeholder feedback gathered during the field testing period.⁸⁴ The following list synthesizes some of the key points that were raised across all field-tested measures through the field testing feedback period:

- Measure development approach
 - Stakeholders expressed appreciation for the opportunity to provide feedback during field testing and for the incorporation of previous suggestions in an effort to continually improve the measure development and field testing processes.
 - Stakeholders reported that the COVID-19 and wildfire public health emergencies presented challenges to participating in field testing. CMS's inclusion of telehealth services in the cost measures, partly in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, was seen as a positive step that should be continued going forward in an effort to expand access to vulnerable patient populations so long as CMS monitors for unintended consequences.
- Field Test Report access, format, and content
 - Stakeholders didn't report any issues accessing Field Test Reports during the field testing period. Feedback generally was positive regarding the Field Test Report that was updated for 2020 and the supplemental episode-level data file, though some stakeholders preferred the previous Excel format.
- Components of episode-based cost measures
 - Field testing feedback was generally not supportive of the inclusion of Part D drug costs in cost measures, with stakeholders expressing concern that clinicians could be held accountable for transactions that are out of their control or if patients require high-cost medications. Relatedly, stakeholders expressed concern about the lack of transparency for Part D costs.
 - Stakeholder input related to the development and testing of chronic condition measures was mixed. Some stakeholders reported that chronic condition cost measures represent an opportunity to reduce healthcare costs without impeding patient access, choice, or quality of care while others reported it was difficult to evaluate the new measures without measure reliability testing results.
 - Stakeholders maintain that resource use and patient health outcomes are influenced by the social determinants of health and that the cost measures aren't

⁸³ Measure Applications Partnership, *National Quality Forum*, https://www.qualityforum.org/Setting_Priorities/Partnership/Measure_Applications_Partnership.aspx.

⁸⁴ CMS, "2020 Field Testing Feedback Summary Report," MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/macra-2020-ft-feedback-summary-report.pdf>.

adequately adjusted for these differences when calculating cost measures performance scores.

- Stakeholders recognize the importance of linking cost and quality, including opportunities to do in the forthcoming MIPS Value Pathways (MVPs), to better evaluate clinician performance and improve patient health outcomes.

The summary report additionally contains measure-specific feedback, which was used as the basis for the post-field testing refinements that were made to the measures, summarized below:

- Refinements to trigger codes, attribution, episode windows, assigned services, risk adjustment variables, exclusions, and alignment of cost with quality
- Adding/removing certain assigned services, Part D services/drugs, and revising the attribution methodology

5.1.2.5 Feedback from Other Users

Pre-Rulemaking

In the 2020-2021 MAP review cycle, the MAP recommended “do not support with potential for mitigation” for the Asthma/COPD measure. The MAP noted the following mitigation points: (i) explore the correlations between the cost measure and quality measures; (ii) NQF endorsement; (iii) explore the concern that good care may result in higher episode costs but with global cost savings; and (iv) evaluate the connection between upstream interventions and downstream cost savings. The MAP’s final recommendations are available for review on their website.⁸⁵

The CY 2021 PFS proposed rule includes a detailed discussion of each of the mitigation points raised by the MAP and the steps taken to address them. Additionally, empirical validity testing results for the Asthma/COPD measure are available on the [MACRA Feedback Page](#).⁸⁶

Person and Family Engagement

Acumen and CMS incorporated actionable input from patients and caregivers throughout the Asthma/COPD measure development process. Throughout Wave 3 of measure development, we solicited and considered PFE input on (i) selection of episode groups for development, and (ii) a broad set of questions around constructing measures that will provide meaningful feedback on clinicians’ resource use via service assignment, provider attribution, episode length, and more. We also sought comments through a questionnaire during field testing for person and family input. This input was shared with the Asthma/COPD Clinician Expert Workgroup for their consideration as they developed the measure. A discussion of the PFE approach and specific feedback is available on the MACRA Feedback Page.⁸⁷

5.1.2.6 Consideration of Feedback

Field Testing

Careful consideration was given to all feedback gathered during field testing, and several updates were made to the measure based on the recommendations of field testing commenters and the Clinician Expert Workgroup comprised of subject matter and measure-development experts.

⁸⁵ Measure Applications Partnership, *National Quality Forum*, http://www.qualityforum.org/Publications/2021/03/MAP_2020-2021_Considerations_for_Implementing_Measures_Final_Report_-_Clinicians,_Hospitals,_and_PAC-LTC.aspx.

⁸⁶ CMS, “Testing Updates for Wave 3 of Measure Development,” MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/testing-updates-wave-3.pdf>.

⁸⁷ CMS, Summary of Person and Family Engagement (PFE) and Input for Wave 3 Episode-based Cost Measure Development (March 2021). <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/summary-person-and-family-engagement.pdf>.

After completing field testing, Acumen compiled the feedback provided through the survey and comment letters into a measure-specific report, which was then provided to the Clinician Expert Workgroup, along with empirical analyses to inform their discussion and evaluation of any refinements needed to ensure that the measure is capturing what it was intended to capture.

The changes to the Asthma/COPD measure made after consideration of field testing analyses and stakeholder feedback are:

- **Service Assignment**
 - Added the following services:
 - Laboratory complete blood count with immunoglobulin level
 - Biologics dupilumab and reslizumab
 - Removed the following services:
 - Thoracic surgery
 - Services associated with non-specific symptoms, including malaise, syncope, and chest pain
- **Measure-Specific Risk Adjustors**
 - Added the following risk adjustors:
 - Allergen testing/treatment
 - Bi-Level Positive Airway Pressure (BiPAP)/Continuous Positive Airway Pressure (CPAP)
 - Edited the following risk adjustor:
 - Adjusted the Smoking risk adjustment variable to differentiate between current/recent and prior history of smoking and remove codes related to non-smoking nicotine dependence. The updated risk adjustment variables are: Current/Recent Smoking and Prior History of Smoking

5.2 Usability

5.2.1 Improvement

N/A. The measure has not yet been implemented, and as such has not had influence over performance.

5.2.2 Unexpected Findings

N/A. There were no unexpected findings during the development and testing of this measure.

5.2.3 Unexpected Benefits

N/A. There were no unexpected benefits during the development and testing of this measure.

Other Additional Information

Asthma/COPD Clinician Expert Workgroup Members:

Barbara Spivak, MD, American Medical Association
Carolyn Fruci, MD, PhD, American Thoracic Society
Christopher Beal, DO, FACOI, American Osteopathic Association
Christopher Yost, MD, America's Essential Hospitals
David Seidenwurm, MD, American College of Radiology
Dirk Steinert, MD, American College of Physicians
Don Bukstein, MD, American College of Allergy, Asthma, and Immunology
James Gajewski, MD, American College of Physicians
Jamieson Wilcox, OTD, OTR/L, American Occupational Therapy Association
Joanne Wisely, MA, CCC/SLP, FNAP, National Association for the Support of Long Term Care
Karan Chugh, MD, American College of Chest Physicians
Keasha Guerrier, MD, American Academy of Family Physicians
Mark Levine, MD, American Geriatrics Society
Melinda Mackey, RN, MSN, CPHQ, CCM, CPhT, National Association for Healthcare Quality
Sabrena McCarley, MBA-SL, OTR/L, CLIPP, RAC-CT, QCP, American Occupational Therapy Association
Stephanie Baranko, DNP, RN, NEA-BC, CLSSGB, American Nurses Association

The Asthma/COPD Clinician Expert Workgroup is composed from the larger Chronic Condition and Disease Management Clinical Subcommittee. The composition list of the Clinical Subcommittee is included in the Episode-Based Cost Measures Development Process document.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ CMS, "2020 Episode-Based Cost Measures Field Testing Wave 3 Measure Development Process," MACRA Feedback Page, <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/macra-cmft-ebcm-process-2020.pdf>.