

Power of National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale in Assessing Stroke Systems of Care

Edward C. Jauch, MD MS

The timely article by Fonarow and colleagues in this issue of *JAHA* reports the findings from the largest study to date on the relation of the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) score with 30-day mortality rate in patients hospitalized for acute ischemic stroke.¹ Prior smaller, largely single center, studies have reported similar results but this work used the largest data set to date with data from more than 400 hospitals involved in AHA “Get With The Guidelines—Stroke”

Article on p 42

program, representing more than 33,000 fee-for-service Medicare beneficiaries. The authors, using the initial NIHSS score alone as a continuous variable, demonstrated excellent discrimination of 30-day mortality rate, with a *c* statistic of 0.82. In this context, the *c* statistic provides a means for comparing the different prognostic models fitted to the same data and the best model is associated with the highest *c* statistic. The authors then compared their model to the reported Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) clinical Medicare risk-standardized mortality rate (RSMR) model for 30-day stroke mortality. The CMS RSMR for stroke is based on a hierarchical logistic regression model incorporating patient and hospital factors. The model adjusts for patient demographics, indicators of comorbidities, and disease severity, but not initial NIHSS score. The CMS model also adjusts for hospital-specific observed versus expected outcomes. Despite its complexity, the CMS RSMR model did not predict mortality as well as the initial NIHSS score alone (*c* statistic 0.82 versus 0.79, respectively).

Furthermore, categorical grouping of NIHSS score by risk-tree methodology into various tiers of stroke severity preserved

the discriminatory capabilities with *c* statistics ranging from 0.74 to 0.80. Categorical grouping into 4 groups of increasing stroke severity by NIHSS score (low 0 to 7, medium 8 to 13, high 14 to 21, and very high 22 to 42) accurately predicted 30-day mortality rate nearly as well as when the full range of the NIHSS score was used (*c* statistic 0.80 versus 0.82, respectively), and again as well as or perhaps slightly better than the more complicated CMS models. Their results reinforce the importance of using the NIHSS score as a risk modifier in prognostic models used for stroke center certification, public reporting, and perhaps for pay-for-performance reimbursement in the future.

This publication comes at an important point in the organization of stroke systems of care. Organizations and governmental agencies in the United States and across the world are developing stroke systems of care as a way to improve patient outcomes after ischemic stroke.^{2,3} A stroke system of care is defined as a regional integration of stroke resources, including emergency medical services, emergency departments, hospitals, public health organizations, and advocacy organization into a singular stroke care delivery model. At the center of stroke systems of care are primary and comprehensive stroke centers.^{4,5} To justify the effort and expense of creating stroke systems of care and stroke centers, improvement in true patient-centered outcomes must be demonstrated. Data to verify that the creation of primary stroke centers has improved patient outcomes are just now forthcoming.⁶⁻⁹ Unlike primary stroke centers performance measures required by the joint commission and state certification programs, the AHA has recommended that comprehensive stroke centers report additional performance measures including patient outcomes for various interventions and forms of stroke, such as the “percentage of patients undergoing intracranial angioplasty and/or stenting for atherosclerotic disease with stroke or death within 30 days of the procedure.”¹⁰ Similarly the candidate performance measures for comprehensive stroke centers certification by the joint commission include both the initial NIHSS score and modified Rankin score at 30 days. This study highlights that in the determination of hospital-specific RSMR, the initial NIHSS score is a vital contributor to the prognostic power of the model. Future certification processes for primary stroke centers and comprehensive stroke centers may include an assessment of a RSMR as a requirement for reaccreditation.

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the American Heart Association or the American Stroke Association.

From the Division of Emergency Medicine, Department of Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC.

Correspondence to: Professor Edward C. Jauch, MD MS, Department of Neurosciences, Medical University of South Carolina, 169 Ashley Avenue, MSC 300, Charleston, SC 29425. 843-792-5058 office; 843-792-9706 fax. E-mail jauch@musc.edu

© 2012. The Authors. Published on behalf of the American Heart Association, Inc., by Wiley-Blackwell. This is an Open Access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

The CMS began publicly reporting 30-day mortality rate for acute myocardial infarction and heart failure in 2007, for pneumonia in 2008, and intends to begin similar reporting of 30-day ischemic stroke RSMR. Concurrently, in an effort to in part improve quality and better empower healthcare consumers, CMS also intends to use in-house and 30-day mortality rate in their Medicare hospital value-based purchasing proposal.¹¹ Currently stroke is not in the initial 2013 proposed clinical process of care measures for value-based purchasing, but stroke is likely to be addressed in the future. Using the current ischemic stroke RSMR models which do not include the initial NIHSS score may lead to unintentional financial disincentives in stroke centers which care for a disproportionate share of the most severe stroke patients. Given the current modest payment rates for stroke, this may lead to the unintended consequence of decreasing access to stroke expertise in stroke systems of care.

Public reporting of hospital-based mortality is not new but has become far more widespread over the past decade.¹² Despite this experience, the effect of publicly reporting hospital performance does not ensure programmatic improvement in hospitals nor change healthcare consumer purchasing behaviors.¹²⁻¹⁵ Mortality is a poor measure of quality, especially for the lay public to use in making healthcare purchase decisions. Although mortality is a hard data point, actual measurements of quality of care are not well captured by the metric and the use of RSMR is often inappropriately used to directly compare two hospitals with one another. Because a stroke RSMR for individual hospitals will be reported for the foreseeable future, collecting the initial NIHSS score and incorporating it into RSMR providing the best adjusted measure will be key.

In this edition of *JAHA* the work by Fonarow and colleagues for the first time provides the stroke and healthcare community a large-scale validation of our personal experiences of the prognostic power of the initial NIHSS score. It also highlights the importance of collecting the initial NIHSS score for registry data sets as well as incorporating the NIHSS score into RSMR models. Although the overall improvement in predicting stroke mortality incorporating the initial NIHSS score may be seemingly modest, over the current RSMR models (*c* statistic 0.82 versus 0.79, respectively), utilization of a more accurate model will allow better recognition of true performance and provide better discrimination of the quality of care across hospitals.

Disclosures

Dr Jauch currently serves at the Chair of the American Stroke Association Leadership Committee.

References

1. Fonarow GC, Saver JL, Smith EE, Broderick JP, Kleindorfer DO, Sacco RL, Pan W, Olson DM, Hernandez AF, Peterson ED, Schwamm LH. Relationship of National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale to 30-Day Mortality in Medicare Beneficiaries With Acute Ischemic Stroke. *J Am Heart Assoc* 2012; 1:42-50.
2. Schwamm LH, Pancioli A, Acker JE, 3rd, Goldstein LB, Zorowitz RD, Shephard TJ, Moyer P, Gorman M, Johnston SC, Duncan PW, Gorelick P, Frank J, Stranne SK, Smith R, Federspiel W, Horton KB, Magnis E, Adams RJ; American Stroke Association's Task Force on the Development of Stroke Systems. Recommendations for the establishment of stroke systems of care: recommendations from the American Stroke Association's Task Force on the Development of Stroke Systems. *Circulation*. 2005;111:1078-91.
3. Gropen T, Magdon-Ismael Z, Day D, Melluzzo S, Schwamm LH; NECC Advisory Group. Regional implementation of the stroke systems of care model: recommendations of the northeast cerebrovascular consortium. *Stroke*. 2009;40:1793-802.
4. Alberts MJ, Hademenos G, Latchaw RE, Jagoda A, Marler JR, Mayberg MR, Starke RD, Todd HW, Viste KM, Girgus M, Shephard T, Emr M, Shwayder P, Walker MD. Recommendations for the establishment of primary stroke centers. Brain Attack Coalition. *JAMA*. 2000;283:3102-3109.
5. Alberts MJ, Latchaw RE, Selman WR, Shephard T, Hadley MN, Brass LM, Koroshetz W, Marler JR, Booss J, Zorowitz RD, Croft JB, Magnis E, Mulligan D, Jagoda A, O'Connor R, Cawley CM, Connors JJ, Rose-DeRenzy JA, Emr M, Warren M, Walker MD; Brain Attack Coalition. Recommendations for comprehensive stroke centers: a consensus statement from the Brain Attack Coalition. *Stroke*. 2005;36:1597-1616.
6. Lichtman JH, Jones SB, Wang Y, Watanabe E, Leifheit-Limson E, Goldstein LB. Outcomes after ischemic stroke for hospitals with and without joint commission-certified primary stroke centers. *Neurology*. 2011;76:1976-1982.
7. Meretoja A, Roine RO, Kaste M, Linna M, Roine S, Juntunen M, Erilä T, Hillbom M, Marttila R, Rissanen A, Sivenius J, Häkkinen U. Effectiveness of primary and comprehensive stroke centers: PERFECT stroke: a nationwide observational study from Finland. *Stroke*. 2010;41:1102-1107.
8. Smith EE, Hassan KA, Fang J, Selchen D, Kapral MK, Saposnik G. Registry of the Canadian Stroke Network (RCSN); Stroke Outcome Research Canada (SOR-Can) Working Group. Do all ischemic stroke subtypes benefit from organized inpatient stroke care? *Neurology*. 2010;75:456-462.
9. Rajamani K, Millis S, Watson S, Mada F, Salowich-Palm L, Hinton S, Chaturvedi S. Thrombolysis for acute ischemic stroke in joint commission-certified and noncertified Hospitals in Michigan. *J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis*. 2011. doi:10.1016/j.jstrokecerebrovasdis.2011.06.003
10. Leifer D, Bravata DM, Connors JJ, 3rd, Hinchey JA, Jauch EC, Johnston SC, Latchaw R, Likosky W, Ogilvy C, Qureshi AI, Summers D, Sung GY, Williams LS, Zorowitz R; American Heart Association Special Writing Group of the Stroke Council; Atherosclerotic Peripheral Vascular Disease Working Group; Council on Cardiovascular Surgery and Anesthesia; Council on Cardiovascular Nursing. Metrics for measuring quality of care in comprehensive stroke centers: detailed follow-up to Brain Attack Coalition comprehensive stroke center recommendations: a statement for healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. 2011;42:849-77.
11. Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Value-Based Purchasing Program. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 2011. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-05-06/pdf/2011-10568.pdf>. Accessed January 14, 2012.
12. Califf RM, Peterson ED, public reporting of quality measures what are we trying to accomplish? *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;53:831-833.
13. Romano PS, Marcini JP, Dai JJ, Yang XD, Kravitz RL, Rocke DM, Dharmar M, Li Z. Impact of public reporting of coronary artery bypass graft surgery performance data on market share, mortality, and patient selection. *Med Care*. 2011;49:1118-1125.
14. Baker DW, Einstadter D, Thomas C, Husak S, Gordon NH, Cebul RD. The effect of publicly reporting hospital performance on market share and risk-adjusted mortality at high-mortality hospitals. *Med Care*. 2003;41:729-740.
15. Resnic FS, Welt FG. The public health hazards of risk avoidance associated with public reporting of risk-adjusted outcomes in coronary intervention. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;53:825-830.