

NATIONAL QUALITY FORUM

Measure Submission and Evaluation Worksheet 5.0

This form contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The evaluation criteria, evaluation guidance documents, and a blank online submission form are available on the [submitting standards web page](#).

NQF #: 0248	NQF Project: Renal Endorsement Maintenance 2011
(for Endorsement Maintenance Review) Original Endorsement Date: Nov 15, 2007 Most Recent Endorsement Date: Nov 15, 2007 Last Updated Date: May 08, 2012	
BRIEF MEASURE INFORMATION	
De.1 Measure Title: Hemodialysis Adequacy Clinical Performance Measure II: Method of Measurement of Delivered Hemodialysis Dose	
Co.1.1 Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services	
De.2 Brief Description of Measure: Percentage of all adult (≥ 18 years old) hemodialysis patients in the sample for analyses for whom delivered HD dose was calculated using UKM or Daugirdas II during the study period and for whom the frequency of HD per week is specified. Percentage of all adult (≥ 18 years old) in-center HD patients in the sample for analyses for whom delivered HD dose was calculated using UKM or Daugirdas II during the study period and for whom the frequency of HD per week is specified.	
2a1.1 Numerator Statement: Number of patients in the denominator for whom delivered HD dose for a single dialysis session was calculated using UKM or Daugirdas II during the reporting period and for whom the frequency of HD per week is specified.	
2a1.4 Denominator Statement: Number of adult patients (≥ 18 years) receiving in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis.	
2a1.8 Denominator Exclusions: None.	
1.1 Measure Type: Process 2a1. 25-26 Data Source: Electronic Health Records 2a1.33 Level of Analysis: Facility	
1.2-1.4 Is this measure paired with another measure? No	
De.3 If included in a composite, please identify the composite measure (title and NQF number if endorsed):	

STAFF NOTES (issues or questions regarding any criteria)
Comments on Conditions for Consideration:
Is the measure untested? Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> If untested, explain how it meets criteria for consideration for time-limited endorsement:
1a. Specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or NPP addressed by the measure (check De.5): 5. Similar/related <u>endorsed</u> or submitted measures (check 5.1):

Other Criteria:

Staff Reviewer Name(s):

1. IMPACT, OPPORTUNITY, EVIDENCE - IMPORTANCE TO MEASURE AND REPORT

Importance to Measure and Report is a threshold criterion that must be met in order to recommend a measure for endorsement. All three subcriteria must be met to pass this criterion. See [guidance on evidence](#).

Measures must be judged to be important to measure and report in order to be evaluated against the remaining criteria. (evaluation criteria)

1a. High Impact: **H O M O L O I O**

(The measure directly addresses a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or NPP, or some other high impact aspect of healthcare.)

De.4 Subject/Topic Areas (Check all the areas that apply): **Renal, Renal : End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD)**

De.5 Non-Condition Specific (Check all the areas that apply):

1a.1 Demonstrated High Impact Aspect of Healthcare: **Affects large numbers, High resource use, Patient/societal consequences of poor quality**

1a.2 If "Other," please describe:

1a.3 Summary of Evidence of High Impact (Provide epidemiologic or resource use data):

The dose of dialysis is used to estimate the ability of hemodialysis to clear the blood of accumulated toxins. In the adult population, outcome studies have shown an association between dose of hemodialysis in terms of small solute removal and clinical outcomes[1,2]. In addition, at least one prior study demonstrates that a change in dialysis dose is associated with a change in patient outcome [3]. Despite studies demonstrating an association between dialysis adequacy as measured by Kt/V and outcomes [4-6], the facility-level calculation of this measure using CROWNWeb data showed the mean percent of patients with monthly HD adequacy measurements was approximately 76% which suggests that there is opportunity for improvement. For this measure maintenance cycle, we propose that this measure remains in its current format. Since endorsement of this measure, published literature suggests insufficient evidence that compares methods of dialysis adequacy measurement, particularly measures that demonstrate superiority of alternative measures over spKt/V. It should also be noted that there have been no changes in the KDOQI Clinical Practice Guideline for Methods for Measuring and Expressing Hemodialysis Dose (CPG 2).

Currently, frequent hemodialysis (more than thrice weekly) is still rare, with approximately 1% of dialysis patients receiving this modality. As this population grows and the evidence base for alternative adequacy measurement methods grows, the use of stdKt/V in particular should be evaluated by a Clinical Technical Expert Panel. A target measure also should be evaluated because of the potential for a growing percentage of patients being dialyzed more than thrice weekly and where spKt/V is not comparable across treatment schedules. Although this current measure does not exclude patients with more than thrice weekly dialysis, interpretation of the related target measure (CPM III) specifically limits the measure to patients receiving thrice weekly dialysis.

Additional considerations for future expert review of the use of spKt/V measure relates to women and smaller patients. Recent studies that examine dialysis dosing in women and smaller patients should be considered [7,8]. In addition, because prior studies that evaluate the impact of hemodialysis dose on mortality have used spKt/V as the measure of hemodialysis adequacy, alternative methods of adequacy measurement should also be considered. Finally, recent clinical studies suggest the benefit of using online measurement methods for assessing ionic clearance, and these tools should be considered in the future [9].

1a.4 Citations for Evidence of High Impact cited in 1a.3:

1. Lowrie EG, et al. Effect of the hemodialysis prescription of patient morbidity: report from the National Cooperative Dialysis Study. N Engl J Med 305:1176–1181, 1981.
2. Owen WF Jr, et al. The urea reduction ratio and serum albumin concentration as predictors of mortality in patients undergoing hemodialysis. N Engl J Med 329:1001–1006, 1993.
3. Wolfe RA, Hulbert-Shearon TE, Ashby VB, Mahavadevan S, Port FK: Improvements in dialysis patient mortality are associated with Urea Reduction Ratio and Hematocrit, 1999 to 2002. Am J Kidney Dis 45(1):127-135, 2005.
4. Wolfe RA, Ashby VB, Daugirdas JT, Agodoa LY, Jones CA, Port FK: Body size, dose of hemodialysis, and mortality. Am J Kidney Dis 35:80-88, 2000.
5. Port FK, Ashby VB, Dhingra RK, Roys EC, Wolfe RA: Dialysis dose and body mass index are strongly associated with survival in hemodialysis patients. J Am Soc Nephrol 13:1061-1066, 2002.
6. Port FK, Wolfe RA, Hulbert-Shearon TE, McCullough KP, Ashby VB, Held PJ: High dialysis dose is associated with lower mortality among women but not among men. Am J Kidney Dis 43:1014-1023, 2004.
7. Daugirdas JT, Greene T, Chertow GM, et al. Can Rescaling Dose of Dialysis to Body Surface Area in the HEMO Study Explain the Different Responses to Dose in Women versus Men? Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010 Sep;5(9):1628-36.
8. Daugirdas JT, Hanna MG, Becker-Cohen R, et al. Dose of dialysis based on body surface area is markedly less in younger children than in older adolescents. Clin J Am Soc Nephrol. 2010 May;5(5):821-7.
9. Lowrie EG, Li Z, Ofsthun NJ, et al. Evaluating a new method to judge dialysis treatment using online measurements of ionic clearance. Kidney Int. 2006 Jul;70(1):211-7.

1b. Opportunity for Improvement: H● M● L● I●

(There is a demonstrated performance gap - variability or overall less than optimal performance)

1b.1 Briefly explain the benefits (improvements in quality) envisioned by use of this measure:

This measure ensures that the dose of dialysis that ESRD patients receive is monitored routinely. Dose of dialysis is associated with clinical outcomes and quality improvement programs that include measurement of dialysis adequacy will likely improve patient outcomes.

1b.2 Summary of Data Demonstrating Performance Gap *(Variation or overall less than optimal performance across providers): [For Maintenance – Descriptive statistics for performance results for this measure - distribution of scores for measured entities by quartile/decile, mean, median, SD, min, max, etc.]*

Analysis of CROWNWeb data from January 2010 indicate that half of facilities calculated hemodialysis adequacy using UKM or Daugirdas II methods in more than 70% of their patients (76% of facilities in more than 50% of their patients and less than 1% of facilities in 100% of patients).

1b.3 Citations for Data on Performance Gap: *[For Maintenance – Description of the data or sample for measure results reported in 1b.2 including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included]*

Performance gap analyses were performed using CROWNWeb data from January 2010. There were 3400 facilities reporting data for this measure, and a total of 293,694 patients in this reporting month. Mean number of patients per facility was 84 (SD=52).

1b.4 Summary of Data on Disparities by Population Group: *[For Maintenance –Descriptive statistics for performance results for this measure by population group]*

For each facility, the percent of patients by demographic group including sex, race, ethnicity, and age category, was calculated. Facilities were then divided into quintiles based on their percentage within each demographic category. Within each facility-level quintile, the average of each facility's performance measure was calculated. The means were examined for trend across quintile.

No disparities in performance were observed by race, sex, ethnicity, or age. The range in percent of patients with monthly HD adequacy measurements across quintiles is presented below.

Population Group (Range):

Females (56.4%-58.0%)

Males (56.4%-58.0%)

Black (55.3%-60.8%)* highest performance in facilities with 58% or more Black patients

White (53.9%-58.8%)* highest performance in facilities with 0-37% White patients

Hispanic (54.5%-60.2%)

Age (56.8%-58.9% by age group)

1b.5 Citations for Data on Disparities Cited in 1b.4: [For Maintenance – Description of the data or sample for measure results reported in 1b.4 including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included]

CROWNWeb data from July 2009-December 2009 were analyzed. The number of facilities ranged from 3398-3453 and the total number of patients per month ranged from 263,743 - 290,713.

1c. Evidence (Measure focus is a health outcome OR meets the criteria for quantity, quality, consistency of the body of evidence.)

Is the measure focus a health outcome? Yes ☐ No ☐ **If not a health outcome, rate the body of evidence.**

Quantity: H ☐ M ☐ L ☐ I ☐ Quality: H ☐ M ☐ L ☐ I ☐ Consistency: H ☐ M ☐ L ☐ I ☐

Quantity	Quality	Consistency	Does the measure pass subcriterion 1c?
M-H	M-H	M-H	Yes <input type="radio"/>
L	M-H	M	Yes <input type="radio"/> IF additional research unlikely to change conclusion that benefits to patients outweigh harms: otherwise No <input type="radio"/>
M-H	L	M-H	Yes <input type="radio"/> IF potential benefits to patients clearly outweigh potential harms: otherwise No <input type="radio"/>
L-M-H	L-M-H	L	No <input type="radio"/>

Health outcome – rationale supports relationship to at least one healthcare structure, process, intervention, or service

Does the measure pass subcriterion 1c?

Yes ☐ IF rationale supports relationship

1c.1 Structure-Process-Outcome Relationship (Briefly state the measure focus, e.g., health outcome, intermediate clinical outcome, process, structure; then identify the appropriate links, e.g., structure-process-health outcome; process-health outcome; intermediate clinical outcome-health outcome):

The measure focus is the process of measuring hemodialysis adequacy using UKM or Daugirdas II methods.

This process leads to improvement in mortality as follows:

Measure spKt/V--> Assess value-->Identify problem-->Identify treatment options-->Administer the appropriate treatment-->Impact on mortality.

1c.2-3 Type of Evidence (Check all that apply):

Clinical Practice Guideline, Selected individual studies (rather than entire body of evidence)

1c.4 Directness of Evidence to the Specified Measure (State the central topic, population, and outcomes addressed in the body of evidence and identify any differences from the measure focus and measure target population):

The body of evidence shows a relationship between low spKt/V and improved mortality and morbidity. This measure focus is on the method of measurement of hemodialysis dose, or spKt/V.

1c.5 Quantity of Studies in the Body of Evidence (Total number of studies, not articles): **11**

1c.6 Quality of Body of Evidence (Summarize the certainty or confidence in the estimates of benefits and harms to patients across studies in the body of evidence resulting from study factors. Please address: a) study design/flaws; b) directness/indirectness of the evidence to this measure (e.g., interventions, comparisons, outcomes assessed, population included in the evidence); and c) imprecision/wide confidence intervals due to few patients or events): The body of evidence show a correlation between delivered dose of HD and patient mortality and morbidity. Of the 11 studies, 5 measured dialysis dose using spKt/v [1,3,8,9,10], and 3 used URR[4,5,7]. Thus, this evidence indirectly supports this measure. The remaining studies used eKt/V [2,6].

Among the studies measuring dialysis adequacy as spKt/V, one study was the HEMO study, which was a randomized clinical trial with 1846 patients [1], one was a prospective study with 740 patients [3], and the remaining were retrospective cohort studies with sample sizes of 1771 [8] and 1151 [9]. Two of these studies found a significant improvement in mortality with increasing dose of spKt/V [3,8].

1c.7 Consistency of Results across Studies (Summarize the consistency of the magnitude and direction of the effect): Results were consistent across studies. Two of the four studies which measured adequacy using spKt/V found that higher doses were associated with lower mortality [3,8]. The other studies found that increasing dose above the standard dose did not improve mortality [1,9], supporting the current target of spKt/V of 1.2-1.3.

1c.8 Net Benefit (Provide estimates of effect for benefit/outcome; identify harms addressed and estimates of effect; and net benefit - benefit over harms):

Among the studies showing a significant improvement in mortality with increasing dose of spKt/V, relative risks (RR) were presented as spKt/V per 1 unit increase [3] and spKt/V per 0.1 unit increase [8]. The RR per 1 unit increase of spKt/V dose was 0.76 (95% CI: 0.64, 0.92; p=0.004), and per 0.1U increase was 0.95; p<0.05 (no CI given). The HEMO study found no significant difference in mortality among patients in the high dose group, with mean = 1.56 and SD=0.09, compared to the low dose group with mean=1.16 and SD=0.08 (RR=0.96; 95% CI: 0.84, 1.10) [1], supporting the current spKt/V target of 1.2. In the remaining study [9], findings showed patients receiving the highest dialysis dose (spKt/V>2.4) compared to the standard dose group (spKt/V 1.2-1.3) had an increased risk of mortality (RR=2.5; p<0.05), although this may be suggestive of confounding by indication. No other significant associations between dose groups were found in this study [9].

All but one study showed a benefit for a minimum dose of dialysis when measured as spKt/V. Studies evaluating higher doses of dialysis adequacy did not demonstrate additional benefit at spKt/V doses higher than the current target of 1.2.

1c.9 Grading of Strength/Quality of the Body of Evidence. Has the body of evidence been graded? **Yes**

1c.10 If body of evidence graded, identify the entity that graded the evidence including balance of representation and any disclosures regarding bias: The body of evidence was rated in the KDOQI Guidelines. Of the 10 studies, 3 were graded A, one received a B, and the remaining were graded C.

1c.11 System Used for Grading the Body of Evidence: **GRADE**

1c.12 If other, identify and describe the grading scale with definitions:

1c.13 Grade Assigned to the Body of Evidence: An overall grade was not assigned, but individual studies were graded as described above.

1c.14 Summary of Controversy/Contradictory Evidence: No controversial or contradictory evidence was found.

1c.15 Citations for Evidence other than Guidelines(Guidelines addressed below):

1. Eknoyan G, Beck GJ, Cheung AK, et al: Effect of dialysis dose and membrane flux in maintenance hemodialysis. N Engl J Med 347:2010-2019, 2002.
2. Depner T, Daugirdas J, Greene T, et al: Dialysis dose and the effect of gender and body size on outcome in the HEMO Study. Kidney Int 65:1386-1394, 2004.
3. Termorshuizen F, Dekker FW, van Manen JG, Korevaar JC, Boeschoten EW, Krediet RT: Relative contribution of residual renal function and different measures of adequacy to survival in hemodialysis patients: An analysis of the Netherlands Cooperative Study on the Adequacy of Dialysis (NECOSAD)-2. J Am Soc Nephrol 15:1061-1070, 2004.
4. Port FK, Wolfe RA, Hulbert-Shearon TE, McCullough KP, Ashby VB, Held PJ: High dialysis dose is associated with lower mortality among women but not among men. Am J Kidney Dis 43:1014-1023, 2004.
5. Port FK, Ashby VB, Dhingra RK, Roys EC, Wolfe RA: Dialysis dose and body mass index are strongly associated with survival in hemodialysis patients. J Am Soc Nephrol 13:1061-1066, 2002.
6. Wolfe RA, Ashby VB, Daugirdas JT, Agodoa LY, Jones CA, Port FK: Body size, dose of hemodialysis, and mortality. Am J Kidney Dis 35:80-88, 2000.
7. Chertow GM, Owen WF, Lazarus JM, Lew NL, Lowrie EG: Exploring the reverse J-shaped curve between urea reduction ratio and mortality. Kidney Int 56:1872-1878, 1999.
8. Leypoldt JK, Cheung AK, Carroll CE, et al: Effect of dialysis membranes and middle molecule removal on chronic hemodialysis patient survival. Am J Kidney Dis 33:349-355, 1999.
9. Salahudeen AK, Dykes P, May W: Risk factors for higher mortality at the highest levels of spKt/V in hemodialysis patients. Nephrol Dial Transplant 18:1339-1344, 2003.
10. Woods HF, Nandakumar M: Improved outcome for haemodialysis patients treated with high-flux membranes. Nephrol Dial Transplant 15:S36-S42, 2000 (suppl 1).

1c.16 Quote verbatim, the specific guideline recommendation (Including guideline # and/or page #):

Clinical Practice Guidelines for Hemodialysis Adequacy

GUIDELINE 2. Methods for Measuring and Expressing the Hemodialysis dose

2.4 The preferred method for measurement of the delivered dose is formal urea kinetic modeling. Other methods may be used provided they give similar results and do not significantly overestimate the modeled dose. (A)

1c.17 Clinical Practice Guideline Citation: National Kidney Foundation. KDOQI Clinical Practice Guidelines and Clinical Practice Recommendations for Hemodialysis Adequacy, Update 2006.

1c.18 National Guideline Clearinghouse or other URL:

http://www.kidney.org/professionals/KDOQI/guideline_upHD_PD_VA/index.htm

1c.19 Grading of Strength of Guideline Recommendation. Has the recommendation been graded? Yes

1c.20 If guideline recommendation graded, identify the entity that graded the evidence including balance of representation and any disclosures regarding bias: KDOQI members. No information on representation of disclosures regarding bias.

1c.21 System Used for Grading the Strength of Guideline Recommendation: GRADE

1c.22 If other, identify and describe the grading scale with definitions:

1c.23 Grade Assigned to the Recommendation: **A**

1c.24 Rationale for Using this Guideline Over Others: **No other guidelines are available.**

Based on the NQF descriptions for rating the evidence, what was the developer's assessment of the quantity, quality, and consistency of the body of evidence?

1c.25 Quantity: **Moderate** 1c.26 Quality: **High** 1c.27 Consistency: **High**

1c.28 Attach evidence submission form:

1c.29 Attach appendix for supplemental materials:

Was the threshold criterion, *Importance to Measure and Report*, met?

(1a & 1b must be rated moderate or high and 1c yes) Yes ☐ No ☒

Provide rationale based on specific subcriteria:

For a new measure if the Committee votes NO, then STOP.

For a measure undergoing endorsement maintenance, if the Committee votes NO because of 1b. (no opportunity for improvement), it may be considered for continued endorsement and all criteria need to be evaluated.

2. RELIABILITY & VALIDITY - SCIENTIFIC ACCEPTABILITY OF MEASURE PROPERTIES

Extent to which the measure, as specified, produces consistent (reliable) and credible (valid) results about the quality of care when implemented. **(evaluation criteria)**

Measure testing must demonstrate adequate reliability and validity in order to be recommended for endorsement. Testing may be conducted for data elements and/or the computed measure score. Testing information and results should be entered in the appropriate field. Supplemental materials may be referenced or attached in item 2.1. See [guidance on measure testing](#).

S.1 Measure Web Page (*In the future, NQF will require measure stewards to provide a URL link to a web page where current detailed specifications can be obtained*). Do you have a web page where current detailed specifications for this measure can be obtained? **Yes**

S.2 If yes, provide web page URL: http://www.arborresearch.org/ESRD_QMS.aspx

2a. RELIABILITY. Precise Specifications and Reliability Testing: H ☒ M ☒ L ☒ I ☒

2a1. Precise Measure Specifications. (*The measure specifications precise and unambiguous.*)

2a1.1 Numerator Statement (*Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, e.g., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome*):

Number of patients in the denominator for whom delivered HD dose for a single dialysis session was calculated using UKM or Daugirdas II during the reporting period and for whom the frequency of HD per week is specified.

2a1.2 Numerator Time Window (*The time period in which the target process, condition, event, or outcome is eligible for inclusion*):

The entire calendar month.

2a1.3 Numerator Details (*All information required to identify and calculate the cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome such as definitions, codes with descriptors, and/or specific data collection items/responses*):

The numerator will be determined by counting the patients in the denominator for whom Kt/V "Hemodialysis Method" is 'Daugirdas II' OR 'UKM'.

2a1.4 Denominator Statement (Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured):
Number of adult patients (≥ 18 years) receiving in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis.

2a1.5 Target Population Category (Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any): Adult/Elderly Care, Populations at Risk

2a1.6 Denominator Time Window (The time period in which cases are eligible for inclusion):
The entire calendar month.

2a1.7 Denominator Details (All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, codes with descriptors, and/or specific data collection items/responses):

Time Window: The entire calendar month.

The patient's age will be determined by subtracting the patient's date of birth from the first day of the reporting month. Hemodialysis patients are defined as follows: "Admit Date" to the specified facility is prior or equal to the first day of the study period, AND the patient has not been discharged ("Discharge Date" is null or blank), OR "Discharge Date" from the facility is greater than or equal to the last day of the study period AND "Treatment Dialysis Broad Start Date" is prior or equal to the first day of the study period, AND "Dialysis Broad Type of Treatment" = 'HD', AND "Primary Dialysis Setting" = 'Dialysis Facility/Center' on the last day of the study period, AND "Date Regular Chronic Dialysis Began" is prior to the first day of the study period. The denominator will include all patients greater than or equal to 18 years old who are determined to be hemodialysis patients.

2a1.8 Denominator Exclusions (Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population):
None.

2a1.9 Denominator Exclusion Details (All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, codes with descriptors, and/or specific data collection items/responses):
None.

2a1.10 Stratification Details/Variables (All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, codes with descriptors, definitions, and/or specific data collection items/responses):
This measure is not stratified.

2a1.11 Risk Adjustment Type (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in 2a1.10 and for statistical model in 2a1.13): No risk adjustment or risk stratification **2a1.12 If "Other," please describe:**

2a1.13 Statistical Risk Model and Variables (Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development should be addressed in 2b4.):
Not applicable.

2a1.14-16 Detailed Risk Model Available at Web page URL (or attachment). Include coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, definitions, and/or specific data collection items/responses. Attach documents only if they are not available on a webpage and keep attached file to 5 MB or less. NQF strongly prefers you make documents available at a Web page URL. Please supply login/password if needed:

2a1.17-18. Type of Score: [Rate/proportion](#)

2a1.19 Interpretation of Score (*Classifies interpretation of score according to whether better quality is associated with a higher score, a lower score, a score falling within a defined interval, or a passing score*):
[Better quality = Higher score](#)

2a1.20 Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic(*Describe the calculation of the measure score as an ordered sequence of steps including identifying the target population; exclusions; cases meeting the target process, condition, event, or outcome; aggregating data; risk adjustment; etc.*):

[For this measure calculation, the numerator will be divided by the denominator.](#)

[Calculation of the numerator and denominator is described below.](#)

[The patient's age will be determined by subtracting the patient's date of birth from the first day of the reporting month. Hemodialysis patients are defined as follows: "Admit Date" to the specified facility is prior or equal to the first day of the study period, AND the patient has not been discharged \("Discharge Date" is null or blank\), OR "Discharge Date" from the facility is greater than or equal to the last day of the study period AND "Treatment Dialysis Broad Start Date" is prior or equal to the first day of the study period, AND "Dialysis Broad Type of Treatment" = 'HD', AND "Primary Dialysis Setting" = 'Dialysis Facility/Center' on the last day of the study period, AND "Date Regular Chronic Dialysis Began" is prior to the first day of the study period. The denominator will include all patients greater than or equal to 18 years old who are determined to be hemodialysis patients.](#)

[The numerator will be determined by counting the patients in the denominator for whom Kt/V "Hemodialysis Method" is 'Daugirdas II' OR 'UKM'.](#)

2a1.21-23 Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic Diagram URL or attachment:

[Attachment](#)

[Pages from Appendix C CPM Calculation Flow charts_a4.pdf](#)

2a1.24 Sampling (Survey) Methodology. If measure is based on a sample (or survey), provide instructions for obtaining the sample, conducting the survey and guidance on minimum sample size (response rate):

[Not applicable](#)

2a1.25 Data Source (*Check all the sources for which the measure is specified and tested*). If other, please describe:

[Electronic Health Records](#)

2a1.26 Data Source/Data Collection Instrument (*Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument, e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.*): [CROWNWeb](#)

2a1.27-29 Data Source/data Collection Instrument Reference Web Page URL or Attachment: [URL](#)
<http://www.projectcrownweb.org>

2a1.30-32 Data Dictionary/Code Table Web Page URL or Attachment:

[URL](#)

http://projectcrownweb.org/crown/index.php?page=Public_Documents&subPage=Release_Documents

2a1.33 Level of Analysis (*Check the levels of analysis for which the measure is specified and tested*):

[Facility](#)

2a1.34-35 Care Setting (Check all the settings for which the measure is specified and tested): **Post-Acute Care**

2a2. Reliability Testing. (Reliability testing was conducted with appropriate method, scope, and adequate demonstration of reliability.)

2a2.1 Data/Sample (Description of the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):

CROWNWeb is currently being released in phases, to allow the immediate collection of data from a limited number of facilities while providing future users an opportunity to complete the required steps to access the system. CMS moved into Phase II of its phase-in implementation process in July 2009. Data were collected from Phase II facilities and test batch submitters on a voluntary basis. These data are not a random national sample of facilities and hence results are not necessarily representative.

CROWNWeb data from July 2009-October 2010 were analyzed. The number of facilities per month ranged from 3415-3453. The total number of patients per month ranged from 263,743 - 330,187.

2a2.2 Analytic Method (Describe method of reliability testing & rationale):

Reliability was assessed by calculating facility-level month-to-month correlations. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the current performance month and previous month for reporting months July 2009 through October 2010.

2a2.3 Testing Results (Reliability statistics, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted):

Correlation coefficients ranged from 0.85 to 0.98. Month-to-month correlations for this measure are high, indicating the data elements for this measure are reliable.

2b. VALIDITY. Validity, Testing, including all Threats to Validity: **H M L I**

2b1.1 Describe how the measure specifications (measure focus, target population, and exclusions) are consistent with the evidence cited in support of the measure focus (criterion 1c) and identify any differences from the evidence:

The target population in the validity analysis was all ESRD patients on HD who are reported in CROWNWeb in 2009. The population and results from the validity analyses performed were consistent with the evidence provided. The validity analyses showed that relative to facilities with the highest performance scores, the Standardized Mortality Ratio (SMR) increased as performance scores decreased.

2b2. Validity Testing. (Validity testing was conducted with appropriate method, scope, and adequate demonstration of validity.)

2b2.1 Data/Sample (Description of the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):

2009 CROWNWeb data (July - December) were used to calculate monthly performance scores, and the SMR was calculated using 2009 Medicare-paid dialysis claims and the Medical Evidence Form (Form CMS-2728). Documentation regarding the Medicare claims used to calculate the SMR is attached.

2b2.2 Analytic Method (Describe method of validity testing and rationale; if face validity, describe systematic assessment):

Validity was assessed using Poisson regression models to measure the association between facility level quintiles of performance scores and the 2009 SMR (methodology on SMR calculations is attached). Facility-level performance scores were divided into quintiles and the relative risk (RR) of mortality was calculated for each quintile. The highest quintile was used as the reference group. Thus, a RR>1.0 for the lower performance score quintiles would indicate a higher relative risk of mortality.

2b2.3 Testing Results *(Statistical results, assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted; if face validity, describe results of systematic assessment):*

Quintiles of the performance scores were defined as follows:

Q1:0-<44%

Q2:44%-<63%

Q3:63%-<69%

Q4:69%-<76%

Q5:76%-100%

Results from the Poisson model indicated lower performance scores were significantly associated with increased mortality as calculated by SMR ($p < 0.01$). Relative risks (95% confidence intervals) of mortality for quintiles 1 through 4 were 1.06 (1.02, 1.09), 1.12 (1.08, 1.16), 1.07 (1.04, 1.11), 1.05 (1.02, 1.09) respectively.

These findings demonstrate the association between the method of measurement of delivered dose and improved mortality.

POTENTIAL THREATS TO VALIDITY. *(All potential threats to validity were appropriately tested with adequate results.)*

2b3. Measure Exclusions. *(Exclusions were supported by the clinical evidence in 1c or appropriately tested with results demonstrating the need to specify them.)*

2b3.1 Data/Sample for analysis of exclusions *(Description of the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):*
CROWNWeb data from July 2009 through December 2010 included up to 3581 facilities per month with an average of 86 patients per facility. The total number of patients per month ranged from 267,515 - 330,187. There are no exclusions for this measure.

2b3.2 Analytic Method *(Describe type of analysis and rationale for examining exclusions, including exclusion related to patient preference):*

Not applicable; there are no exclusions for this measure.

2b3.3 Results *(Provide statistical results for analysis of exclusions, e.g., frequency, variability, sensitivity analyses):*

Not applicable.

2b4. Risk Adjustment Strategy. *(For outcome measures, adjustment for differences in case mix (severity) across measured entities was appropriately tested with adequate results.)*

2b4.1 Data/Sample *(Description of the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):*

No risk adjustment is performed for this measure.

2b4.2 Analytic Method *(Describe methods and rationale for development and testing of risk model or risk stratification including selection of factors/variables):*

Not applicable

2b4.3 Testing Results *(Statistical risk model: Provide quantitative assessment of relative contribution of model risk factors; risk model performance metrics including cross-validation discrimination and calibration statistics, calibration curve and risk decile plot, and assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for risk models. Risk stratification: Provide quantitative assessment of relationship of risk factors to the outcome and differences in outcomes among the strata):*

Not applicable

2b4.4 If outcome or resource use measure is not risk adjusted, provide rationale and analyses to

justify lack of adjustment: Disparities by population group were not observed (see results in Section 1b.4). Furthermore, there is no evidence suggesting this measure should be risk adjusted.

2b5. Identification of Meaningful Differences in Performance. (The performance measure scores were appropriately analyzed and discriminated meaningful differences in quality.)

2b5.1 Data/Sample (Describe the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):

Analyses were performed using CROWNWeb data from January 2010. There were 3400 facilities and a total of 293,694 patients in this reporting month. Mean number of patients per facility was 84 (SD=52).

2b5.2 Analytic Method (Describe methods and rationale to identify statistically significant and practically/meaningfully differences in performance):

Facility-level percent of patients with the HD adequacy measured using UKM or Daugirdas II methods were calculated as the number of patients within the facility with a specified number of sessions per week whose adequacy measurements are calculated using UKM or the Daugirdas II methods, divided by the total number of patients within the facility. The distribution of facilities within measurement categories was examined.

2b5.3 Results (Provide measure performance results/scores, e.g., distribution by quartile, mean, median, SD, etc.; identification of statistically significant and meaningful differences in performance):

Analysis of CROWNWeb data from January 2010 indicated that 47% of facilities had greater than 70% of their patients' dialysis doses measured using the specified methods (76% of facilities had greater than 50%). Less than 1% of facilities had 100% of their patients' dialysis doses measured using the specified methods. The results indicate that half of the facilities use the specified method for more than 70% of their patients. Very few facilities use the specified methods for all of their patients.

2b6. Comparability of Multiple Data Sources/Methods. (If specified for more than one data source, the various approaches result in comparable scores.)

2b6.1 Data/Sample (Describe the data or sample including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included):

Multiple data sources were not used.

2b6.2 Analytic Method (Describe methods and rationale for testing comparability of scores produced by the different data sources specified in the measure):

Not applicable.

2b6.3 Testing Results (Provide statistical results, e.g., correlation statistics, comparison of rankings; assessment of adequacy in the context of norms for the test conducted):

Not applicable.

2c. Disparities in Care: H M L I NA (If applicable, the measure specifications allow identification of disparities.)

2c.1 If measure is stratified for disparities, provide stratified results (Scores by stratified categories/cohort): This measure is not stratified.

2c.2 If disparities have been reported/identified (e.g., in 1b), but measure is not specified to detect disparities, please explain:

No disparities have been identified.

2.1-2.3 Supplemental Testing Methodology Information:

URL

<http://www.dialysisreports.org/pdf/esrd/public/SMRdocumentation.pdf>

Steering Committee: Overall, was the criterion, *Scientific Acceptability of Measure Properties*, met? (Reliability and Validity must be rated moderate or high) Yes ☒ No ☒

Provide rationale based on specific subcriteria:

If the Committee votes No, STOP

3. USABILITY

Extent to which intended audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) can understand the results of the measure and are likely to find them useful for decision making. (**evaluation criteria**)

C.1 Intended Actual/Planned Use (Check all the planned uses for which the measure is intended): Public Reporting, Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)

3.1 Current Use (Check all that apply; for any that are checked, provide the specific program information in the following questions): Public Reporting, Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)

3a. Usefulness for Public Reporting: H ☒ M ☒ L ☒ I ☒

(The measure is meaningful, understandable and useful for public reporting.)

3a.1. Use in Public Reporting - disclosure of performance results to the public at large (If used in a public reporting program, provide name of program(s), locations, Web page URL(s)). If not publicly reported in a national or community program, state the reason AND plans to achieve public reporting, potential reporting programs or commitments, and timeline, e.g., within 3 years of endorsement: **[For Maintenance – If not publicly reported, describe progress made toward achieving disclosure of performance results to the public at large and expected date for public reporting; provide rationale why continued endorsement should be considered.]**

Quality measure results will be evaluated for future public reporting on Medicare's Dialysis Facility Compare website.

3a.2. Provide a rationale for why the measure performance results are meaningful, understandable, and useful for public reporting. If usefulness was demonstrated (e.g., focus group, cognitive testing), describe the data, method, and results: Healthcare providers and patients can easily understand the meaning of this measure. In addition, there is general acceptance of the use of spKt/V for the measurement of dialysis adequacy. The percent of patients with monthly adequacy measurements improved from 52% in 2000 to 76% in 2007. Furthermore, improvement in dialysis adequacy is associated with improvement in mortality (see body of evidence in Importance section).

3.2 Use for other Accountability Functions (payment, certification, accreditation). If used in a public accountability program, provide name of program(s), locations, Web page URL(s): The use of spKt/V to measure dialysis adequacy is currently in use for a CMS Quality Incentive Payment Demonstration Evaluation, a related project of the CMS Disease Management Demonstration Evaluation. [http://www.nephronline.com/assets/documents/SpecialSectionsReports/QIP%20Report_final\(2\).pdf](http://www.nephronline.com/assets/documents/SpecialSectionsReports/QIP%20Report_final(2).pdf)

3b. Usefulness for Quality Improvement: H ☒ M ☒ L ☒ I ☒

(The measure is meaningful, understandable and useful for quality improvement.)

3b.1. Use in QI. If used in quality improvement program, provide name of program(s), locations, Web page URL(s):

[For Maintenance – If not used for QI, indicate the reasons and describe progress toward using performance results for improvement].

The use of spKt/V to measure dialysis adequacy has been used in multiple quality improvement programs. An example is an initiative of ESRD Network 5 to improve performance for achieving spKt/V targets (<http://www.esrdnet5.org/adequacyproj.asp>). Similarly ESRD Network 18 includes spKt/V for its quality improvement initiatives (<http://www.esrdnetwork18.org/pdfs/QI%20-%20Tools%20&%20Forms/2010-2011%20Clinical%20Performance%20Goals-FINAL.pdf>).

Also, in previous years, this measure was reported in ESRD CPM Annual Reports. The ESRD CPM Project was a national effort designed to assist dialysis providers to improve patient care and outcomes.

3b.2. Provide rationale for why the measure performance results are meaningful, understandable, and useful for quality improvement. If usefulness was demonstrated (e.g., *QI initiative*), describe the data, method and results:

See response in 3a.2.

Overall, to what extent was the criterion, *Usability*, met? H M L I

Provide rationale based on specific subcriteria:

4. FEASIBILITY

Extent to which the required data are readily available, retrievable without undue burden, and can be implemented for performance measurement. (**evaluation criteria**)

4a. Data Generated as a Byproduct of Care Processes: H M L I

4a.1-2 How are the data elements needed to compute measure scores generated? (Check all that apply).

Data used in the measure are:

Abstracted from a record by someone other than person obtaining original information (e.g., chart abstraction for quality measure or registry)

4b. Electronic Sources: H M L I

4b.1 Are the data elements needed for the measure as specified available electronically (Elements that are needed to compute measure scores are in defined, computer-readable fields): ALL data elements in electronic health records (EHRs)

4b.2 If ALL data elements are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources:

4c. Susceptibility to Inaccuracies, Errors, or Unintended Consequences: H M L I

4c.1 Identify susceptibility to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences of the measurement identified during testing and/or operational use and strategies to prevent, minimize, or detect. If audited, provide results:

There are no potential barriers to retrieving data necessary for the measure, and there are no data availability issues.

4d. Data Collection Strategy/Implementation: H M L I

A.2 Please check if either of the following apply (regarding proprietary measures):

4d.1 Describe what you have learned/modified as a result of testing and/or operational use of the measure regarding data collection, availability of data, missing data, timing and frequency of data collection, sampling, patient confidentiality, time and cost of data collection, other feasibility/implementation issues (e.g., fees for use of proprietary measures):

Since this measure has been collected for several years as part of the CPM project, facilities are familiar with the data required for this measure, and data are readily available. It is unlikely that data elements will

be susceptible to inaccuracies, errors, or unintended consequences.

Overall, to what extent was the criterion, *Feasibility*, met? H ☐ M ☐ L ☐ I ☐
Provide rationale based on specific subcriteria:

OVERALL SUITABILITY FOR ENDORSEMENT

Does the measure meet all the NQF criteria for endorsement? Yes ☐ No ☐
Rationale:

If the Committee votes No, STOP.

If the Committee votes Yes, the final recommendation is contingent on comparison to related and competing measures.

5. COMPARISON TO RELATED AND COMPETING MEASURES

If a measure meets the above criteria and there are endorsed or new related measures (either the same measure focus or the same target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and the same target population), the measures are compared to address harmonization and/or selection of the best measure before a final recommendation is made.

5.1 If there are related measures (either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (both the same measure focus and same target population), list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures:

0247 : Hemodialysis Adequacy Clinical Performance Measure I: Hemodialysis Adequacy- Monthly measurement of delivered dose

0249 : Delivered Dose of Hemodialysis Above Minimum

0323 : Adult Kidney Disease: Hemodialysis Adequacy: Solute

1418 : Frequency of Adequacy Measurement for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients

1421 : Method of Adequacy Measurement for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients

1423 : Minimum spKt/V for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients

5a. Harmonization

5a.1 If this measure has EITHER the same measure focus OR the same target population as [NQF-endorsed measure\(s\)](#): Are the measure specifications completely harmonized?

5a.2 If the measure specifications are not completely harmonized, identify the differences, rationale, and impact on interpretability and data collection burden:

5b. Competing Measure(s)

5b.1 If this measure has both the same measure focus and the same target population as NQF-endorsed measure(s):

Describe why this measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., a more valid or efficient way to measure quality); OR provide a rationale for the additive value of endorsing an additional measure. (Provide analyses when possible):

The measures listed above are related measures. There are no competing measures.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Co.1 Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner): Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard , Mail Stop S3-01-02, Baltimore, Maryland, 21244-1850

Co.2 Point of Contact: Edward Q., Garcia III, MHS, Health Policy Analyst, MMSNQF@hsag.com, 410-786-6738-
Co.3 Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, 7500 Security Boulevard, Baltimore, Maryland, 21244
Co.4 Point of Contact: Thomas, Dudley, Thomas.Dudley@cms.hhs.gov, 410-786-6738-
Co.5 Submitter: Claudia, Dahlerus, claudia.dahlerus@arborresearch.org, 410-786-6738- , Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Co.6 Additional organizations that sponsored/participated in measure development:
Co.7 Public Contact: Claudia, Dahlerus, Claudia.Dahlerus@ArborResearch.org, 734-665-4108- , Arbor Research Collaborative for Health

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development Ad.1 Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development. Clinical and data technical expert panels (TEP) were held in September and October 2006, respectively. Since 2006, no TEPs have been held for adult hemodialysis adequacy measures.
Ad.2 If adapted, provide title of original measure, NQF # if endorsed, and measure steward. Briefly describe the reasons for adapting the original measure and any work with the original measure steward: No changes to this measure are requested.
Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance Ad.3 Year the measure was first released: 2007 Ad.4 Month and Year of most recent revision: 11, 2007 Ad.5 What is your frequency for review/update of this measure? Every 3 years Ad.6 When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure? 06, 2013
Ad.7 Copyright statement:
Ad.8 Disclaimers:
Ad.9 Additional Information/Comments:
Date of Submission (MM/DD/YY): 06/23/2011