

# 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.

## Iterative Improvement

(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
<b>Pro</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have assembled multiple Technical Expert Panels of diverse stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They have become more transparent over time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been very responsive generally to feedback from stakeholders and scientific advances</li> <li>• Most responsive of the various rating systems to changes in measurement science, recent literature, and stakeholder feedback</li> <li>• Uses expert panel effectively</li> <li>• Ranking for specific specialty or condition will not be shown if data are missing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety Grade: Uses national expert panel</li> <li>• Top Hospitals: Uses Technical and Content Experts for measure selection</li> </ul>
<b>Con</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No robust peer review of methods prior to release</li> <li>• Some concerns regarding incorporation of feedback in recent literature and from Technical Expert Panels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No robust public or peer review/comment of methods prior to release</li> <li>• Some concerns about lack of incorporation of stakeholder feedback and advances in science</li> <li>• Lack of expert methodologies to Advisory Panel</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No robust public or peer review/comment of methods prior to release</li> <li>• Frequently releases changes without opportunity for public comment well in advance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No robust public or peer review/comment of methods prior to release</li> <li>• Concerns regarding lack of responsiveness to the issues raised by their Expert Panel, hospitals, scientific advancements, and other stakeholders</li> </ul>

Source: The Authors. Details of the rating process are available at [www.RatingTheRaters.org](http://www.RatingTheRaters.org)

NEJM Catalyst ([catalyst.nejm.org](http://catalyst.nejm.org)) © Massachusetts Medical Society