

---

# Impact of MACRA Legislation and MIPS Scores on Cost Effective Analysis for Negative Pressure Wound Therapy Devices

---

Jeremy Kubiak, Subhas Gupta

---

## INTRODUCTION

The Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act (MACRA) changes reimbursement from a fee-for-service payment system to fee-for-value. Physicians will be scored according to the quality of their care in the MIPS program and will receive a positive or negative modifier to their Medicare reimbursement based on that score.

## OBJECTIVE:

To analyze a cost-effective model for Negative Pressure Wound Therapy (NPWT) devices with attention to how a MIPS score is affected.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Three devices from KCI and Smith & Nephew each were compared for cost-effectiveness and MIPS score impact. From KCI, the V.A.C.Ultra, ActiV.A.C., and SNaP devices were compared to the S&N RENASYS, RENASYS GO, and PICO devices respectively. Impact on the MIPS sections of Quality, Cost, and Clinical Practice Improvement Activities (CPIA) were taken into account. Participation in Alternative Payment Models was not analyzed.

## RESULTS & CONCLUSION

Due to the variability of wound treatment, the devices were compared to each other based on the types of wounds they are

typically indicated for. If a wound requires inpatient care, the KCI V.A.C.Ultra with instillation therapy is the better choice because it reduces infection rates and treats more complex wounds faster than traditional NPWT as seen with the RENASYS device. This improves the Quality score because of lower infection rates and it improves the Cost score because wounds heal faster and discharge comes earlier. If the wound can be cared for on an outpatient basis, the KCI SNaP mechanical device is the best option because it is the cheapest, most cost-effective choice over the S&N PICO device. The SNaP and PICO devices are better options than the ActiV.A.C and RENASYS GO devices because they are ultra-lightweight, require no canister for exudate, and can fit in a discreet pouch or pocket which is highly beneficial for patient satisfaction and the CPIA section score. If the wound can be cared for on an outpatient basis, but is too large or produces too much exudate for the SNaP and PICO devices, the KCI ActiV.A.C and S&N RENASYS Go devices are better options. Between these two devices the RENASYS GO is more cost effective and thus improves the Cost score.

---

From Loma Linda University Medical Center (J.K, S.G.)

Accepted for publication: November 2017

The authors have no funding, financial relationships, or conflicts of interest to disclose.

Send correspondence to: jkubiak@llu.edu