Measure Information

This document contains the information submitted by measure developers/stewards, but is organized according to NQF's measure evaluation criteria and process. The item numbers refer to those in the submission form but may be in a slightly different order here. In general, the item numbers also reference the related criteria (e.g., item 1b.1 relates to subcriterion 1b).

Brief Measure Information

NQF #: 1418
Corresponding Measures:
De.2. **Measure Title:** Frequency of Adequacy Measurement for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients
Co.1.1. **Measure Steward:** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
De.3. **Brief Description of Measure:** Percentage of all pediatric (less than18 years) patients receiving in-center hemodialysis or home (irrespective of frequency of dialysis) with documented monthly adequacy measurements (spKt/V) or its components in the calendar month.
1b.1. **Developer Rationale:** By requiring a minimum of monthly evaluation of HD adequacy, timely dose adjustments can be made, which is critical among pediatric patients in a growth phase. Small scale observational studies support the association between delivered hemodialysis dose and patient outcomes including the potential for improved growth with intensive hemodialysis regimens.

S.4. **Numerator Statement:** Number of patients in the denominator with monthly adequacy measurements (spKt/V) or its components in the calendar month.
S.7. **Denominator Statement:** Number of pediatric patients (less than18 years) receiving in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis (irrespective of frequency of dialysis).
S.10. **Denominator Exclusions:** None.

De.1. **Measure Type:** Process
S.23. **Data Source:** Electronic Health Records
S.26. **Level of Analysis:** Facility

IF Endorsement Maintenance – Original Endorsement Date: Aug 16, 2011 **Most Recent Endorsement Date:** Aug 16, 2011

IF this measure is included in a composite, NQF Composite#/title:

IF this measure is paired/grouped, NQF#/title:

De.4. **IF PAIRED/GROUPED, what is the reason this measure must be reported with other measures to appropriately interpret results?** Method of Adequacy Measurement for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients
Minimum spKt/V for Pediatric Hemodialysis Patients

1. Evidence, Performance Gap, Priority – Importance to Measure and Report

Extent to which the specific measure focus is evidence-based, important to making significant gains in healthcare quality, and improving health outcomes for a specific high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare where there is variation in or overall less-than-optimal performance. ***Measures must be judged to meet all subcriteria to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

1a. Evidence to Support the Measure Focus – See attached Evidence Submission Form
1418_Evidence_MSF5.0_Data.doc

1b. Performance Gap
Demonstration of quality problems and opportunity for improvement, i.e., data demonstrating:

- considerable variation, or overall less-than-optimal performance, in the quality of care across providers; and/or
- disparities in care across population groups.

1b.1. **Briefly explain the rationale for this measure** *(e.g., the benefits or improvements in quality envisioned by use of this measure)*
By requiring a minimum of monthly evaluation of HD adequacy, timely dose adjustments can be made, which is critical among pediatric patients in a growth phase. Small scale observational studies support the association between delivered hemodialysis dose and patient outcomes including the potential for improved growth with intensive hemodialysis regimens.

1b.2. **Provide performance scores on the measure as specified (current and over time) at the specified level of analysis.** *(This is required for endorsement maintenance. Include mean, std dev, min, max, interquartile range, scores by decile. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities included). This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.*
Currently there is variation in the frequency of measurement of hemodialysis adequacy among the pediatric population. CPM data demonstrate that over 20% of pediatric patients do not have documented Kt/V values. Also, there are many pediatric patients who are dialyzed in adult hemodialysis facilities, and therefore, may not be monitored.

1b.3. **If no or limited performance data on the measure as specified is reported in 1b2, then provide a summary of data from the literature that indicates opportunity for improvement or overall less than optimal performance on the specific focus of measurement.**
Internal analysis of CPM data.

1b.4. **Provide disparities data from the measure as specified (current and over time) by population group, e.g., by race/ethnicity, gender, age, insurance status, socioeconomic status, and/or disability.** *(This is required for endorsement maintenance. Describe the data source including number of measured entities; number of patients; dates of data; if a sample, characteristics of the entities include.) This information also will be used to address the subcriterion on improvement (4b.1) under Usability and Use.*
In the North American Pediatric Renal Transplant Cooperative Study (NAPRTCS), monthly hemodialysis adequacy data were analyzed from 138 children from 32 centers. Multivariate modeling indicated that after adjusting for body surface area and lack of any Kt/V center measures, the mean Kt/V dose was significantly higher among females compared to males (ß=0.13, $p<0.05$) and among Nonblack patients compared to Black patients (ß=0.22, $p<0.001$).

1b.5. **If no or limited data on disparities from the measure as specified is reported in 1b4, then provide a summary of data from the literature that addresses disparities in care on the specific focus of measurement. Include citations.**
Leonard MB, et al. Racial and center differences in hemodialysis adequacy in children treated at pediatric centers: a North American Pediatric Renal Transplant Cooperative Study (NAPRTCS) report. J Am Soc Nephrol. 2004 Nov;15(11):2923-32

1c. High Priority (previously referred to as High Impact)

The measure addresses:

- a specific national health goal/priority identified by DHHS or the National Priorities Partnership convened by NQF; OR
- a demonstrated high-priority (high-impact) aspect of healthcare (e.g., affects large numbers of patients and/or has a substantial impact for a smaller population; leading cause of morbidity/mortality; high resource use (current and/or future); severity of illness; and severity of patient/societal consequences of poor quality).

1c.1. **Demonstrated high priority aspect of healthcare**
Frequently performed procedure, Severity of illness
1c.2. **If Other:**

1c.3. **Provide epidemiologic or resource use data that demonstrates the measure addresses a high priority aspect of healthcare. List citations in 1c.4.**
The incidence and prevalence rates of pediatric end-stage renal disease (ESRD) continue to increase with 7209 pediatric patients with ESRD in 2007 [1]. Although the majority of these patients are managed with kidney transplantation, approximately 2000 pediatric patients receive maintenance dialysis. Data also reveal that the five-year survival among pediatric patients receiving maintenance dialysis has not improved [1], demonstrating the need to improve the quality of dialysis care in this fragile patient group, particularly since no dialysis quality measures have been in place for the pediatric ESRD population. Finally, improving patient outcomes in pediatric patients is a priority particularly since the cost of care for a pediatric ESRD patient is markedly higher than for

an adult patient [2].

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[3,4]. No equivalent large scale clinical trials have been conducted in the pediatric hemodialysis population but smaller scale observational studies support the association between delivered hemodialysis dose and patient outcomes[5] including the potential for improved growth with intensive hemodialysis regimens [6,7].

Prior studies have used a monthly interval of measurement of hemodialysis dose [3,4]. Furthermore, since pediatric patients are in a growth phase, a minimum of monthly evaluation of HD adequacy is critical to ensure timely dose adjustment as needed. Currently there is variation in the frequency of measurement of hemodialysis adequacy among the pediatric population. Analysis of 2007 Clinical Performance Measures (CPM) data demonstrate that during the 3 month study period, dialysis adequacy using spKt/V was not measured at any time in 20% of pediatric patients. For all of these reasons, monthly measurement of HD adequacy is a highly important measure in the pediatric population.

1c.4. **Citations for data demonstrating high priority provided in 1a.3**

1. U.S. Renal Data System, USRDS 2009 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Bethesda, MD, 2009.

2. Michael Leavitt, Secretary of Health and Human Services. A Design for a Bundled End-stage Renal Disease Prospective Payment System, Report to Congress, 2008.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. Gorman G, et al. Clinical outcomes and dialysis adequacy in adolescent hemodialysis patients. Am Journal Kidney Dis; 47: 285-93, 2006.

6. Fischbach M, et al. Intensified and daily hemodialysis in children might improve statural growth. Pediatr Nephrol 21:1746–1752, 2006.

7. Tom A, et al. Growth during maintenance hemodialysis: impact of enhanced nutrition and clearance. J Pediatr. Apr;134(4):464-71, 1999.

1c.5. **If a PRO-PM (e.g. HRQoL/functional status, symptom/burden, experience with care, health-related behaviors), provide evidence that the target population values the measured PRO and finds it meaningful.** *(Describe how and from whom their input was obtained.)*

2. Reliability and 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. ***Measures must be judged to meet the subcriteria for both reliability and validity to pass this criterion and be evaluated against the remaining criteria.***

2a.1. Specifications The measure is well defined and precisely specified so it can be implemented consistently within and across organizations and allows for comparability. eMeasures should be specified in the Health Quality Measures Format (HQMF) and the Quality Data Model (QDM).

De.5. **Subject/Topic Area** *(check all the areas that apply):*

Renal : End Stage Renal Disease (ESRD)

De.6. **Non-Condition Specific** *(check all the areas that apply):*

S.1. **Measure-specific Web Page** *(Provide a URL link to a web page specific for this measure that contains current detailed specifications including code lists, risk model details, and supplemental materials. Do not enter a URL linking to a home page or to general information.)*

S.2a. **If this is an eMeasure**, HQMF specifications must be attached. Attach the zipped output from the eMeasure authoring tool (MAT) - if the MAT was not used, contact staff. (Use the specification fields in this online form for the plain-language description of the specifications)
Attachment:

S.2b. **Data Dictionary, Code Table, or Value Sets** *(and risk model codes and coefficients when applicable) must be attached. (Excel or csv file in the suggested format preferred - if not, contact staff)*
Attachment:

S.3. **For endorsement maintenance**, please briefly describe any changes to the measure specifications since last endorsement date and explain the reasons.

S.4. **Numerator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the measure focus or what is being measured about the target population, i.e., cases from the target population with the target process, condition, event, or outcome)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, state the outcome being measured. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.
Number of patients in the denominator with monthly adequacy measurements (spKt/V) or its components in the calendar month.

S.5. **Time Period for Data** *(What is the time period in which data will be aggregated for the measure, e.g., 12 mo, 3 years, look back to August for flu vaccination? Note if there are different time periods for the numerator and denominator.)*
The entire calendar month.

S.6. **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, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)*
IF an OUTCOME MEASURE, describe how the observed outcome is identified/counted. Calculation of the risk-adjusted outcome should be described in the calculation algorithm.
The numerator will be determined by counting the patients in the denominator who meet one of the following criteria in the one month study period: "Kt/V Hemodialysis Collection Date" is populated, AND "Kt/V Hemodialysis" is populated, OR "Kt/V Hemodialysis Collection Date" is populated, AND "BUN Pre-Dialysis" is populated, AND "BUN Post-Dialysis" is populated, AND "Pre-Dialysis Weight" is populated, AND "Pre-Dialysis Weight Unit of Measure" is populated, AND "Post-Dialysis Weight" is populated, AND "Post-Dialysis Weight Unit of Measure" is populated, AND "Delivered Minutes of BUN Hemodialysis Session" is populated.

S.7. **Denominator Statement** *(Brief, narrative description of the target population being measured)*
Number of pediatric patients (less than18 years) receiving in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis (irrespective of frequency of dialysis).

S.8. **Target Population Category** *(Check all the populations for which the measure is specified and tested if any):*
Children

S.9. **Denominator Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate the target population/denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses , code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)*
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' or 'Home' 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 less than 18 years old who are determined to be in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis patients.

S.10. **Denominator Exclusions** *(Brief narrative description of exclusions from the target population)*
None.

S.11. **Denominator Exclusion Details** *(All information required to identify and calculate exclusions from the denominator such as definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format at S.2b)*
None.

S.12. **Stratification Details/Variables** *(All information required to stratify the measure results including the stratification variables, definitions, specific data collection items/responses, code/value sets – Note: lists of individual codes with descriptors that exceed 1 page should be provided in an Excel or csv file in required format with at S.2b)*
No stratification is required for this measure. Measure may be displayed separately for in-center hemodialysis patients and home hemodialysis patients.

S.13. **Risk Adjustment Type** (Select type. Provide specifications for risk stratification in S.12 and for statistical model in S.14-15)
No risk adjustment or risk stratification
If other:

S.14. **Identify the statistical risk model method and variables** *(Name the statistical method - e.g., logistic regression and list all the risk factor variables. Note - risk model development and testing should be addressed with measure testing under Scientific Acceptability)*
N/A

S.15. **Detailed risk model specifications** *(must be in attached data dictionary/code list Excel or csv file. Also indicate if available at measure-specific URL identified in S.1.)*
Note: Risk model details (including coefficients, equations, codes with descriptors, definitions), should be provided on a separate worksheet in the suggested format in the Excel or csv file with data dictionary/code lists at S.2b.

S.15a. **Detailed risk model specifications** (*if not provided in excel or csv file at S.2b*)

S.16. **Type of score:**
Rate/proportion
If other:

S.17. **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

S.18. **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.)*
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. Home hemodialysis patients are determined by "Primary Dialysis Setting"= "Home" on the last day of the study period. The denominator will include all

patients less than 18 years old who are determined to be in-center hemodialysis or home hemodialysis patients.
The numerator will be determined by counting the patients in the denominator who meet one of the following criteria in the one month study period: "Kt/V Hemodialysis Collection Date" is populated, AND "Kt/V Hemodialysis" is populated, OR "Kt/V Hemodialysis Collection Date" is populated, AND "BUN Pre-Dialysis" is populated, AND "BUN Post-Dialysis" is populated, AND "Pre-Dialysis Weight" is populated, AND "Pre-Dialysis Weight Unit of Measure" is populated, AND "Post-Dialysis Weight" is populated, AND "Post-Dialysis Weight Unit of Measure" is populated, AND "Delivered Minutes of BUN Hemodialysis Session" is populated.

S.19. **Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic Diagram URL or Attachment** *(You also may provide a diagram of the Calculation Algorithm/Measure Logic described above at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)*

S.20. **Sampling** *(If measure is based on a sample, provide instructions for obtaining the sample and guidance on minimum sample size.)*
IF a PRO-PM, identify whether (and how) proxy responses are allowed.
N/A

S.21. **Survey/Patient-reported data** *(If measure is based on a survey, provide instructions for conducting the survey and guidance on minimum response rate.)*
IF a PRO-PM, specify calculation of response rates to be reported with performance measure results.

S.22. **Missing data** (specify how missing data are handled, e.g., imputation, delete case.)
Required for Composites and PRO-PMs.

S.23. **Data Source** *(Check ONLY the sources for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED).*
If other, please describe in S.24.
Electronic Health Records

S.24. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(Identify the specific data source/data collection instrument e.g. name of database, clinical registry, collection instrument, etc.)*
IF a PRO-PM, identify the specific PROM(s); and standard methods, modes, and languages of administration.
CROWNWeb

S.25. **Data Source or Collection Instrument** *(available at measure-specific Web page URL identified in S.1 OR in attached appendix at A.1)*
URL

S.26. **Level of Analysis** *(Check ONLY the levels of analysis for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*
Facility

S.27. **Care Setting** *(Check ONLY the settings for which the measure is SPECIFIED AND TESTED)*
Post-Acute Care
If other:

S.28. **COMPOSITE Performance Measure** - Additional Specifications *(Use this section as needed for aggregation and weighting rules, or calculation of individual performance measures if not individually endorsed.)*

2a. Reliability – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form
2b. Validity – See attached Measure Testing Submission Form
1418_MeasureTesting_MSF5.0_Data.doc

3. Feasibility

Extent to which the specifications including measure logic, require data that are readily available or could be captured without undue burden and can be implemented for performance measurement.

3a. Byproduct of Care Processes

For clinical measures, the required data elements are routinely generated and used during care delivery (e.g., blood pressure, lab test, diagnosis, medication order).

3a.1. **Data Elements Generated as Byproduct of Care Processes.**

generated by and used by healthcare personnel during the provision of care, e.g., blood pressure, lab value, medical condition

If other:

3b. Electronic Sources

The required data elements are available in electronic health records or other electronic sources. If the required data are not in electronic health records or existing electronic sources, a credible, near-term path to electronic collection is specified.

3b.1. **To what extent are the specified data elements available electronically in defined fields?** *(i.e., data elements that are needed to compute the performance measure score are in defined, computer-readable fields)*

Yes

3b.2. **If ALL the data elements needed to compute the performance measure score are not from electronic sources, specify a credible, near-term path to electronic capture, OR provide a rationale for using other than electronic sources.**

3b.3. **If this is an eMeasure, provide a summary of the feasibility assessment in an attached file or make available at a measure-specific URL.**

Attachment:

3c. Data Collection Strategy

Demonstration that the data collection strategy (e.g., source, timing, frequency, sampling, patient confidentiality, costs associated with fees/licensing of proprietary measures) can be implemented (e.g., already in operational use, or testing demonstrates that it is ready to put into operational use). For eMeasures, a feasibility assessment addresses the data elements and measure logic and demonstrates the eMeasure can be implemented or feasibility concerns can be adequately addressed.

3c.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.**

IF a PRO-PM, consider implications for both individuals providing PROM data (patients, service recipients, respondents) and those whose performance is being measured.

Because data elements required for this measure are already being collected as part of the ESRD CPM, facilities are familiar with data required for this measure. This reduces the likelihood of errors in the data collection process.

3c.2. **Describe any fees, licensing, or other requirements to use any aspect of the measure as specified** *(e.g., value/code set, risk model, programming code, algorithm)*.

4. Usability and Use

Extent to which potential audiences (e.g., consumers, purchasers, providers, policy makers) are using or could use performance results for both accountability and performance improvement to achieve the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4a. Accountability and Transparency

Performance results are used in at least one accountability application within three years after initial endorsement and are publicly reported within six years after initial endorsement (or the data on performance results are available). If not in use at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible plan for implementation within the specified timeframes is provided.

4.1. Current and Planned Use
NQF-endorsed measures are expected to be used in at least one accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement in addition to performance improvement.

Planned	Current Use (for current use provide URL)
Public Reporting Quality Improvement (Internal to the specific organization)	

4a.1. For each CURRENT use, checked above, provide:

- Name of program and sponsor
- Purpose
- Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included

4a.2. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application (e.g., payment program, certification, licensing) what are the reasons? (*e.g., Do policies or actions of the developer/steward or accountable entities restrict access to performance results or impede implementation?*)

4a.3. If not currently publicly reported OR used in at least one other accountability application, provide a credible plan for implementation within the expected timeframes -- any accountability application within 3 years and publicly reported within 6 years of initial endorsement. (*Credible plan includes the specific program, purpose, intended audience, and timeline for implementing the measure within the specified timeframes. A plan for accountability applications addresses mechanisms for data aggregation and reporting.*)

4b. Improvement

Progress toward achieving the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations is demonstrated. If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, then a credible rationale describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4b.1. Progress on Improvement. (Not required for initial endorsement unless available.)
Performance results on this measure (current and over time) should be provided in 1b.2 and 1b.4. Discuss:

- **Progress (trends in performance results, number and percentage of people receiving high-quality healthcare)**
- **Geographic area and number and percentage of accountable entities and patients included**

4b.2. If no improvement was demonstrated, what are the reasons? If not in use for performance improvement at the time of initial endorsement, provide a credible rationale that describes how the performance results could be used to further the goal of high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations.

4c. Unintended Consequences

The benefits of the performance measure in facilitating progress toward achieving high-quality, efficient healthcare for individuals or populations outweigh evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations (if such evidence exists).

4c.1. Were any unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations identified during testing; OR has evidence of unintended negative consequences to individuals or populations been reported since implementation? If so, identify the negative unintended consequences and describe how benefits outweigh them or actions taken to mitigate them.
Data elements for this measure are already being collected and are unlikely to be susceptible to inaccuracies, errors or unintended consequences.

5. Comparison to Related or 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.

5. Relation to Other NQF-endorsed Measures
Are there related measures (conceptually, either same measure focus or target population) or competing measures (conceptually both the same measure focus and same target population)? If yes, list the NQF # and title of all related and/or competing measures.

5.1a. **List of related or competing measures (selected from NQF-endorsed measures)**

5.1b. **If related or competing measures are not NQF endorsed please indicate measure title and steward.**

5a. Harmonization

The measure specifications are harmonized with related measures;
OR
The differences in specifications are justified

5a.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses 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 Measures

The measure is superior to competing measures (e.g., is a more valid or efficient way to measure);
OR
Multiple measures are justified.

5b.1. **If this measure conceptually addresses 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.)
This measure is for pediatric (<18 years) patients only. The NQF endorsed measure is for patients >=18 years old.

Related Measures: NQF # 0247. ESRD- HD Adequacy CPM I: Monthly measurement of delivered dialysis dose

Appendix

A.1 Supplemental materials may be provided in an appendix. All supplemental materials (such as data collection instrument or methodology reports) should be organized in one file with a table of contents or bookmarks. If material pertains to a specific submission form number, that should be indicated. Requested information should be provided in the submission form and required attachments. There is no guarantee that supplemental materials will be reviewed.
Attachment:

Contact Information

Co.1 **Measure Steward (Intellectual Property Owner):** Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Co.2 **Point of Contact:** Corette, Byrd, MMSSupport@Battelle.org, 202-786-1158-

Co.3 **Measure Developer if different from Measure Steward:** Arbor Research/UM-KECC
Co.4 **Point of Contact:** Claudia, Dahlerus, Claudia.Dahlerus@arborresearch.org, 734-665-4108-

Additional Information

Ad.1 **Workgroup/Expert Panel involved in measure development**
Provide a list of sponsoring organizations and workgroup/panel members' names and organizations. Describe the members' role in measure development.
Dr. Bradley Warady, panel chair (University of Missouri, Kansas City School of Medicine, Kansas City, MO)
Dr. Carolyn Abitbol (University of Miami, Holtz Children's Hospital, Miami, FL)
Dr. Eileen Brewer (Baylor College of Medicine/Texas Children's Hospital, Houston, TX)
Dr. Stuart Goldstein (Baylor College of Medicine/Texas Children's Hospital, Houston, TX)
Dr. Alicia Neu (Johns Hopkins Medical Institution, Baltimore, MD)
Dr. Irene Restaino (Children's Hospital of The King Daughters, Norfolk, VA)
Dr. Douglas Silverstein (Children´s National Medical Center, Washington, D.C.)
Dr. Sylvia Ramirez, Moderator (Arbor Research Collaborative for Health)
Alissa Kapke, Analyst, (Arbor Research Collaborative for Health
Jeffrey Pearson, Analytical Manager, (Arbor Research Collaborative for Health)

Measure Developer/Steward Updates and Ongoing Maintenance
Ad.2 **Year the measure was first released:**
Ad.3 **Month and Year of most recent revision:**
Ad.4 **What is your frequency for review/update of this measure?** Three years
Ad.5 **When is the next scheduled review/update for this measure?** 2013

Ad.6 **Copyright statement:**
Ad.7 **Disclaimers:**

Ad.8 **Additional Information/Comments:**