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This is a clear and well written paper that extends the association between HRQOL measures and patient outcomes in the elderly. But I really wonder how valuable the KDQOL-36 is in elderly patients. The associations between PCS and MCS is less strong that in prior studies in younger patients (such as DOPPS or FMC studies) and there is no increased risk in the 3 kidney specific domains (in fact a lower risk with one of these). This surprises me and should be mentioned in the discussion. Is the KDQOL-36 perhaps not as useful in the elderly? Should we be looking for another instrument? CMS is re-examining what HRQOL measures should be given routinely -- should the findings from this study make us rethink this instrument in the elderly? Should we be focusing on other domains?
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