



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

**REQUEST FOR COMMENT:**

**Recommendations of the Respiratory Workgroup**

*The Maryland Hospital Association is seeking comment on clinical criteria used to define pneumonia, aspiration pneumonia, and respiratory failure. Medical and quality leadership are asked to review this document with appropriate staff and stakeholders. It is the workgroup’s goal that the recommended criteria be considered by each hospital’s Medical Executive Committee for adoption. Please submit your feedback to Justin Ziombra at [jziombra@mhaonline.org](mailto:jziombra@mhaonline.org) by Tuesday, April 14<sup>th</sup>.*

**Background**

The 30% reduction in complications required under the new hospital waiver and the annual targets outlined within the Maryland Hospital Acquired Condition (MHAC) payment policy<sup>1</sup> are based on 65 Potentially Preventable Complications (PPCs).<sup>2</sup> Because PPCs are based on administrative data, the assignment of a PPC is derived from clinical documentation and coding. While hospitals have dedicated significant resources to improving clinical documentation and coding, it has become apparent that variability in the criteria used to define the occurrence of specific clinical conditions across hospitals is hindering our ability to accurately quantify complications and collaborate to prevent them. The premise of this work is that use of consistent criteria to define specific conditions will provide the necessary ‘level setting’ from which to truly measure performance and support collaboration on quality improvement opportunities. For these reasons, hospital leaders requested that MHA convene a group of clinical and quality representatives to consider criteria currently used across hospitals, review evidence, relevant literature and guidelines, and work to develop consensus definitions.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The statewide reduction target for 2015 is 7% comparing FY2014 to CY2015 risk adjusted PPC rates; The proposed amount at risk for the MHAC program is 3% of inpatient revenue  
<sup>2</sup> 3M Health Information Systems developed PPCs; The PPC software relies on present on admission indicators from administrative data to calculate the actual versus expected number of complications for each hospital  
<sup>3</sup> This activity was approved by MHA’s Council on Clinical Quality Issues as well as the Executive Committee

31 *Process*

32 Informed by data analyses of PPC performance, hospital medical and quality leaders  
33 identified a subset of diagnoses that were widely agreed upon to have varied diagnostic  
34 and documentation patterns. The diagnoses were then prioritized based on volume and  
35 variability in performance and grouped into four categories: urinary tract infections,  
36 obstetric hemorrhages and lacerations, pneumonia/respiratory failure and acute renal  
37 failure/kidney injury. A workgroup was convened around each of the four categories and  
38 was comprised of physicians, non-physician clinicians, and documentation and coding  
39 professionals from a cross-section of Maryland's community and teaching hospitals and  
40 health systems.<sup>4</sup> Over a series of meetings each workgroup was charged with  
41 developing a proposed definition informed by published criteria and existing practice.  
42 Hospitals were engaged in the process through submission of hospital-based definitions  
43 as well as offering comment on the workgroups' proposed definitions. The workgroups'  
44 recommendations account for inpatient coding guidelines<sup>5</sup> and apply to any occurrence  
45 of the diagnosis, not only scenarios that would trigger a PPC under the MHAC policy.

46  
47 Each workgroup's proposed criterion are intended to serve as a guideline for provider  
48 and coder consideration and are not intended to restrict provider judgment when  
49 diagnosing a patient or alter coder assignment based on established guidelines. This  
50 clinical definition will not supplant the need for providers to clearly document a  
51 diagnosis. Provider documentation will continue to be the basis for inpatient coding of  
52 diagnoses as is required by coding guidelines. Coders will continue to use provider  
53 documentation as the source of the coded diagnosis. The workgroup encourages  
54 hospitals to utilize approved definitions to guide coders and clinical documentation  
55 specialists to query physicians when the documented diagnoses lack the respective  
56 supporting clinical indicators.

57  
58  
59

---

<sup>4</sup> Workgroup meeting material and rosters available at <http://www.mhaonline.org/quality>

<sup>5</sup> ICD-9 Official Coding Guidelines, approved by four organization that make up the Cooperating Parties for the ICD-9-CM: the American Hospital Association (AHA), the American Health Information Management Association (AHIMA), the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) and the National Center for Health Statistics

60 **Respiratory Workgroup Deliberations**

61 To arrive at a proposed definition, the workgroup, over a series of meetings, based their  
62 deliberations on the following:

- 63 • *Current practice at Maryland hospitals*
  - 64 ○ Medical and Quality leads at all Maryland acute care hospitals were asked  
65 to submit internal policies or guidelines used at their facilities to define  
66 pneumonia, aspiration pneumonia and respiratory failure
- 67 • *Relevant literature and published guidelines including, but not limited to, the*  
68 *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s National Healthcare Safety*  
69 *Network (CDC NHSN)*
- 70 • *Expertise of workgroup members*

71  
72 The workgroups recognize that any definition or guideline will not apply to every patient,  
73 and therefore each hospital and/or provider is expected to use appropriate professional  
74 judgment when applying this guideline. While the workgroup strongly encourages the  
75 use of standardized criteria within and across hospitals, any guideline that is adopted  
76 will not negate the use of the provider’s documentation, which is the basis for inpatient  
77 coding.

78  
79 **Proposed Defining Criteria for Pneumonia**

80 In forming defining criteria for pneumonia, workgroup members considered the  
81 *Pneumonia (Ventilator-associated [VAP] and non-ventilator-associated Pneumonia*  
82 *[PNEU]) Event* criteria developed by CDC NHSN.<sup>6</sup> Members had reservations about  
83 wholly endorsing these algorithms as the workgroup agreed that it would be more  
84 appropriate to form a single set of criteria to broadly define pneumonia, as opposed to  
85 creating multiple definitions for specific etiologies (i.e., viral versus bacterial). The  
86 workgroup’s proposed definition for pneumonia is:

87  
88  
89

---

<sup>6</sup> CDC NHSN “Pneumonia (Ventilator-associated [VAP] and non-ventilator-associated Pneumonia [PNEU]) Event,”  
January 2015

90

<b>Diagnostic Criteria For Pneumonia</b>	
<b>Patient Must Meet One Element From A, One Element From B, and C.</b>	
<b>A*</b>	<b>Signs, Symptoms and Lab Values</b>
-Temperature $\geq 38$ or $\leq 36$ -Leukopenia (<4000 WBC/mm <sup>3</sup> ) or leukocytosis (>12,000 WBC/mm <sup>3</sup> )	
<b>And</b>	
<b>B*</b>	
-Purulent sputum -Cough -Dyspnea -Tachypnea -Supportive findings physical exam -Worsening gas exchange	<b>Imaging</b>
<b>And</b>	
<b>C**</b>	
-Supportive imaging	

91 \*When other attributable causes have been ruled out.

92 \*\*‘Supportive Imaging’ is defined as radiographic evidence of persistent infiltrates. The workgroup notes  
93 that initial chest X-rays can sometimes fail to show evidence of pneumonia due to such conditions as  
94 dehydration, however subsequent chest X-rays may indicate its presence.

95

96 **Proposed Defining Criteria for Aspiration Pneumonia**

97 Workgroup members noted that there is no single, validated and comprehensive  
98 definition for aspiration pneumonia that could be readily endorsed. The workgroup also  
99 noted that aspiration pneumonia is sometimes diagnosed when in fact the patient may  
100 have a different and more transient condition such as laryngotracheobronchitis, or other  
101 condition such as chemical pneumonitis.<sup>7</sup> To distinguish between aspiration pneumonia  
102 and other conditions, the workgroup concluded that a time element should be  
103 considered. A true case of aspiration pneumonia would meet the definition of  
104 ‘Pneumonia’ detailed above, with the requirement that signs and symptoms (i.e.

<sup>7</sup> Xiaowen H. Joyce S. et al. Aspiration-Related Pulmonary Syndromes *Chest* 147:3 818-819

105 elements from 'A' and 'B') persist for longer than 48 hours and are supported through  
106 radiographic imaging ('C'). Workgroup members also noted that an aspiration event is  
107 rarely witnessed.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the group agreed that a reasonable suspicion that an  
108 aspiration event occurred prior to the pneumonia sufficiently qualifies for the definitional  
109 criteria of aspiration pneumonia.

110

111 The workgroup's proposed definition for aspiration pneumonia is:

112

### **Diagnostic Criteria For Aspiration Pneumonia**

**For patients where there is a Reasonable Suspicion of Aspiration, as determined by the provider, a case of Pneumonia (as defined in the 'Pneumonia' Criteria Above) in which the Signs and Symptoms last longer than 48 hours after a suspected or witnessed aspiration event**

113

#### **Respiratory Failure**

114  
115 The workgroup concluded that an appropriate definition for respiratory failure for use in  
116 hospitals should be more holistic than customary definitions that rely principally on lab  
117 results and pulse oximetry to define respiratory failure. The group sought to craft a  
118 relevant definition that provides clinicians with a useful prospective tool, and noted that  
119 defining respiratory failure principally through Arterial Blood Gas (ABG) results is more  
120 appropriate as a retrospective screen for chart reviews and epidemiological  
121 surveillance. Relying principally on blood gas values is also problematic because:

- 122 1) Many patients do not receive routine ABGs  
123 2) Some patients, particularly those in post-operative recovery, may have an  
124 abnormal ABG, however the result often normalizes in a short period of time  
125 and is not necessarily indicative of respiratory failure  
126 3) Some patients with chronic respiratory conditions have baseline ABGs that are  
127 abnormal

128 The workgroup agreed that the defining criteria for respiratory failure should include lab  
129 values and other signs and symptoms, and should also incorporate the intervention

---

<sup>8</sup> Xiawon H. et al, 818-819

130 required as this is an important consideration in defining respiratory failure and better  
 131 captures the resource utilization required to treat the condition.

132  
 133 The workgroup sought to create a comprehensive definition for respiratory failure that  
 134 would identify an instance of the condition regardless of etiology, and therefore the  
 135 group refrained from creating multiple definitions that distinguish by subtype (e.g.  
 136 hypercapnic respiratory failure). The exception is post-operative respiratory failure, for  
 137 which the workgroup concluded that the length of time mechanical ventilation is required  
 138 after surgery should be considered (see below).

139  
 140 The workgroup’s definition of respiratory failure is:

<b>Diagnostic Criteria For Respiratory Failure</b>	
<b>Patient Must Meet One Element From A, One Element From B, and One Element From C.</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>Signs, Symptoms and Lab Values</b>
-Altered mental status -Tachypnea or lowered respiratory rate -Dyspnea or increased work of breathing -Hemodynamic instability	
<b>And</b>	
<b>B*</b>	<b>Signs, Symptoms and Lab Values</b>
-SpO2 < 92% or a dependence on at least 4L/min of O2 through nasal cannula to prevent SpO2 from dropping below 92% and further decompensation -Acute respiratory acidosis: either a pH<7.35 from an arterial sample or a pH<7.3 from a venous sample	
<b>And</b>	
<b>C</b>	<b>Intervention</b>
-The unanticipated need for an intervention to support ventilation and/or gas exchange that is physiologically required to prevent decompensation; These interventions may include the use of a mechanical ventilator, BiPAP, CPAP, High Flow Therapy, Non-Rebreather Mask or Nasal Cannula delivering at least 4L/min of O2	

141 \*Assuming these findings are deviations from the patient's baseline

142

143 **The presence of an element from Section A or Section B before treatment**  
144 **(Section C) is initiated, can be considered to be symptomatic of respiratory**  
145 **failure.**

146

### 147 **Post-Operative Respiratory Failure**

148 The workgroup noted that many patients are expected to remain on a ventilator  
149 following surgery. For many patients, the need for mechanical ventilation during the  
150 recovery period is expected and should not be considered respiratory failure.

151 Workgroup members concluded that one important distinguishing characteristic  
152 between a common course of recovery and an unexpected case of respiratory failure is  
153 time. The workgroup therefore recommends that patients who remain intubated for 48  
154 hours or less, or for an expected period of time relative to the type of surgery, should  
155 not be diagnosed as having respiratory failure. Some procedures, such as open  
156 abdominal surgeries, may require an expected post-operative ventilator period of  
157 greater than 48 hours. Providers are encouraged to clearly document the expected  
158 ventilator-assist period and, once the patient is extubated, document if the period was  
159 expected or unexpected.

160

### 161 **Instructions for Submitting Comments**

162 Please utilize the 'track changes' function to make line-item comments or suggestions.  
163 Additionally, the 'General Comments' section on the next page can be used to write  
164 longer notes and provide overall feedback. Please refer to a line number when writing  
165 comments. The workgroup is seeking both clinical feedback as well as comments that  
166 address feasibility or other practical considerations regarding implementation. Please  
167 submit your feedback to Justin Ziombra at [zjiombra@mhaonline.org](mailto:zjiombra@mhaonline.org) by **Tuesday, April**  
168 **14<sup>th</sup>.**

169

### 170 **General Comments**

171

172

173

174