## Rating the Raters – Strengths and Weaknesses Assessment of the Four Public Hospital Quality Rating Systems

The comments in the table below reflect the discussion that the Rating-the-Raters group had about each rating system. These comments for each rating system were provided to the leaders of that rating system to solicit feedback.

## Importance/Impact

(CMS) Hospital Compare Overall Star Ratings	Healthgrades Top Hospitals	USNWR (U.S. News & World Report) Best Hospitals	Leapfrog Hospital Safety Grade and Leapfrog Top Hospitals
Pro			
• Compiled by largest payer in U.S.	• Procedure- and condition- specific rankings	<ul> <li>Overall, specialty and procedure/condition rankings are helpful</li> <li>Useful and rigorous rating system overall</li> <li>High-complexity and high-acuity measures where quality tends to vary, but also focuses on more common procedure areas</li> <li>Measures generally have high face validity</li> <li>Inclusion of registry data (STS data for CABG and AVR) in procedure/condition rankings</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Focus on safety</li> <li>Includes assessment of culture of safety</li> </ul>
Con			
• Very few elective condition- or procedure- specific measures (most are less common conditions or not elective admissions)		<ul> <li>Paucity of clinically meaningful and rigorous outcomes data (e.g., mortality considered quality metric and not safety metric)</li> <li>No information for individual common elective procedures/ conditions</li> <li>Safety focused, but misses a lot of other important measures for quality and should be more balanced</li> </ul>	

Source: The Authors. Details of the rating process are available at www.RatingTheRaters.org NEJM Catalyst (catalyst.nejm.org) © Massachusetts Medical Society