Quality indicator 2nd level review checklist

*Note: For all No and Unclear responses, document reasons/questions in the reviewer notes field in the corresponding spreadsheet

| 1. | Identify source document. | | | |
|-----|--|-----|-------------|-----------|
| 2. | Title: Does the title match the description? | □ Y | □N | □ Unclear |
| 3. | Is condition category consistent with source document? *Note: Some abstracted indicators were genericized because they are applicable to multiple problems, such as the need for an exam regardless of problem (e.g., headache, neck pain, etc.) | ПΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 4. | Is the Donabedian category appropriate? | ПΥ | \square N | □ Unclear |
| 5. | Is the IOM domain appropriate? | ΠΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 6. | Is the evidence level appropriate? *Note: when references supporting an abstracted indicator are not listed in the source document, the default grading is 5. When references are available, review to determine grading level | ПΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 7. | Is the metric understandable? | ПΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 8. | Does the metric appear to measure the intended indicator? *Note: The metric should measure what is described in the title and description | ПΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 9. | Does the indicator meet all 5 SMART criteria? | ПΥ | □N | □ Unclear |
| 10. | Is the indicator distinct from others from the same source? | □Y | □N | □ Unclear |