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ABSTRACT

Background

Low back pain (LBP) is a leading cause of work disability. While absent from work, workers with LBP may receive income support from a system such as workers’ compensation or social security. Current evidence suggests that income support systems can influence recovery from LBP, but provides little insight as to why and how these effects occur. This study examines how and in what contexts income support systems impact the healthcare quality for people with work disability and LBP and their functional capacity.

Methods

We performed a realist review, a type of literature review that seeks to explain how social interventions and phenomena in certain contexts generate outcomes, rather than simply whether they do. Five initial theories about the relationship between income support systems and outcomes were developed, tested, and refined by acquiring and synthesising academic literature from purposive and iterative electronic database searching. This process was supplemented with grey literature searches for policy documents and legislative summaries, and semi-structured interviews with experts in income support, healthcare and LBP.

Results

Income support systems influence healthcare quality through funding restrictions, healthcare provider administrative burden, and allowing employers to select providers. They also influence worker functional capacity through the level of participation and financial incentives for employers, measures to prove the validity of the worker’s LBP, and certain administrative procedures. These mechanisms are
often exclusively context-dependent, and generate differing and unintended outcomes depending on features of the healthcare and income support system, as well as other contextual factors such as socioeconomic status and labour force composition.

Discussion

Income support systems impact the healthcare quality and functional capacity of people with work disability and LBP through context-dependent financial control, regulatory and administrative mechanisms. Research and policy design should consider how income support systems may indirectly influence workers with LBP via the workplace.
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BACKGROUND

Non-specific low back pain (LBP) is a prevalent symptom and major contributor to the global burden of disability [1-4]. Approximately 540 million people are estimated to have LBP per annum, most of whom are of working age [4, 5]. The resultant work disability leads to substantial economic burden, with the costs of healthcare and rehabilitation, wage replacement, and lost productivity cited in the billions of dollars per annum [4]. The pain, activity limitation, and participation restriction resulting from LBP can have a significant social and psychological impact, with mental health conditions a common comorbidity [6-9].

If a worker suffers from LBP that limits their ability to work they may seek wage replacement from an income support system [10]. Systems such as disability insurance, social security and workers’ compensation can provide this support. Some systems, such as workers’ compensation in Canada and Australia, fund healthcare for treatment and rehabilitation of LBP. Others, such as the Netherlands and United Kingdom (UK) fund healthcare through separate systems [10-12]. Income support systems are complex, and vary substantially between geographical regions.

Contemporary evidence regarding the management of LBP indicates that good quality healthcare adopts a biopsychosocial approach, and encourages both staying active and at work where possible [13-18]. Imaging of acute LBP and treatments such as opioids, injection therapies and surgery are considered low-value care, have high costs, and in some cases, are associated with detrimental effects on recovery and return to work [15, 19]. Healthcare quality therefore influences functional capacity, the ability of an individual to perform activities of daily living and work [19-23].
Predictors of work disability due to LBP have been characterised as falling within four domains or ‘systems’: personal, workplace, healthcare, and legislative [24]. Our review protocol hypothesised that the legislative system (i.e., income support) influences healthcare and workplace systems, which in turn impact healthcare quality and functional capacity. This hypothesis was based on contemporary literature, which suggests that income support systems may be detrimental [25-28]. For example, workers’ compensation recipients take longer to return to work than workers who do not receive workers’ compensation [29, 30].

Literature to date has typically described the relationship between income support, healthcare quality and functional capacity with a successionist model of causality. That is, X event (i.e., receipt of wage replacement from an income support system) precedes Y event (i.e., changes in functional capacity) [31], without considering the precise causal mechanism. This same literature also provides limited insight into the role of context. A greater understanding of both could improve policy design [31].

We chose realist review methodology to examine how and in what contexts income support systems influence healthcare quality and functional capacity [32]. A realist review seeks to explain how a complex social programme or phenomena generates an outcome, rather than make a determination on a causal relationship as in systematic reviews [31, 33]. This method has been applied to similar questions of complex social systems [34, 35]. In this review we sought to answer the following research questions: (1) How and in what contexts do income support systems impact the quality of healthcare in people who are unable to work due to LBP?; (2) How and in what contexts do income support systems impact the functional capacity of people who are unable to work due to LBP?
METHODS

We conducted this review and report our findings as per Pawson’s methodology and the Realist And Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses: Evolving Standards (RAMESES) group methodological guidance for realist reviews [36]. This involved the following stages: (1) clarifying scope, identifying review questions, formulating initial theories, (2) purposive and iterative searching for literature, (3) appraising literature and extracting data, (4) analysing and synthesising data and refining theories, and (5) disseminating review results [31, 37, 38]. In the following section we provide a summary of the research methodology. Further information on the research methods and realist theory is available in our published review protocol [32].

Initial theories

We conducted initial purposive searches, held several collective author discussions, and consulted with experts to develop five initial theories to test in this review [32, 39, 40]. These theories were programme theories that described how and in what contexts income support systems may impact healthcare quality and functional capacity. Each theory consisted of an income support system policy that triggered a mechanism; the “non-observable” yet real process that generates an actual or empirical outcome. This mechanism acted within a set of contextual features, which modified how the mechanism generated the outcome. Initial theories were developed around the Sherbrooke Model of Work Disability [24], explaining the conceptual interactions between income support, healthcare, and workplace systems.

Search strategy

Academic literature was the primary source of information for the refinement of our theories. Grey literature was used to define income support and healthcare system
types which provided a macro-level view of policies in the regions in which studies were conducted. This provided us a greater understanding of context in each region.

**Academic searches**

We used an iterative search strategy in this review. Firstly, we conducted searches of the electronic databases Ovid MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, PsycINFO, and CINAHL. Search terms included synonyms based on the terms “low back pain”, “income support”, “workers compensation”, “social security”, “income protection”, “disability support”, “functional capacity”, “work ability”, “return to work”, “quality of care”, and “medical costs”. Search terms were combined with appropriate Boolean operators and truncations adapted to each databases’ requirements. Reference lists of included studies were also scanned and Scopus was searched to identify studies that had cited included literature.

**Grey literature searches**

Grey literature searches were conducted in the following policy databases: International Labour Organisation (ILO) NATLEX, EPLex, LEGOSH, and NORMLEX databases [41-44], United States Social Security Administration databases (US-SSA) [45], International Social Security Administration (ISSA) publication database [46], the Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC) database [47], and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) document library [48].

**Eligibility criteria**

One author (MDD) screened titles and abstracts for eligibility. An additional author (TL) screened a random sample of 10% of the titles and abstracts for consistency. We included any literature that described the impact of an income support system on
healthcare quality for LBP or on the functional capacity of workers with LBP. Further information on eligibility criteria is available in our protocol [32].

Data extraction and appraisal

Data were extracted from each piece of literature by at least two authors into a standardised data extraction table within a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet [49]. As well as the characteristics of included studies (such as study region, sample characteristics and data sources), we also extracted data in relation to each of the five initial theories. The relevance and rigour of literature was rated as very, moderately, or less relevant or rigorous. Relevance refers to whether literature contains data that adequately addresses a theory, and rigour whether or not the data were generated with “credible and trustworthy” methods [31, 37, 38]. These two dimensions are typical of a realist review and are often used as a form of quality appraisal, in place of traditional quality assessment or risk of bias tools [31, 32].

Semi-structured interviews

One author (MDD) conducted four semi-structured telephone interviews with experts in the fields of income support systems, healthcare and LBP. Interviews were not intended to be exhaustive but used to test our initial theories and identify important anecdotal or experiential knowledge that might be lacking from traditional literature searches.

Interviews were structured around each of the five initial theories; interviewees were asked whether or not they agreed with an initial theory, and why [50]. They were also asked if they thought there were any additional contextual factors or mechanisms that we had not identified. Interviews were analysed with a realist logic of analysis [50].
The Monash University Human Ethics Research Committee provided ethics approval for this project (Project ID 14144, July 2018).

Data analysis and synthesis

Data generated from the different sources were combined and consolidated into context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) configurations [31]. These CMO configurations were first organised under each of the initial theories. Each member of the review team independently reviewed CMO configurations and theories and then the findings were discussed as a group to deliberate the role of context, the relevance and rigour of evidence, and varying outcome patterns. The review team also decided whether theoretical saturation had been reached and if subsequent further literature searches were required to adequately explain a theory. The first author (MDD) compiled the results of independent review and discussions, and refined the theories and CMO configurations. This synthesis process was performed four times, as theories were refined.

Changes from protocol

Three minor changes were made to the methodology of the review compared to the protocol. Firstly, an eligibility criterion was added before the commencement of full-text screening: literature was excluded if it did not provide explanatory insight or understanding of how an income support system or associated policy, practice, or process impacted healthcare quality or functional capacity. This criterion was retrospectively applied to titles and abstracts from the initial search, but no additional items were included in full-text screening. The necessity of this criterion became apparent when early searches yielded large volumes of literature describing successionist causal models for the role of income support systems in worker
functional capacity and healthcare quality. That is, they described simply that an
interaction occurs, and did not contribute to the refinement of our theories.

Secondly, we adopted citation searching during the review (described above), as it
was more efficient for iterative searches. Finally, due to time constraints we
conducted four semi-structured interviews rather than the planned ten to 15 [32].
However, this was unlikely to effect the findings as the four interviews sufficiently
tested the initial theories.

RESULTS

Search results

The first round of searching identified n=1,156 pieces of literature from academic
databases (Figure 1). After duplicate removal, title and abstract and full text
screening n=15 studies were included. Of the n=92 items identified from reference
lists of included studies in the second round of searching, n=3 pieces of literature
were ultimately included. Finally, n=520 items were identified from Scopus searches
leading to an additional n=4 included pieces of literature. Once all three search
rounds were completed, n=22 papers were included.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 AND CAPTION HERE]
Characteristics of included studies

Details of the included studies is shown in Table 1. The majority of studies were conducted in the US (n=13) and Canada (n=4). Other studies were published variously in Japan (n=1), the UK (n=1) and Australia (n=1), with a single study including six different countries (Denmark, Germany, Israel, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the US). Most studies solely utilised administrative data (n=10), six used administrative data and other data sources, five used questionnaire data alone, while two reviews used academic literature.

Characteristics of included systems

Information on the system types of included studies is described in Table 2. Four studies defined the typology of the disability policy model, employment injury protection scheme, unemployment protection scheme and healthcare system [51-54]. There were a limited range of system types, as most studies were conducted in North America. Most studies explored the impact of workers' compensation systems; that is they explored the ‘employer liability’ type employment injury protection scheme. This system is a cause-based system funded by insurance premiums from employers. Three studies examined other system types, such as social security and disability insurance (SSDI). These disability-based systems sit within a liberal disability policy model and a social insurance unemployment protection scheme and benefit applicants are typically means-tested [52, 54].

Most studies were conducted in environments with either a private healthcare system or national health insurance system. Healthcare system type was defined by state, societal or private responsibility for regulation, funding, and service provision.
of healthcare. The US is one of a few systems where healthcare regulation, funding, and service provision are private. Canada and Australia have a national health insurance system in which regulation and funding are performed by the province or state respectively, with private service provision [51, 55].

Most included studies (being from North America), had income support and healthcare systems with a degree of commodification, that is, access to welfare and healthcare are dependent on market position. In the case of healthcare, this may reflect a need and desire from healthcare workers to provide services in return for income. Commodification of welfare and healthcare was not present in all studies. For example, the UK uses a national health service type healthcare system; regulation, funding, and service provision are all performed by the state leaving very little commodification.

Interviews

Interviewed experts were from the US, Canada, UK and New Zealand and were all primarily research focussed. The sample did not include individual system actors such as employers, doctors or workers. Expert interviewee responses to initial theories highlighted the importance of context, with some providing different explanations for mechanisms compared to others. Summarised responses from expert interviewees are available in the appendix (Appendix Table 3)

Analysis and synthesis

Results of the analysis and synthesis are presented below and summarised in Figure 2. Each theory is supported by at least one CMO configuration. Where a single CMO configuration supported a theory, the CMO configuration is reported as the theory.
Theory 1 – Income support system role in funding healthcare

Income support systems that pay for and control healthcare in regions with commodified healthcare systems can generate adverse healthcare and functional outcomes for workers with LBP due to underlying financial incentives and healthcare professional responses to funding restrictions, as well as healthcare provider peer interactions, and regional socioeconomic factors.

CMO configuration 1 (n=3 pieces of literature)

In regions where income support systems can fund healthcare that would otherwise be funded by insurance or out-of-pocket payments, healthcare professionals are incentivised to provide unnecessary care.

Regions with a greater number of independent MRI sites had higher rates of early MRI due to potential clinician ‘self-referral’ [33]. Evidence from simulated scenarios demonstrated private clinicians are more likely to see workers with LBP more often if their healthcare was funded by an income support system (an employer liability system) than by private insurance or out of their own pocket [56]. In clinical scenarios, physiotherapists treat compensated patients similarly to other patients, but were more likely to suggest ongoing physiotherapy for treatment [57]. It was unclear whether this was due to financial incentives.

CMO configuration 2 (n=5 pieces of literature)

Income support systems that attempt to control payments for healthcare in regions with private healthcare systems encourage healthcare providers to seek income maintenance strategies. This can lead to overtreatment, use of low-value treatments, and worse functional outcomes.
Income support systems implement policy mechanisms and tools to control healthcare expenditure with strategies such as medical fee schedules, utilization review programmes, limiting treating provider choice and number of services. However, these restrictions on healthcare payments can lead to either no change in healthcare quality outcomes [33], diversion to other treatment options [20], or negative healthcare quality outcomes such as increased opioid prescribing [58], possible additional health services [59] and poorer functional outcomes such as increased length of disability [27]. The literature suggested that healthcare providers – “increased the volume and complexity of treatment to maintain income levels” [27]. However, a fee schedule by itself does not appear to trigger a healthcare provider to demonstrate this behaviour [59]. Instead, the degree of restriction imposed by the policy tends to correlate with more income-driven behaviour [59]. This strategy was only demonstrated in studies from regions with private healthcare systems, where such a strategy is both possible to generate income.

**CMO configuration 3 (n=1 piece of literature)**

More physicians per capita increases peer-to-peer interactions and more conversations about inappropriate treatments, leading to fewer inappropriate treatments.

Regions with a greater number of physicians per capita demonstrated less early opioid prescribing (within 15 days) for workers with LBP [58]. A single study reported that a higher density of physicians in a given region means there is greater “peer-to-peer” interaction. It was suggested this could lead to “more communication of information and peer influences” regarding the risks associated with opioid use in workers with LBP [58].
CMO configuration 4 (n=3 pieces of literature)

Healthcare providers in regions with lower socioeconomic status and fewer healthcare resources select options that require less effort, consume fewer resources and are not supported by best practice evidence.

Regional socioeconomic factors were demonstrated to affect healthcare provision and length of disability in workers with LBP. Lower median household income was associated with higher rates of early MRI (within 30 days), as clinicians chose the “less time-and-effort-consuming” option of referring workers to imaging for LBP rather than attempting to explain the condition to workers with potentially lower education levels [33]. Household inequality was also associated with opioid prescription, as it was thought that opioids were prescribed in place of access to appropriate high-quality healthcare services in higher poverty areas [58]. Higher unemployment rates were generally associated with a greater length of disability. One offered explanation was that where unemployment is high workers have difficulty finding alternative work that is less physically demanding [28].

Theory 2 – Income support system demands on healthcare providers

CMO configuration 5 (n=5 pieces of literature)

Healthcare providers may not see work-focussed care as within their scope of practice. When income support systems impose administrative demands on healthcare providers, they lack incentives and motivation to engage the income support system and worker in a work-focussed manner, leading to poorer work outcomes.

Work-focussed healthcare is acknowledged as important for recovery among workers with LBP among workers with LBP, yet some clinicians do not address this.
Evidence from a review suggests healthcare professionals regard work issues as beyond their “professional remit” [60]. There was also evidence to suggest clinicians who do not see work issues and return to work as part of their role may focus solely on clinical issues [61]. A lack of experience with workers’ compensation workers may lead to worse worker outcomes [62], and minimal willingness to change practices based on new work-focused knowledge [63]. Expert interviewees agreed with literature that healthcare professionals may not address work issues and income support systems because of the perceived increased demands, and lack of financial incentive, time, and decision-making authority [60]. However, a single study also suggested that knowledge of patient workers’ compensation status was unlikely to affect clinical decision-making [57]. This also aligned with statements from expert interviewees that even if healthcare providers are not incentivized to engage income support systems, quality of care was unlikely to be affected.

Theory 3 – Employer choice of healthcare provider

CMO configuration 6 (n=3 pieces of literature)

Where income support systems allow the employer to choose the workers’ healthcare provider in regions with income support systems funded by employers, the employer is incentivized by wage replacement and insurance premiums to choose the healthcare provider that will return the worker to work the fastest.

In the US, the length of disability was lower when the employer could choose healthcare providers, which was attributed to selection of work-focused healthcare providers who were familiar with the workplace [27]. This aligned with results from interviews. The experts suggested this theory might hold, although the employer is likely to focus on wage replacement duration as a function of total premium costs and not healthcare quality. Experts further explained that employers in their
respective countries have little to no influence on healthcare. Further US literature measured the effect of limiting treatment provider choice as part of a composite cost containment score. While cost containment was shown to have an adverse effect on healthcare quality and work outcomes, it was not possible to isolate treating provider choice from the composite measure, and it is unclear how initial treating provider choice contributed to this outcome [33, 58].

Theory 4 – Employer incentives

CMO configuration 7 (n=2 pieces of literature)

Where income support systems require employer involvement in worker rehabilitation, penalties for non-compliance incentivise employers.

There was limited LBP-specific literature available for this theory, although expert interviewees suggested that it may be possible. A single trial that found that the introduction of an employer-based peer adviser led to a 49% reduction in LBP-related sick leave [63]. Legislation to increase worker functional accommodation was followed by an increase in healthcare costs associated with no-loss-time claims [64]. Experts suggested that a financial incentive may work in their own respective systems, however the motivation would be for employers to return workers to work and reduce their financial burden, not to improve their functional capacity. Another expert pointed to a lack of financial incentive or motivation for employers to be involved in worker recovery in some regions. A third expert suggested that some employers may just ‘tick the boxes’ to meet legislative requirements until they can terminate the worker’s employment.
Theory 5 – Income support system impact on the worker

Where income support systems with more generous benefits require workers with LBP to meet administrative requirements and prove the validity of their disability, workers feel unsupported and are not incentivized to return to work.

Income support systems that require workers to prove their injury when they have a poorly defined, stigma-attached condition such as LBP feel an ongoing need to prove they are genuinely disabled. This in turn contributes to inappropriate use of healthcare and ongoing time away from work. (n=5 pieces of literature)

Where workers are required to prove they are disabled due to their LBP and ‘defend their legitimacy’, they may have worse work outcomes. It is possible that the presence of financial incentives motivate workers to have their disability recognised.

Interviewed experts suggested that where workers have to prove their LBP causes disability (i.e., cause-based systems); they may seek tests that are more complex and treatments to legitimize their pain with the income support system or employer.

Workers funded by workers’ compensation tended to have worse functional outcomes than workers funded by disability pensions or disability insurance (i.e., where a specific cause is not required), and motor vehicle accident insurance [65-67]. In a motor vehicle accident compensation system, a switch from a tort to no-fault scheme significantly reduced claims for LBP as well as the median duration of disability [68]. These data conflicted with a single study. However, the latter study compared types of benefits in a region with a disability-based income support system, making comparisons challenging [69]. It was hypothesised that the adversarial environment associated with tort law may delay claim closure. Experts also noted that LBP tends to carry more stigma than other ‘more credible’ conditions,
and that the associated residual pain issues and diagnostic uncertainty can frustrate workers. Nevertheless, one study comparing multiple countries demonstrated that requirement for medical certification to receive benefits was not a significant predictor of engagement in return to work [70].

**CMO configuration 9 (n=4 pieces of literature)**

Income support systems that offer more generous benefits or who step down benefits in response to return to work activities reduce the incentive for workers to seek functional improvement, contributing to increased work absence.

Both literature and interviewed experts suggested that more ‘benevolent’ wage replacement reduced the incentive for workers to return to work [60]. Wage replacement that offered a higher proportion of the workers’ pre-injury earnings and reductions in benefits during scenarios such as partial return to work acted as disincentives to return to work. Conversely, a single trial only found differences in return to work between workers who do and do not receive workers’ compensation when they had surgical intervention for their LBP; no differences were found in those conservatively managed [71]. The authors acknowledged the potential role of financial incentives, but hypothesised that there may be other important differences between compensated and non-compensated workers. Another study of a similar cohort also identified significant differences in socioeconomic characteristics of workers who did and did not receive workers’ compensation [72]. The authors suggested these should be considered when attempting to causally link compensation and worker outcomes. An international-comparative study also suggested that the absence of long-term disability benefits, or delayed access to them, was predictive of earlier return to work [70]. The US interviewee also explained that to avoid long-term liability associated with indefinite claims in some US states,
workers’ compensation bodies had begun paying lump sums to some workers, however, the effect of this was unknown.

Income support systems that include certain administrative requirements that result in waiting periods or delays and cause the worker to feel unsupported and frustrated, leading to worse functional and recovery outcomes.

Certain ‘rules and practices’ of the system such as ‘right to case appeal’ and ‘slow or dissatisfactory case management’ have been cited as detrimental to worker recovery [60]. Interviewed experts suggested such features and waiting periods may stop the worker from working, and that if the worker feels unsupported during these periods they may be less likely to ultimately return to work. One expert also pointed to requirements for approval for certain healthcare providers or volumes of healthcare by some income support systems, possibly leading to worse functional outcomes.

DISCUSSION

This realist review sought to understand how and in what contexts income support systems impact healthcare quality and functional capacity in workers with LBP. We have found those healthcare providers, employers, and workers’ responses to income support system policies and features, can impact healthcare quality and worker functional capacity. These effects are context specific and only operate in certain types of income support and healthcare systems or in workers with certain sociodemographic features. While contemporary literature has previously identified the impact of income support systems on these outcomes, we believe this review provides a new understanding of the causes of these events.
Several trends emerged in the included literature. The use of a successionist model of causality meant the majority of included studies treated income support systems as single entities or statuses, which may miss certain nuances inherent to large systems such as income support. The majority of included literature also did not discuss context in detail, or even at all. In particular, there was limited discussion of the context of parallel systems or regions. For example, few pieces of literature investigating income support systems also described the local healthcare system despite the potentially important relationship between the two. Finally, we found that most literature originated in regions with similar system types.

Several theoretical themes were also present. We found the prevailing mechanisms were economic incentives. The role of economic incentives in the income support and healthcare system settings has long been documented [73-77]. Most policies of income support systems rely on the responses of actors to economic incentives. In some cases economic incentives lead to contradictory behaviour from system actors. For example, the income maintenance strategy, theorised by some included studies, was thought to be a direct response to attempts to reduce healthcare costs.

Supporting evidence from work disability literature not specific to people with LBP

We identified some evidence that was ineligible for inclusion, but may have contributed to the development and refinement of our theories. This evidence was usually excluded as the sample did specifically include workers with LBP. For the most part, work disability literature not specific to LBP aligns with our already established theories. For example, healthcare providers have previously found difficulties with workers’ compensation systems and the return to work process in
workers who had “multiple injuries, gradual onset or complex illnesses, chronic pain, and mental health conditions” [26]. In some cases healthcare providers were found to refuse to treat compensated workers, citing additional “clinical complexities” and “time and financial burdens” [78]. Such evidence aligns with our established Theory 2. However, additional insights indicate that differences in doctors’ roles within systems may affect work outcomes [79], financial incentives may be used successfully to influence healthcare provider adoption of occupationally-focussed healthcare programs [80], and fee schedules can achieve intended cost-containment objectives [81]. Furthermore, a shift of funding income support responsibility from the state to employers was found to be beneficial for worker return to work times [82]. There is also evidence to suggest that specific financial incentives for employers may encourage actions such as claim reporting time [83].

The impact of the income support system directly on the worker is also well-documented, and aligns with our Theory 5. Evidence exploring the mechanisms and contexts in which benefit generosity may have incentive effects and impact work disability outcomes has previously been published [73-77]. There is also evidence to suggest that receipt of financial compensation is associated with worse functional outcomes [84]. More specifically, the administrative and legal aspects of income support systems may be generally detrimental to recovery [85], and most interactions with income support systems resulted in “significant psychosocial consequences for injured workers” [25].

However, we sought to identify and understand the impact of income support systems specifically on outcomes of workers with LBP as this is the greatest contributor to disability worldwide [4]. In the majority of cases it is not possible to identify a specific pathoanatomic cause of LBP, and the diagnosis of non-specific
LBP typically depends upon ruling out much rarer specific and or serious causes. The subjective nature and causative ambiguity of LBP appears to lend itself to a certain amount of stigma or challenged integrity [86], that is not reflected in other musculoskeletal conditions such as osteoarthritis [87]. This may lead to particular challenges for a worker seeking wage replacement from a cause-based system. The US interviewee even suggested worker attempts “to prove the legitimacy of their pain and disability” might lead to greater utilisation of tests such as imaging, as reflected in Theory 5.

The role of context and system types

The mechanisms identified in the review were conceptually reliant on underlying contextual factors. There is likely substantial complexity to the number and layer of contextual factors not elucidated in this review. However, we were able to understand the theoretical influence that some high-level contextual factors, such as system typology, had over some mechanisms. For example, the income maintenance behaviour demonstrated by healthcare providers appears to be reliant on a commodified healthcare system type [51, 88].

Healthcare system type is one feature of a larger policy landscape. Some included literature suggested that different income support system types (i.e., cause-based or disability-based systems) might lead to different outcomes. In one circumstance disability-based systems such as unemployment benefits appeared to have better outcomes than time-limited benefits [67]. Furthermore, it has previously been suspected that the tightening of US workers’ compensation policies lead workers to move to social security disability insurance. That is, a move from cause-based systems to a disability-based system. However, identifying causality for this inter-system movement has previously been debated [89, 90].
High level system features may also have the potential to affect how policy mechanisms in neighbouring systems react; incentives for physician performance (i.e., pay-for-performance) may function more effectively in regions within more commodified welfare systems [91]. There is potential for future research into the role of such contextual factors.

**Strengths and limitations**

Realist reviews are a relatively new methodology, and provide a novel and contemporary understanding of how and in what contexts social programmes such as income support function. We believe the understanding of the role of income support systems in the population of workers with LBP benefits from the use of this methodology.

A strength of our realist review is that we used transparent methods and published our protocol including our initial theories in an open peer-reviewed journal [32]. Our protocol was peer-reviewed by two experts in realist reviews. As is customary for realist reviews we used an iterative search strategy and searched both academic and grey literature. We also documented all changes to our protocol including their justification.

We also recognise several limitations of this review. We treated context at a very high-level. By opting for system typologies, rather than more detailed features, we avoided the impact of policy changes over time and differences in local applications. However, this did prevent a more detailed understanding of the policy setting.

Included literature was published between 1988 and 2018. There has been substantial development the evidence-base for LBP, as well as in the design of income support systems, during this time. We did not account for this temporality.
issue in our review. Finally, we also had a small and relatively homogenous sample of expert interviewees. Although interviews were not the primary activity of this review, we could have benefited from a larger and more role-diverse sample.

**Recommendations for future research**

Realist reviews are an expanding research methodology. A realist understanding can provide a nuanced understanding of the impact of social programmes and phenomena. Future research of the health and work ability of people accessing and interacting with income support systems, including those with LBP, should utilise both realist review and realist evaluation methods. We believe this will provide new insights into the role of income support systems, which have global and context-dependent ramifications.

Future research should also explore how the mechanisms identified in this review might generate outcomes in different contexts. While we are able to theorise how system typologies may enable or disable our mechanisms, we lacked the literature to explore how this might occur. A broader realist review of income support systems funding in general may be able to answer such questions. We also found that included studies rarely reported on local policies or system design. This aligns with previous research which has found that income support systems are generally defined poorly in research studies [92]. A greater understanding of context is likely to benefit future research by refining where and when policy research is generalizable.

We found a paucity of literature regarding the impact of income support system policies on the employer in cases where workers have LBP. This may be due to challenges associated with research methodologies in this cohort, or simply an under-researched area. We recommend future exploration of the impact of policies, such as financial incentives, on employers of workers with LBP.
Finally, we recommend additional policy research to examine how policies may have population-scale impact on persons and workers with LBP. This could be achieved by investigating the influence of policies in existing administrative data; a method employed by several studies included in this review.

**Recommendations for future policy development**

While we acknowledge that policy development for LBP should be context dependent, we can make some broad recommendations. Firstly, a biopsychosocial approach, rather than a more typical economic approach, should be considered when developing policies.

The findings from our review confirm that there is interaction between different systems. A disabled worker typically engages a healthcare and income support system simultaneously; they require may treatment from the healthcare system to return to work, utilising wage replacement from the income support system in the interim. Any future policy development should therefore explore how policies within one system may affect other systems. We also identified research of conditions other than LBP to suggest that the policies of one income support system may affect another income support system. Future policy development should not be performed in ‘silos’, and instead consider wider societal and inter-system ramifications.

**Conclusion**

This realist review has provided an understanding of how and in what contexts income support systems impact healthcare quality for and functional capacity of workers with LBP. This impact occurs through multiple underlying context-dependent mechanisms triggered by financial incentive and control policies, regulatory procedures, and administrative events. Future research would benefit from utilising
realist review methods, and should make efforts to define relative contextual factors local to research. Future policy development should focus on understanding the biopsychosocial aspects of LBP, and how income support systems may interact with one another and with other systems such as healthcare.
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Figure 1 Results of searching, screening, and sorting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author (year) [ref]</th>
<th>ST¹</th>
<th>Rel.²</th>
<th>Rig.³</th>
<th>Region(s)</th>
<th>Sample / Sample size</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Outcomes measured</th>
<th>Relevant results to each theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Anema (2009) [70]        | 1   | ●●●  | ●●●   | Denmark, Germany, Israel, The Netherlands, Sweden, USA | Compensation claimants for LBP Denmark n = 563 Germany n = 358 Israel n = 316 The Netherlands n = 426 Sweden n = 374 USA n = 460 Total n = 2,825 | Prospective observational | Administrative, questionnaire, policy analysis | Work disability duration | Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker
- Requirement of a medical certificate to receive benefits was not a significant predictor of work
- A lack of long-term disability benefits or delayed access to long-term disability benefits was predictive of an earlier return to work
- Different treatment options were popular in certain regions |
| Atlas (2007) [72]        | 3   | ●●   | ●●●   | USA | Workers with LBP who were and were not receiving workers’ compensation Total n = 3759 Receiving workers’ compensation n = 564 Receiving other disability compensation n = 317 Controls (work-capable) n = 2878 | Prospective observational and randomized | Questionnaire, interview, clinical assessment | Compensation status, socioeconomic status, demographic characteristics | Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker
- Socioeconomic characteristics are markedly different between workers receiving and not receiving workers’ compensation for LBP
- ’Workers receiving workers’ compensation were younger, more likely to be male, non-white, less education, and smokers’
- ’Workers' compensation recipients also more likely to retain an attorney, and much less likely to work as a manager or professional’ |
| Atlas (2010) [71]        | 1   | ●●   | ●●●   | USA | Workers with LBP who have and have not received surgical intervention for LBP Randomized and observational cohorts combined. At 2 year follow-up, total n = 924 | Prospective observational and randomized | Questionnaire | Compensation status, functional and pain status (Oswestry Disability Index, SF-36 Questionnaire) | Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare
- Workers receiving workers’ compensation benefit less from surgical intervention
- No differences were found at 2 years between workers' compensation and non-workers’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work disability</th>
<th>Work participation</th>
<th>Critical appraisal of various forms of literature – sample not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</td>
<td>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</td>
<td>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some healthcare professionals may avoid workers in receipt of more benevolent wage replacement due to a lack of financial incentive and may not address them due to a lack of time and standard procedures, and increasing job demands.</td>
<td>- Certain administrative hurdles and rules of systems may be detrimental to worker recovery.</td>
<td>- When workers with LBP are required to prove their disability and defend legitimacy of LBP, the likelihood of returning to work may be reduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bartys (2017) [60]

Receiving workers’ compensation n = 113
Not receiving workers’ compensation n = 811

- It has been postulated that financial incentives or the adversarial nature of the workers’ compensation system may account for worse outcomes. There may be other important differences between workers who do and do not receive workers’ compensation for LBP, including the financial incentives of the workers’ compensation system. It has been postulated that financial incentives or the adversarial nature of the workers’ compensation system may account for worse outcomes. There may be other important differences between workers who do and do not receive workers’ compensation for LBP, including the financial incentives of the workers’ compensation system.

| Receiving workers’ compensation n = 113 | Not receiving workers’ compensation n = 811 |

- Critical appraisal of various forms of literature – sample not applicable
- It has been postulated that financial incentives or the adversarial nature of the workers’ compensation system may account for worse outcomes. There may be other important differences between workers who do and do not receive workers’ compensation for LBP, including the financial incentives of the workers’ compensation system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Critical appraisal of various forms of literature – sample not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authors' note: This preprint is not peer-reviewed. The copyright holder for this preprint. doi: medRxiv preprint
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Type of Data</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Key Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Carnide (2018) [93] | 3 | ● ● ● | Canada | Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP in a single Canadian province | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Opioid, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory (NSAID, and skeletal muscle relaxant (SMR) prescription | Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare  
Rigorous analysis of opioid prescribing patterns pre and post-injury in compensated workers similar or lower than USA  
This could reflect greater reimbursement of injury-related prescriptions in US compensation systems; however, WorkSafeBC also attempted to limit opioid prescriptions during the same period |
| Cassidy (2003) [68] | 2 | ● ● ● | Canada | Motor vehicle accident claimants with LBP | Prospective cohort | Administrative, questionnaire | Work disability duration, functional and pain status (SF-36 Questionnaire), mood (CES-D Questionnaire) | Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker  
Receipt of workers’ compensation and motor vehicle accident compensation significantly associated with chronic LBP |
| Fujii (2012) [65] | 1 | ● ● | Japan | Japanese citizens who had experienced any LBP | Prospective observational | Questionnaire | Demographic characteristics, receipt of compensation for LBP, | Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker  
Receipt of workers’ compensation and motor vehicle accident compensation significantly associated with chronic LBP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graves (2018) [94]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP in USA state of Washington</td>
<td>Interrupted time-series</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation recipients more likely than motor vehicle accident compensation recipients to have chronic LBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workers who underwent spinal fusion and received workers’ compensation or disability compensation</td>
<td>Case-control study</td>
<td>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Utilization review programme reduced the proportion of MRI provided to workers with low back pain (21.2% to 15.6%), increased the mean duration between injury and first MRI, and reduced spinal injections. Programme did not change proportion of surgery. There was a significant negative trend in disability duration after the implementation of the review programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– There was also a significant increase in the proportion of workers who received radiographs after the implementation of the review programme (2.46%, 95%CI 1.24, 3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Trends observed in this study may reflect a national long-term decline in advanced imaging utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Workers receiving workers’ compensation have significantly worse functional outcomes compared to matched controls than disability compensation cases compared to matched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 3.27 (95%CI 2.56-4.16), and aOR 1.85, 95%CI 1.36-2.50) respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Workers’ compensation recipients more likely than motor vehicle accident compensation recipients to have chronic LBP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:***
- Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare
- Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker

**References:**
- Graves (2018) [94]
- Gum (2013) [66]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamison (1988) [67]</td>
<td>Workers referred to single pain centre in USA</td>
<td>Workers referred to single pain centre in USA</td>
<td>Total n = 110</td>
<td>Workers referred to single pain centre in USA</td>
<td>Workers referred to single pain centre in USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laliberte (2017) [56]</td>
<td>Physical therapy professionals</td>
<td>Physical therapy professionals</td>
<td>Total n = 846</td>
<td>Physical therapy professionals</td>
<td>Physical therapy professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pransky (2015) [33]</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states</td>
<td>Total n = 5,359</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workers’ compensation appears to have a negative influence on recovery from spinal fusion for LBP compared to disability compensation.

Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker

Workers receiving disability compensation for LBP are more likely to use medical and surgical procedures, and experience worse recovery than workers receiving time-limited compensation or no compensation.

Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare

In a clinical scenario, patient insurance status did not influence wait time and treatment duration. However, workers insured by workers’ compensation would be treated significantly more frequently than those insured by private insurance or out-of-pocket payments.

Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare

Workers’ compensation cost containment efforts were not associated with MRI use in the first 30 days of onset of LBP. It was hypothesised that cost containment efforts could have a reactive approach to increasing medical costs in workers’ compensation schemes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost containment score was not predictive of early MRI use in the fully adjusted model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPs could choose healthcare facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment goals made by physiotherapists were of mixed severity associated with early MRI use (smaller association than other factors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater severity associated with increased early MRI use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory 1 – Independent MRI sites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater state percentage of MRI sites that are not linked to a hospital (i.e., independent) was positively associated with rate of early MRI (within 30 days). It was hypothesised that this could be due to 'self-referral' from healthcare providers who have a financial stake in the MRI site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower median income was associated with increased early imaging. It was hypothesised that lower median income could indicate lower patient education level and subsequently reduced capacity to 'understand complex explanations'. This could ultimately lead to the 'less time-and-effort-consuming' option of referring workers to imaging for their low back pain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater severity associated with early MRI use (smaller association than other factors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per capita rate of physicians and orthopaedic surgeons, income inequality, wage replacement rate, state average malpractice premium, and number of MRI sites per million population were not significant in the final model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schonstein (2002) [61]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physiotherapists treating compensated workers with low back pain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retrospective case review of NOC forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work-focused healthcare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administered healthcare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment goals made by physiotherapists were of mixed severity associated with early MRI use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A greater state percentage of MRI sites that are not linked to a hospital (i.e., independent) was positively associated with rate of early MRI (within 30 days). It was hypothesised that this could be due to 'self-referral' from healthcare providers who have a financial stake in the MRI site. |

---

**Schonstein (2002) [61]**

Australia

Physiotherapists treating compensated workers with low back pain

Retrospective case review of NOC forms

Administrative healthcare

Work-focused healthcare

Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs

Treatment goals made by physiotherapists were of mixed severity associated with early MRI use (smaller association than other factors).

Greater severity associated with increased early MRI use (smaller association than other factors).

Per capita rate of physicians and orthopaedic surgeons, income inequality, wage replacement rate, state average malpractice premium, and number of MRI sites per million population were not significant in the final model.

Cost containment score was not predictive of early MRI use in the fully adjusted model.

GPs could choose healthcare facility.

- Cost containment score was not predictive of early MRI use in the final model.
- GPs could choose healthcare facility.

- Cost containment score was not predictive of early MRI use in the fully adjusted model.
- GPs could choose healthcare facility.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study Design</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Health Outcomes</th>
<th>Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shraim (2015) [27]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Work disability duration, medical costs</td>
<td>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− Mean length of disability for workers with low back pain was 2.5 days greater (95%CI 1.4, 3.6) in states that had medical fee schedules. It was hypothesised that healthcare providers responded to fee schedules with income maintenance strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shraim (2017) [28]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Work disability duration, medical costs</td>
<td>Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>− Mean length of disability for workers with low back pain was 6.1 days greater (95%CI 5.0, 7.2) in states with initial treating provider choice. It was hypothesised that if employers choose the healthcare provider, they will choose medical providers who are familiar with the workplace and provide care ‘oriented to achieving timely and sustained return to work, thus reducing incentives for excessive and inappropriate medical care’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notification of Commencement Form (NOC) n = 219

Hypothesised that some physiotherapists do not believe that ‘achieving return to work is an integral part of their physiotherapy role’ (Theory 2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simmonds (1996) [57]</td>
<td>Double-blind RCT, Questionnaire</td>
<td>Physical therapists (PTs) at acute care hospitals n = 20, PTs at rehabilitation centres n = 21, PTs at private physiotherapy clinics n = 21, Total PTs n = 62. Lower neighbourhood median household income is associated with increased average length of disability in workers with low back pain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinnott (2009) [62]</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort, Administrative</td>
<td>Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from USA state of California, Disability status (chronic disability &gt;= 91 days of work disability). Delays in claim acceptance and treatment increased the likelihood that a low back injury can become chronic. System allows delays of up to 90 days. It was hypothesised that systems could control this delay, and thus affect treatment outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasiak (2006) [59]</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort, Administrative</td>
<td>Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states, Healthcare utilization (visits per person, services per). Amount of reimbursement is positively associated with costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding**
- Higher unemployment may experience more challenges
- Lower neighbourhood median household income is associated with increased average length of disability in workers with low back pain.

**Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs**
- PTs more likely to be recommended workers’ compensation workers to physiotherapy and expect worse outcomes – this may be due to an unconscious bias.
- Among physical therapists, knowledge of patient compensation status did not affect judgement of physical assessments.
- Workers’ compensation workers expected to have worse outcomes.

**Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs**
- Delays in claim acceptance and treatment increased the likelihood that a low back injury can become chronic. System allows delays of up to 90 days. It was hypothesised that systems could control this delay, and thus affect treatment outcomes.
- Healthcare providers who see less workers’ compensation workers ultimately produce worse outcomes.

**Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding**
- Amount of reimbursement is positively associated with costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Year)</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Outcome Measures</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watson (2004) [69]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Persons unemployed for &gt;6 months receiving incapacity benefit or unemployment benefit with LBP &gt;6 months Incapacity benefits (i.e., medically determined) n = 39 Unemployment benefits (not medically determined) n = 45 Total n = 86</td>
<td>Prospective cohort</td>
<td>Work status, functional status / disability (Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire), pain (VAS), psychological measures, physical measures</td>
<td>Theory 5</td>
<td>No significant differences in any functional, work disability, or employment outcomes between the two types of benefits – Benefit type (either unemployment or medically determined benefit) does not predict long-term outcomes in those with chronic LBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster (2009) [58]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Workers’ compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states Claimants who received at least one early opioid prescription proportion = 21.3% Total claimants n = 8,262</td>
<td>Retrospective cohort</td>
<td>Healthcare utilization (early opioid prescription; &lt;15 days post-injury)</td>
<td>Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding – Workers’ compensation cost containment efforts were positively associated with prescribing opioids for low back pain in the first 15 days of treatment (PR 1.12, 95% CI 1.02, 1.24). It was hypothesised that healthcare providers responded to cost containment efforts with income maintenance strategies – The number of physicians per capita was negatively associated with early opioid prescribing (&lt;15 days). It was hypothesised that higher physician concentrations result in greater peer-to-peer interaction, with more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claimants who received chiropractic services n = 8,894 All other claimants n = 4,840 Total claimants n = 13,734
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Werner (2009) [63]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Critical appraisal of various literature – sample not applicable**

**Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP**

The cost containment score was a composite score that contained the employer choice of healthcare provider (HCP). This score was used to assess the cost-containment strategies of employers. Werner [63] performed a critical appraisal of various literature and found that the sample was not applicable to their study.

**Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs**

Current guidelines indicate that management of LBP should focus on staying active and staying at work. However, doctors are highly likely to give sickness certification to workers with LBP, which is counter to the evidence. Unfortunately, healthcare professionals are not always willing to adjust their recommendations and treatment strategies. Several studies targeting doctors with updated knowledge about back pain and various treatment interventions have been unsuccessful in reducing sickness absence.

**Theory 1 – Communication of information and peer influences related to the risks of opioid use in working populations**

Household inequality for each state was positively associated with a higher rate of prescribing opioids. It was suggested that this could reflect "less access to quality medical care in high poverty areas," such as those found in "economically unequal states." It was also suggested that, in combination with lower physicians per capita, opioids may be prescribed in the absence of appropriate services. However, this could reflect less access to quality medical care in high poverty areas, such as those found in economically unequal states. It was also suggested that, in combination with lower physicians per capita, opioids may be prescribed in the absence of appropriate services.
Table 2 Characteristics and features of income support and healthcare systems in included studies [51, 53, 54]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Disability Policy Model</th>
<th>Employment Injury Protection Scheme</th>
<th>Unemployment Protection Scheme</th>
<th>Healthcare System Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Liberal (A) Employer liability</td>
<td>Social assistance</td>
<td>National health insurance</td>
<td><strong>Theory 4 – ISS incentives for employers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>National health insurance</td>
<td><strong>Wong (2014) [64]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ST** = Search Tranche, **Rel.** = Relevance, **Rig.** = Rigour, **●●●** = relevant / rigorous, **●●** = moderately relevant / rigorous, **●** = less relevant / rigorous

- **Theory 4 – ISS incentives for employers**
  - A single trial of employer-based peer adviser found a reduction in:
    - LBP-related sick leave by 49%
    - Total sickness absence of 27%

- **Wong (2014) [64]**
  - Yearly aggregates of lost-time claims for LBP in Canada
  - System dynamics model
  - Submitted and accepted lost-time claims for LBP

- **Administrative LBP system dynamics**
  - The local income support system 'provides a greater weighting to lost-time claims (with higher costs) than no-lost-time claims (with lower costs) in determining whether a firm is administered a surcharge or refund for their payments for workers' compensation'.
  - This coincides with legislation aimed to increase worker accommodation. There could be a reporting issue though.

- **27%**
  - No-lost-time claims increased with legislation compensation coverage, this coincides with legislation aimed to increase worker accommodation.

- **lost-time claims increased could be a reporting issue though**

- **Author/funder** who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. This copyright holder for this preprint (which was not peer-reviewed) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC BY 4.0 International license.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Political system</th>
<th>Social insurance</th>
<th>Social insurance and social assistance</th>
<th>Voluntary income-related insurance and social assistance</th>
<th>National health service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Social-democratic (A)</td>
<td>Direct provision (private insurance for accidents / public insurance for occupational disease)</td>
<td>Subsidized voluntary insurance and social assistance</td>
<td>National health service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Social-democratic (B)</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance and social assistance</td>
<td>Social health insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Etatist social health insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Liberal (B)</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Etatist social health insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Social-democratic (A)</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Social insurance and social assistance</td>
<td>Social health insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Social-democratic (B)</td>
<td>Social insurance</td>
<td>Voluntary income-related insurance and social assistance</td>
<td>National health service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Liberal (A)</td>
<td>Social insurance; social assistance</td>
<td>Social insurance and social assistance</td>
<td>National health service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Liberal (B)</td>
<td>Employer liability</td>
<td>Social insurance and unemployment aid</td>
<td>Private health system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX**

**Appendix Table 3 Summary of results from semi-structured interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Theory 1** | - Should work in theory, probably does not in practice  
- Fee schedules are too limiting, do not always offer evidence-based care, and when they do practitioners might not adhere to guidelines anyway  
- In a private healthcare system, good providers might opt out of care if fee schedules are too low  
- Fee schedules could also be used to reduce inequalities between subgroups |
| **Theory 2** | - Volume of paperwork required by workers’ compensation systems and a lack of decision-making authority were flagged as disincentives for healthcare providers to engage the system  
- This would not affect healthcare quality though |
| **Theory 3** | - Agreement that this might work in US  
- While the theory might hold, the employer is likely to focus on reducing wage replacement time and not healthcare quality  
- Employers have little to no say in healthcare in some jurisdictions |
| **Theory 4** | - Financial incentive could be good, but warned against over-estimating the effect it might have  
- Incentives are not based around worker recovery and functional capacity past what is required to return to work |
| **Theory 5** | - Experts suggested that functional capacity might not be the right outcome for this theory  
- There may be a lack of incentive or motivation for employers to be involved in worker recovery in the UK, as the state handles all wage replacement  
- This theory would hold, but there are changes in local legislation that might allow employers to ‘tick the boxes’ until they could remove an injured worker |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Key points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Theory 6                                          | - All experts agreed with this theory  
- Experts suggested that longer wait times and a worker perception that they have to prove their injury is real, or feeling unsupported, questioned, or tested by the system, healthcare provider, or employer, leads to worse functional and recovery outcomes |
| How do income support systems impact healthcare quality? | - The perception that workers need to prove that they are injured can lead them needing to feel ‘sicker’ and seek more aggressive treatment and diagnostics to prove their pain and have it documented  
- Specific characteristics of income support systems, such as the use of Independent Medical Examiners may lead to negative outcomes |
| How do income support systems impact functional capacity? | - Some disorders might be more ‘credible’ than others; LBP tends to carry more stigma, residual pain issues, and diagnostic uncertainty that can make it frustrating for workers |
| Other                                             | - More benevolent a wage replacement system, the less motivating it is to seek functional improvement  
- There has been a shift in the US toward lump sum payments to reduce long-term, sometimes indefinite, claim liability  
- It was also noted that a substantial volume of workers’ compensation claims in the US may now be investigated by private investigators, and that it was commonplace for a worker with a low back pain claim to be filmed and this may have a negative impact on functional capacity and recovery |
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