

Patient-Centered Care: An Opportunity to Accomplish the “Three Aims” of the National Quality Strategy in the Medicare ESRD Program

Ann M. O'Hare,* Nancy Armistead,[†] Wendy L. Funk Schrag,[‡] Louis Diamond,[§] and Alvin H. Moss^{||}

Abstract

In light of mounting federal government debt and levels of Medicare spending that are widely viewed as unsustainable, commentators have called for a transformation of the United States health care system to deliver better care at lower costs. This article presents the priorities of the Coalition for Supportive Care of Kidney Patients for how clinicians might achieve this transformation for patients with advanced CKD and their families. The authors suspect that much of the high-intensity, high-cost care currently delivered to patients with advanced kidney disease may be unwanted and that the “Three Aims” put forth by the National Quality Strategy of better care for the individual, better health for populations, and reduced health care costs may be within reach for patients with CKD and ESRD. This work describes the coalition’s vision for a more patient-centered approach to the care of patients with kidney disease and argues for more concerted efforts to align their treatments with their goals, values, and preferences. Key priorities to achieve this vision include using improved prognostic models and decision science to help patients, their families, and their providers better understand what to expect in the future; engaging patients and their families in shared decision-making before the initiation of dialysis and during the course of dialysis treatment; and tailoring treatment strategies throughout the continuum of their care to address what matters most to individual patients.

Clin J Am Soc Nephrol 9: 2189–2194, 2014. doi: 10.2215/CJN.01930214

Introduction

Health care in the United States is undergoing a “delivery system transformation.” The US Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) is testing innovative payment and service delivery models to enhance quality care for Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries while at the same time reducing program expenditures. In short, the goal is to deliver better care at lower cost (1). The Medicare ESRD program is among the CMS-funded programs in which value-based purchasing will be implemented (2). Increases in Medicare spending, particularly in the Medicare ESRD program, have provided the major impetus for these proposed changes (2–4). In 2010, 7.9% of all Medicare expenditures were spent on the 1.3% of Medicare beneficiaries with ESRD (5).

The CMS foresees that to achieve long-term success in health care reform, clinicians and organizations will need to make “fundamental changes in their day-to-day operations” (1). The members of the Coalition for Supportive Care of Kidney Patients (CCKP; formerly the Kidney End-of-Life Coalition), composed of renal palliative care specialists, representatives of kidney and hospice organizations, and patients with ESRD and their family members, believe that better quality care for patients with CKD and ESRD can likely be achieved at similar or lower costs. Furthermore, CCKP members agree with the CMS that reform of the care of patients with CKD and ESRD will

require fundamental changes in our approach to the care of these patients (6).

This article aims to present the CCKP’s vision for how clinicians might work together with patients with advanced CKD and their families to optimize care. Studies of dialysis patients’ preferences for end-of-life care suggest that much of the high-intensity, high-cost care currently delivered to older patients with advanced kidney disease may be unwanted, and that efforts to align treatment decisions with what matters most to individual patients may lead many patients to choose lower-intensity, lower-cost treatments (7–9). Experience in oncology reveals that efforts to align treatment plans with patient preferences and to integrate palliative care earlier in the course of illness are shown to result in better patient quality of life, less aggressive care, earlier referral to hospice, better caregiver bereavement adjustment, and lower costs (10–13). On the basis of the oncology experience, it seems likely that stronger efforts to align treatments for advanced kidney disease with patients’ informed preferences might have the added benefit of resulting in lower-cost care.

We suspect that the implementation of the CCKP’s vision will accomplish the “Three Aims” of the National Quality Strategy and the Institute for Healthcare Improvement to promote better care for the individual, better health for populations, and reduced health care costs (14). The CCKP believes that a strategy of patient-centered care based on available evidence and aligned

*Department of Medicine, University of Washington and Veterans Affairs Puget Sound Healthcare System, Seattle, Washington; [†]Mid-Atlantic Renal Coalition, Richmond, Virginia; [‡]Fresenius Medical Care, Newton, Kansas; [§]Quality Health Care Advisory Group, Rockville, Maryland; and ^{||}Section of Nephrology, West Virginia University School of Medicine, Morgantown, West Virginia

Correspondence:
Dr. Alvin H. Moss, Section of Nephrology, West Virginia University School of Medicine, PO Box 9022, Morgantown, WV 26506-9022.
Email: amoss@hsc.wvu.edu

with the values and goals of patients with CKD and ESRD may simultaneously enhance their care while embracing the fiscal realities of the Medicare ESRD program.

History and Growth of the Medicare ESRD Program

The Medicare ESRD program has far exceeded initial projections in terms of the size of the population and associated costs. The social contract that is the Medicare ESRD program came into existence in 1972, when the US Congress explicitly acknowledged that withholding life-extending technology on the basis of inability to pay was ethically and morally inconsistent with our country's values (15). The program was never intended to provide RRT to all patients with advanced kidney disease. In a 1975 Report to Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare agreed with the need for guidelines to assure that whole categories of patients are not excluded from receiving treatment, but it also stated that not all patients with CKD should be dialyzed (16). The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare wrestled with defining the program, but its final policy objectives (to provide for the health care needs of patients with kidney disease, to create the infrastructure for their treatment, and to assure quality while containing costs) are still relevant (17). As the primary payer for ESRD in this country, the US Federal Government spent \$34.3 billion on the Medicare ESRD program in 2011 (18). Medicare now covers 82% of patients, with the remainder being covered by Medicaid, the US Department of Veterans Affairs, the US Department of Defense, and private insurance (18).

Since its inception, the Medicare ESRD program has implemented a number of reforms intended to reduce costs and improve the quality of care (*e.g.*, bundled payment, pay-for-performance measures) but has not generally sought to elicit patient and family preferences and priorities or to tailor care to optimize those outcomes that matter most to individual patients.

Over time, there has been a progressive liberalization of dialysis initiation practices resulting in a dramatic expansion in the size of the Medicare ESRD program. Between 1990 and 2010, the number of new patients with ESRD in the United States increased from 50,869 to 116,946, and the crude annual incidence of ESRD increased from 119.4 to 369.4 per million (19). This trend does not appear to be completely explained by trends in the prevalence of CKD (20). Furthermore, patients are not only initiating dialysis in greater numbers, but they are also doing so earlier in the course of their kidney disease. Over the last 10–15 years, there has been a pervasive trend across a wide range of different patient groups toward initiation of chronic dialysis at progressively higher levels of kidney function (21,22). Possible contributors to more liberal dialysis initiation practices over time include less stringent guideline criteria for dialysis initiation, changes in the recommended approach to measurement and classification of CKD, and active collaboration between the CMS and the Kidney Disease Outcomes Quality Initiative to eliminate regulatory barriers to dialysis initiation at higher levels of renal function (23,24).

Temporal trends in the incidence of treated ESRD have been particularly pronounced in very elderly patients, a group for whom the benefits of this treatment are least certain.

Reports of limited survival and poor outcomes after initiation of dialysis, high levels of health care intensity and low rates of hospice use at the very end of life in older dialysis patients have helped to highlight the potential burdens of dialysis treatment in this most vulnerable group (24–28). In addition, a growing number of reports from outside the United States comparing outcomes among patients who initiate dialysis versus those treated more conservatively suggest that dialysis may have little effect on life expectancy in frail older adults, and that any gains in life expectancy may be offset by more days spent in a health care setting (29,30). Collectively, this work has generated skepticism about the benefits and appropriateness of more liberal approaches to dialysis initiation in frail older adults (31,32).

Limited data are available on the benefits and harms of treatment with dialysis versus more conservative approaches in the care of frail older patients with symptomatic advanced kidney disease who are not candidates for renal transplantation (33–35). Several studies have demonstrated that some patients are willing to make tradeoffs between longer survival time and better quality of life. In one study of 578 patients with advanced CKD, only a small minority reported that they would want to live as long as possible if this would mean prolonged pain and discomfort (8). In a second study of 242 patients with CKD, 75% said they would prefer to live for a shorter period if this would mean avoiding pain and suffering (7). In a third study of 105 patients with CKD, many were willing to make substantial tradeoffs in survival (up to 15 months) in exchange for improved quality of life. Some viewed time spent on dialysis and restrictions on travel imposed by dialysis treatments as detrimental to their quality of life, and said they would be willing to accept shorter survival in order to reduce treatment time and travel restrictions (9).

In addition to the dialysis procedure itself, initiation of dialysis often means that patients are committing themselves to more intensive patterns of health care utilization overall, in many instances without full understanding of what might lie ahead. The majority of older dialysis patients in the United States initiate dialysis in the hospital and many go on to experience high rates of hospitalization after initiation (36). In a study of older Medicare beneficiaries starting dialysis, patients were classified into five levels of intensity of care around the time of dialysis initiation, ranging from outpatient initiation at one extreme to spending >2 weeks in the hospital and receiving at least one intensive procedure such as cardiopulmonary resuscitation, mechanical ventilation, or feeding tube placement at the other. For patients aged ≥ 85 years who received the highest level of intensity of care, median survival after dialysis initiation was <6 months, with more than one third of that time spent in the hospital (36). Many patients continue to receive very aggressive care focused on life prolongation toward the end of their lives. Almost one half (44.5%) of older United States dialysis patients die in a hospital setting compared with 35.2% of Medicare beneficiaries with other severe chronic illnesses (including congestive heart failure, advanced liver disease, dementia, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease) (27). Rates of hospitalization (76%) and intensive care unit (ICU)

admission (49.0%) during the final month of life are also substantially higher than reported for other older Medicare beneficiaries, including those with cancer (of whom, 61.3% are hospitalized and 24.0% are admitted to an ICU) and heart failure (of whom, 64.2% are hospitalized and 19.0% are admitted to an ICU). Compared with older Medicare beneficiaries with cancer, those receiving long-term dialysis spend twice as many days in the hospital during the last month of life (9.8 versus 5.1 days) and are three times more likely to undergo an intensive procedure (29.0% versus 9%) (27). By contrast, rates of palliative care and hospice utilization among dialysis patients at the end of life are about one half of that of other chronic disease populations (28). Clinicians, patients, and families often find it difficult to say “no” to intensive interventions (including dialysis) that are intended to prolong life when these are offered. As providers, we may have to work hard to resist the “technological imperative” and “biomedicalization of aging” that currently pervade medical practice in order to support the big-picture goals of individual patients (37).

Patient-Centered Care

In its 2001 report *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*, the Institute of Medicine (IOM) noted that the United States health care delivery system does not provide consistent, high-quality medical care to all people. The report identified six specific suggestions for improvement. Among the six was the recommendation that medical treatment should be patient centered. The IOM defined the term “patient centered” as “providing care that is respectful of and responsive to individual patient preferences, needs, and values, and ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions” (38). Since the publication of the IOM report, there has been growing national interest in more individualized, patient-centered models of care. These models focus on what matters most to individual patients, and less on what might matter to providers or health systems (39). Maximizing survival, which is often prioritized in conventional disease-oriented approaches to care, is often but one of several competing patient goals for patients and their families. Other possible goals that are of greater importance to some patients are to promote or maintain quality of life, preserve dignity, optimize comfort, and limit treatment time (7–9). Patients, rather than disease processes, and shared, rather than paternalistic, approaches to decision-making are usually favored in more patient-centered individualized models of care.

Shared decision-making has been described as the “pinacle of patient-centered care” (40). It is a process of communication by which physicians and patients agree on a specific course of action based on a common understanding of the patient’s preferences and treatment goals and the benefits versus harms of different treatment alternatives. Shared decision-making affords clinicians an opportunity to learn about the patient’s values, goals, and preferences, while affording patients an opportunity to learn about their prognosis, expected illness trajectory, and the consequences of available treatments (41). The recommendation that patients with CKD and their providers engage in shared decision-making before dialysis is initiated has been widely endorsed by major nephrology organizations including the

American Society of Nephrology (42) and the Renal Physicians Association (41).

There is now growing consensus that dialysis should not be viewed as a default therapy for advanced kidney disease (8,43,44). Before the initiation of dialysis, patients and their families should be informed about the benefits, burdens, and alternatives to dialysis, what dialysis treatment will involve, what the experience of being on dialysis might be like for them, and how it might affect their life and the lives of their family members (44). However, available evidence suggests that shared decision-making is currently poorly integrated into the clinical care of patients with kidney disease, that treatment decisions leading up to and including dialysis initiation may be presented to patients more as a necessity than as a choice, and that patients and their families often have little input into these decisions (45). Despite the large effect of dialysis treatment on the lives of patients and their families, available data suggest that these decisions are largely made by providers (8,45). Lack of patient choice in the dialysis decision-making process was identified as a major theme in a systematic review of 18 studies of interviews with patients with CKD and ESRD (46). In a study of 99 dialysis patients who were interviewed about their experience with dialysis decision-making, the majority felt “unprepared and ill-informed” about the decision to start dialysis and only one patient recalled being explicitly told that not starting dialysis was an option (47). Taken together, these studies indicate that treatment practices for patients with ESRD may often be out of step with the kind of care that some, if not many, patients and their families would want if they fully understood what might lie ahead. When asked after the fact, some patients report regretting their decision to initiate dialysis (8). Indeed, recent work has highlighted the presence of a large disconnect between provider and patient perceptions about prognosis and candidacy for interventions like kidney transplant that can markedly change prognosis (48). Although patients with kidney disease report being open to discussions about prognosis and future illness trajectories, a minority report never having had such conversations with their providers (8,45,49). In addition, both patients and providers cite the large degree of uncertainty about prognosis and future illness trajectory as a major barrier toward disease-related planning during the course of kidney disease (49).

The emerging experience of some centers in Europe and Australia with supportive care models for advanced kidney disease suggests that when dialysis is presented explicitly as a treatment choice and patients are offered a clear alternative, a significant percentage of patients will choose not to receive dialysis (50,51). In an Australian study, 65% of patients with stage 5 CKD were offered an option of medical management without dialysis and 14% chose this option (52). Formal supportive care pathways have been slower to emerge in the United States than in Europe and Australia, perhaps reflecting broader societal differences in the context in which treatment decisions for advanced CKD occur. Nevertheless, the Australian experience raises the possibility that efforts to frame dialysis more explicitly as a treatment choice and to develop strong positive alternatives to dialysis in this country might ultimately translate into fewer United States patients choosing

to initiate dialysis for their advanced kidney disease. An alternative to dialysis, active medical management without dialysis, has been explicitly identified as an option for United States patients with ESRD with poor prognoses in a patient-centered approach (53).

The CSCKP's Vision for the Medicare ESRD Program

The CSCKP believes that there is ample opportunity to improve the care of patients with advanced CKD while embracing the economic realities of the Medicare ESRD program. We believe that by strengthening efforts to ensure that patients with advanced CKD participate in shared decision-making throughout the course of kidney disease, it may be possible to simultaneously improve care while reducing costs. Because patients' illness experience, preferences, health status, and treatment options often change over time, a flexible approach of reevaluation and redirection will often be needed to ensure that treatments remain aligned with patients' values and preferences. Our vision (Table 1) includes a number of priorities outlined in the CSCKP strategic plan (6).

First, efforts to better inform patients, their families, and their providers about what to expect in the future in terms of their own prognosis and illness trajectory are sorely

needed. The development of prognostic models for patients with stages 4 and 5 CKD, for life expectancy and time to and likelihood of ESRD onset, may help to provide patients with more realistic expectations. Point-of-care decision support tools that can be readily applied to real-world complex clinical cases will be helpful in supporting this goal, as would efforts to promote research that can directly inform patient-centered care (*e.g.*, inclusion of patient-important outcomes, recruitment of study populations that resemble real-world clinical populations). Advance-care planning based on realistic expectations about likely future health events may help patients and their families anticipate treatment decisions that may arise in the setting of a serious life-threatening illness, communicate their preferences regarding intensity of treatment with family members and members of the health care team, and document these preferences in a manner likely to be respected in the treatment they receive (54).

Second, engagement of patients, families, and their providers in a process of shared decision-making around the myriad treatment decisions that patients with kidney disease may encounter during the course of their illness is an important step toward helping to ensure that patient and family goals and preferences more strongly shape treatment decisions (55). These include, but are not limited to, decisions

Table 1. Priorities of the Coalition for Supportive Care of Kidney Patients

Priority	Goal
1. Enhance efforts to help patients, their families, and their providers to better understand the expected course of their disease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop robust prognostic models to provide patients with advanced CKD with realistic expectations in terms of life expectancy, illness trajectory, and future treatment decisions Promote research to augment information on patient-centered outcomes associated with different treatment options that can be generalized to real-world clinical settings Encourage the development and implementation of point-of-care decision support tools tailored to patients with CKD
2. Promote shared decision making for patients with advanced CKD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enhance efforts to elicit patient goals, values, and preferences Provide communication skills training for clinicians caring for patients with CKD Support reimbursement for clinician time spent in shared decision-making with patients and their families Promote advance care planning for patients with kidney disease, beginning early in the disease course and continuing as the illness progresses
3. Tailor treatment strategies to what matters most to individual patients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Align treatment plans and quality metrics to optimize patient-important goals and preferences to maximize patient quality of life Encourage regulatory and practice changes to allow for greater flexibility in the timing and prescription of dialysis and the development of strong positive treatment alternatives to dialysis Promote regulatory changes for greater integration of hospice and palliative care into other aspects of the care of patients with advanced kidney disease as needed to support patient goals and preferences Increase palliative care training, both in nephrology fellowship programs and continuing medical education

about dialysis initiation, continuation, and discontinuation and may also pertain to related interventions (e.g., treatment modality for advanced kidney disease, choice and timing of vascular access placement, referral for kidney transplant) as well as broader efforts to maintain health (e.g., renoprotective and cardioprotective interventions). The emerging field of decision science and associated tools (e.g., decision aids) may be extremely helpful in supporting many of these decisions (56). Changes to reimbursement will also likely be needed to ensure that providers have adequate time to engage in shared decision-making with patients and their families.

Third, stronger efforts are needed to tailor the care of patients with advanced kidney disease to match their own goals and preferences. Development of a more individualized, patient-centered approach to the care of patients with advanced kidney disease will require changes to regulatory and care structures. Such changes would likely include greater flexibility in the approach to preparation, timing, and prescription of dialysis with the development of quality metrics to address the extent to which treatment practices support patient goals (21,57,58). Stronger efforts are also needed to ensure access to treatment modalities that best address each patient's goals at different points in their illness trajectory, such as home therapies (59) and kidney transplantation. A more patient-centered approach to the care of patients with advanced kidney disease will also benefit from the development of strong positive alternatives to dialysis with the option to integrate palliative care earlier in the course of illness. The provision of palliative care throughout the course of advanced kidney disease may require regulatory changes to allow for flexibility in the provision of dialysis to patients enrolled in hospice programs. Adaptation and testing of supportive care models developed outside the United States and provider education in the principles and practice of palliative and end-of-life care may also be helpful in supporting this goal (60–62).

In summary, stronger efforts to ensure that patients with advanced kidney disease have an opportunity to shape their own care are sorely needed. We believe that centering care on the patient by emphasizing what matters most to patients and their families and ensuring that patient values guide all clinical decisions may have the added benefit of limiting unwanted, high-intensity, high-cost care in this population.

Acknowledgments

In 2007, the Mid-Atlantic Renal Coalition (MARC) established the Coalition for Supportive Care of Kidney Patients (CSCCKP; formerly the Kidney End-of-Life Coalition) in recognition that end-of-life care is an essential component of the continuum of quality care. The coalition maintains a resource-rich website that encourages active engagement in meaningful shared decision-making. MARC is a nonprofit subsidiary of West Virginia Medical Institute/Quality Insights Holdings and serves as an ESRD Network organization. The CSCCKP is supported by MARC from reserve funds.

Disclosures

A.M.O. received an honorarium from UpToDate and research funding from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the US Department of Veterans Affairs. In addition, she served as chair for the American Society of

Nephrology Geriatric Nephrology Advisory Group. The opinions expressed in the article do not reflect those of these organizations.

References

1. Rajkumar R, Conway PH, Tavenner M: CMS—Engaging multiple payers in payment reform. *JAMA* 311: 1967–1968, 2014
2. Andersen MJ, Friedman AN: The coming fiscal crisis: Nephrology in the line of fire. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 8: 1252–1257, 2013
3. US Congressional Budget Office: Long-term budget outlook. Available at: http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/06-21-Long-Term_Budget_Outlook.pdf. Accessed March 15, 2013
4. Medicare Trustees: 2012 Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Funds. Available at <https://www.cms.gov/Research-Statistics-Data-and-Systems/Statistics-Trends-and-Reports/ReportsTrustFunds/downloads/tr2012.pdf>. Accessed December 13, 2013
5. US Renal Data System: *USRDS 2010 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States*, Bethesda, MD, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, 2010
6. Coalition for Supportive Care of Kidney Patients: Strategic Plan: 2013 to 2016. Available at: http://www.kidneysupportivecare.org/Files/StrategicPlanDRAFTv3_2014.aspx. Accessed February 26, 2014
7. Hines SC, Glover JJ, Babrow AS, Holley JL, Badzek LA, Moss AH: Improving advance care planning by accommodating family preferences. *J Palliat Med* 4: 481–489, 2001
8. Davison SN: End-of-life care preferences and needs: Perceptions of patients with chronic kidney disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 5: 195–204, 2010
9. Morton RL, Snelling P, Webster AC, Rose J, Masterson R, Johnson DW, Howard K: Factors influencing patient choice of dialysis versus conservative care to treat end-stage kidney disease. *CMAJ* 184: E277–E283, 2012
10. Wright AA, Zhang B, Ray A, Mack JW, Trice E, Balboni T, Mitchell SL, Jackson VA, Block SD, Maciejewski PK, Prigerson HG: Associations between end-of-life discussions, patient mental health, medical care near death, and caregiver bereavement adjustment. *JAMA* 300: 1665–1673, 2008
11. Zhang B, Wright AA, Huskamp HA, Nilsson ME, Maciejewski ML, Earle CC, Block SD, Maciejewski PK, Prigerson HG: Health care costs in the last week of life: Associations with end-of-life conversations. *Arch Intern Med* 169: 480–488, 2009
12. Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A, Gallagher ER, Admane S, Jackson VA, Dahlin CM, Blinderman CD, Jacobsen J, Pirl WF, Billings JA, Lynch TJ: Early palliative care for patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 363: 733–742, 2010
13. Parikh RB, Kirch RA, Smith TJ, Temel JS: Early specialty palliative care—Translating data in oncology into practice. *N Engl J Med* 369: 2347–2351, 2013
14. US Department of Health and Human Services: National Quality Strategy. Available at: <http://www.ahrq.gov/workingforquality/>. Accessed December 13, 2013
15. Rettig RA: Special treatment—The story of Medicare's ESRD entitlement. *N Engl J Med* 364: 596–598, 2011
16. US Department of Health, Education and Welfare: *Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States: Treatment of Chronic Kidney Failure: Dialysis, Transplant, Costs, and the Need for More Vigorous Efforts*, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, DC, 1975
17. US Department of Health, Education and Welfare: *Office of the Secretary, Final Policies PL 92-603, Section 299I*, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, DC, 1974
18. US Renal Data System: *USRDS 2013 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States*, Bethesda, MD, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, 2013

19. US Renal Data System: *USRDS 2012 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States*, Bethesda, MD, National Institutes of Health, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, 2012
20. Hsu CY, Vittinghoff E, Lin F, Shlipak MG: The incidence of end-stage renal disease is increasing faster than the prevalence of chronic renal insufficiency. *Ann Intern Med* 141: 95–101, 2004
21. Rosansky SJ, Clark WF, Eggers P, Glasscock RJ: Initiation of dialysis at higher GFRs: Is the apparent rising tide of early dialysis harmful or helpful? *Kidney Int* 76: 257–261, 2009
22. O'Hare AM, Choi AI, Boscardin WJ, Clinton WL, Zawadzki I, Hebert PL, Kurella Tamura M, Taylor L, Larson EB: Trends in timing of initiation of chronic dialysis in the United States. *Arch Intern Med* 171: 1663–1669, 2011
23. Kurella M, Covinsky KE, Collins AJ, Chertow GM: Octogenarians and nonagenarians starting dialysis in the United States. *Ann Intern Med* 146: 177–183, 2007
24. O'Hare AM, Vig EK, Hebert PL: Initiation of dialysis at higher levels of estimated GFR and subsequent withdrawal. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 8: 179–181, 2013
25. Kurella Tamura M, Covinsky KE, Chertow GM, Yaffe K, Landefeld CS, McCulloch CE: Functional status of elderly adults before and after initiation of dialysis. *N Engl J Med* 361: 1539–1547, 2009
26. Jassal SV, Chiu E, Hladunewich M: Loss of independence in patients starting dialysis at 80 years of age or older. *N Engl J Med* 361: 1612–1613, 2009
27. Wong SP, Kreuter W, O'Hare AM: Treatment intensity at the end of life in older adults receiving long-term dialysis. *Arch Intern Med* 172: 661–663, discussion 663–664, 2012
28. Murray AM, Arko C, Chen SC, Gilbertson DT, Moss AH: Use of hospice in the United States dialysis population. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 1: 1248–1255, 2006
29. Alston H: Conservative care for end-stage kidney disease: Joint medical conference with the Renal Association, British Geriatrics Society and Association for Palliative Medicine. *Clin Med* 13: 383–386, 2013
30. Carson RC, Juszczak M, Davenport A, Burns A: Is maximum conservative management an equivalent treatment option to dialysis for elderly patients with significant comorbid disease? *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 4: 1611–1619, 2009
31. Thorsteinsdottir B, Swetz KM, Tilburt JC: Dialysis in the frail elderly—A current ethical problem, an impending ethical crisis. *J Gen Intern Med* 28: 1511–1516, 2013
32. Thorsteinsdottir B, Montori VM, Prokop LJ, Murad MH: Ageism vs. the technical imperative, applying the GRADE framework to the evidence on hemodialysis in very elderly patients. *Clin Interv Aging* 8: 797–807, 2013
33. Abra G, Kurella Tamura M: Timing of initiation of dialysis: Time for a new direction? *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 21: 329–333, 2012
34. Treit K, Lam D, O'Hare AM: Timing of dialysis initiation in the geriatric population: Toward a patient-centered approach. *Semin Dial* 26: 682–689, 2013
35. Arnold RM, Zeidel ML: Dialysis in frail elders—A role for palliative care. *N Engl J Med* 361: 1597–1598, 2009
36. Wong SPY, Kreuter W, O'Hare AM: Healthcare intensity at initiation of chronic dialysis among older adults. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 25: 143–149, 2014
37. Kaufman SR, Shim JK, Russ AJ: Revisiting the biomedicalization of aging: Clinical trends and ethical challenges. *Gerontologist* 44: 731–738, 2004
38. Institute of Medicine: *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century*, Washington, DC, The National Academies Press, 6, 2001
39. Tinetti ME, Fried T: The end of the disease era. *Am J Med* 116: 179–185, 2004
40. Barry MJ, Edgman-Levitan S: Shared decision making—Pinnacle of patient-centered care. *N Engl J Med* 366: 780–781, 2012
41. Renal Physicians Association: *Shared Decision-Making in the Appropriate Initiation of and Withdrawal from Dialysis*, 2nd Ed., Rockville, MD, Renal Physicians Association, 2010
42. Williams AW, Dwyer AC, Eddy AA, Fink JC, Jaber BL, Linas SL, Michael B, O'Hare AM, Schaefer HM, Shaffer RN, Trachtman H, Weiner DE, Falk AR; American Society of Nephrology Quality, and Patient Safety Task Force: Critical and honest conversations: The evidence behind the “Choosing Wisely” campaign recommendations by the American Society of Nephrology. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 7: 1664–1672, 2012
43. Germain MJ, Davison SN, Moss AH: When enough is enough: The nephrologist's responsibility in ordering dialysis treatments. *Am J Kidney Dis* 58: 135–143, 2011
44. Kurella Tamura M, Periyakoil VS: The patient perspective and physician's role in making decisions on instituting dialysis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 28: 2663–2666, 2013
45. Kaufman SR, Shim JK, Russ AJ: Old age, life extension, and the character of medical choice. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci* 61: S175–S184, 2006
46. Morton RL, Tong A, Howard K, Snelling P, Webster AC: The views of patients and carers in treatment decision making for chronic kidney disease: Systematic review and thematic synthesis of qualitative studies. *BMJ* 340: c112, 2010
47. Song MK, Lin FC, Gilet CA, Arnold RM, Bridgman JC, Ward SE: Patient perspectives on informed decision-making surrounding dialysis initiation. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 28: 2815–2823, 2013
48. Wachterman MW, Marcantonio ER, Davis RB, Cohen RA, Waikar SS, Phillips RS, McCarthy EP: Relationship between the prognostic expectations of seriously ill patients undergoing hemodialysis and their nephrologists. *JAMA Intern Med* 173: 1206–1214, 2013
49. Schell JO, Patel UD, Steinhilber KE, Ammarell N, Tulsy JA: Discussions of the kidney disease trajectory by elderly patients and nephrologists: A qualitative study. *Am J Kidney Dis* 59: 495–503, 2012
50. Murtagh FE, Marsh JE, Donohoe P, Ekbal NJ, Sheerin NS, Harris FE: Dialysis or not? A comparative survival study of patients over 75 years with chronic kidney disease stage 5. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 22: 1955–1962, 2007
51. Murtagh FE, Cohen LM, Germain MJ: The “no dialysis” option. *Adv Chronic Kidney Dis* 18: 443–449, 2011
52. Morton RL, Turner RM, Howard K, Snelling P, Webster AC: Patients who plan for conservative care rather than dialysis: A national observational study in Australia. *Am J Kidney Dis* 59: 419–427, 2012
53. Vandecasteele SJ, Kurella Tamura M: A patient-centered vision of care for ESRD: Dialysis as a bridging treatment or as a final destination. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2014 May 15. pii: ASN.2013101082. [Epub ahead of print] PMID: 24833125
54. Citko J, Moss AH, Carley M, Tolle SW: The National POLST Paradigm Initiative, 2nd Ed. Fast Facts and Concepts #178, 2010. Available at: http://www.eperc.mcw.edu/EPEC/FastFactsIndex/ff_178.htm. Accessed February 13, 2014
55. Schmidt RJ, Moss AH: Dying on dialysis: The case for a dignified withdrawal. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 9: 174–180, 2014
56. Bakitas M, Kryworuchko J, Matlock DD, Volandes AE: Palliative medicine and decision science: The critical need for a shared agenda to foster informed patient choice in serious illness. *J Palliat Med* 14: 1109–1116, 2011
57. Harris A, Cooper BA, Li JJ, Bulfone L, Branley P, Collins JF, Craig JC, Fraenkel MB, Johnson DW, Kesselhut J, Luxton G, Pilmore A, Rosevear M, Tiller DJ, Pollock CA, Harris DC: Cost-effectiveness of initiating dialysis early: A randomized controlled trial. *Am J Kidney Dis* 57: 707–715, 2011
58. Crews DC, Scialla JJ, Liu J, Guo H, Bandeen-Roche K, Ephraim PL, Jaar BG, Sozio SM, Miskulin DC, Tangri N, Shafi T, Meyer KB, Wu AW, Powe NR, Boulware LE; Developing Evidence to Inform Decisions about Effectiveness (DECI) Patient Outcomes in End Stage Renal Disease Study Investigators: Predialysis health, dialysis timing, and outcomes among older United States adults. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 25: 370–379, 2014
59. Chaudhary K, Sangha H, Khanna R: Peritoneal dialysis first: Rationale. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 6: 447–456, 2011
60. Holley JL, Carmody SS, Moss AH, Sullivan AM, Cohen LM, Block SD, Arnold RM: The need for end-of-life care training in nephrology: National survey results of nephrology fellows. *Am J Kidney Dis* 42: 813–820, 2003
61. Quill TE, Abernethy AP: Generalist plus specialist palliative care—Creating a more sustainable model. *N Engl J Med* 368: 1173–1175, 2013
62. Davison SN: The ethics of end-of-life care for patients with ESRD. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 7: 2049–2057, 2012