

1 **THE IMPACT OF INCOME SUPPORT SYSTEMS ON HEALTHCARE**
2 **QUALITY AND FUNCTIONAL CAPACITY IN WORKERS WITH LOW**
3 **BACK PAIN: A REALIST REVIEW**

4

5 **Authors**

6 Mr Michael Di Donato*, Insurance Work and Health Group, School of Public Health
7 and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria
8 3004, Australia

9 michael.didonato@monash.edu; +61 (0) 3 9905 6417

10

11 Dr Ross Iles, Insurance Work and Health Group, School of Public Health and
12 Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria
13 3004, Australia.

14 ross.iles@monash.edu

15

16 Dr Tyler Lane, Insurance Work and Health Group, School of Public Health and
17 Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria
18 3004, Australia.

19 tyler.lane@monash.edu

20

21

22 Professor Rachelle Buchbinder, Monash Department of Clinical Epidemiology,
23 Cabrini Institute and Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health and
24 Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 4 Drysdale St, Malvern, Victoria 3144,
25 Australia.

26 rachelle.buchbinder@monash.edu

27

28 Professor Alex Collie, Insurance Work and Health Group, School of Public Health
29 and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria
30 3004, Australia

31 alex.collie@monash.edu;

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 **ABSTRACT**

45 **Background**

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

53 **Methods**

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

62 **Results**

63 Income support systems influence healthcare quality through funding restrictions,
64 healthcare provider administrative burden, and allowing employers to select
65 providers. They also influence worker functional capacity through the level of
66 participation and financial incentives for employers, measures to prove the validity of
67 the worker's LBP, and certain administrative procedures. These mechanisms are

68 often exclusively context-dependent, and generate differing and unintended
69 outcomes depending on features of the healthcare and income support system, as
70 well as other contextual factors such as socioeconomic status and labour force
71 composition.

72 **Discussion**

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

78 **Keywords**

79 Low back pain; income support systems; realist review; workers' compensation

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90 **BACKGROUND**

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

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

106 Contemporary evidence regarding the management of LBP indicates that good
107 quality healthcare adopts a biopsychosocial approach, and encourages both staying
108 active and at work where possible [13-18]. Imaging of acute LBP and treatments
109 such as opioids, injection therapies and surgery are considered low-value care, have
110 high costs, and in some cases, are associated with detrimental effects on recovery
111 and return to work [15, 19]. Healthcare quality therefore influences functional
112 capacity, the ability of an individual to perform activities of daily living and work [19-
113 23].

114 Predictors of work disability due to LBP have been characterised as falling within
115 four domains or ‘systems’: personal, workplace, healthcare, and legislative [24]. Our
116 review protocol hypothesised that the legislative system (i.e., income support)
117 influences healthcare and workplace systems, which in turn impact healthcare
118 quality and functional capacity. This hypothesis was based on contemporary
119 literature, which suggests that income support systems may be detrimental [25-28].
120 For example, workers’ compensation recipients take longer to return to work than
121 workers who do not receive workers’ compensation [29, 30].

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

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

138 **METHODS**

139 We conducted this review and report our findings as per Pawson’s methodology and
140 the Realist And Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses: Evolving Standards
141 (RAMESES) group methodological guidance for realist reviews [36]. This involved
142 the following stages: (1) clarifying scope, identifying review questions, formulating
143 initial theories, (2) purposive and iterative searching for literature, (3) appraising
144 literature and extracting data, (4) analysing and synthesising data and refining
145 theories, and (5) disseminating review results [31, 37, 38]. In the following section we
146 provide a summary of the research methodology. Further information on the
147 research methods and realist theory is available in our published review protocol
148 [32].

149 **Initial theories**

150 We conducted initial purposive searches, held several collective author discussions,
151 and consulted with experts to develop five initial theories to test in this review [32,
152 39, 40]. These theories were programme theories that described how and in what
153 contexts income support systems may impact healthcare quality and functional
154 capacity. Each theory consisted of an income support system policy that triggered a
155 mechanism; the “non-observable” yet real process that generates an actual or
156 empirical outcome. This mechanism acted within a set of contextual features, which
157 modified how the mechanism generated the outcome. Initial theories were developed
158 around the Sherbrooke Model of Work Disability [24], explaining the conceptual
159 interactions between income support, healthcare, and workplace systems.

160 **Search strategy**

161 Academic literature was the primary source of information for the refinement of our
162 theories. Grey literature was used to define income support and healthcare system

163 types which provided a macro-level view of policies in the regions in which studies
164 were conducted. This provided us a greater understanding of context in each region.

165 *Academic searches*

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

175 *Grey literature searches*

176 Grey literature searches were conducted in the following policy databases:
177 International Labour Organisation (ILO) NATLEX, EPLex, LEGOSH, and NORMLEX
178 databases [41-44], United States Social Security Administration databases (US-
179 SSA) [45], International Social Security Administration (ISSA) publication database
180 [46], the Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC) database [47],
181 and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)
182 document library [48].

183 **Eligibility criteria**

184 One author (MDD) screened titles and abstracts for eligibility. An additional author
185 (TL) screened a random sample of 10% of the titles and abstracts for consistency.
186 We included any literature that described the impact of an income support system on

187 healthcare quality for LBP or on the functional capacity of workers with LBP. Further
188 information on eligibility criteria is available in our protocol [32].

189 **Data extraction and appraisal**

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

200 **Semi-structured interviews**

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

206 Interviews were structured around each of the five initial theories; interviewees were
207 asked whether or not they agreed with an initial theory, and why [50]. They were also
208 asked if they thought there were any additional contextual factors or mechanisms
209 that we had not identified. Interviews were analysed with a realist logic of analysis
210 [50].

211 The Monash University Human Ethics Research Committee provided ethics approval
212 for this project (Project ID 14144, July 2018).

213 **Data analysis and synthesis**

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

225 **Changes from protocol**

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

235 functional capacity and healthcare quality. That is, they described simply that an
236 interaction occurs, and did not contribute to the refinement of our theories.

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

242 **RESULTS**

243 **Search results**

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

251

252 [INSERT FIGURE 1 AND CAPTION HERE]

253

254

255

256 **Characteristics of included studies**

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

264 [INSERT TABLE 1 AND CAPTION HERE]

265 **Characteristics of included systems**

266 Information on the system types of included studies is described in Table 2. Four
267 studies defined the typology of the disability policy model, employment injury
268 protection scheme, unemployment protection scheme and healthcare system [51-
269 54]. There were a limited range of system types, as most studies were conducted in
270 North America. Most studies explored the impact of workers' compensation systems;
271 that is they explored the 'employer liability' type employment injury protection
272 scheme. This system is a cause-based system funded by insurance premiums from
273 employers. Three studies examined other system types, such as social security and
274 disability insurance (SSDI). These disability-based systems sit within a liberal
275 disability policy model and a social insurance unemployment protection scheme and
276 benefit applicants are typically means-tested [52, 54].

277 Most studies were conducted in environments with either a private healthcare
278 system or national health insurance system. Healthcare system type was defined by
279 state, societal or private responsibility for regulation, funding, and service provision

280 of healthcare. The US is one of a few systems where healthcare regulation, funding,
281 and service provision are private. Canada and Australia have a national health
282 insurance system in which regulation and funding are performed by the province or
283 state respectively, with private service provision [51, 55].

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

292 [INSERT TABLE 2 AND CAPTION HERE]

293 **Interviews**

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

300 **Analysis and synthesis**

301 Results of the analysis and synthesis are presented below and summarised in Figure
302 2. Each theory is supported by at least one CMO configuration. Where a single CMO
303 configuration supported a theory, the CMO configuration is reported as the theory.

304 [INSERT FIGURE 2 AND CAPTION HERE]

305 **Theory 1 – Income support system role in funding healthcare**

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

311 *CMO configuration 1 (n=3 pieces of literature)*

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

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

323 *CMO configuration 2 (n=5 pieces of literature)*

324 *Income support systems that attempt to control payments for healthcare in regions*
325 *with private healthcare systems encourage healthcare providers to seek income*
326 *maintenance strategies. This can lead to overtreatment, use of low-value treatments,*
327 *and worse functional outcomes.*

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

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

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

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

352 *CMO configuration 4 (n=3 pieces of literature)*

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

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

367 **Theory 2 – Income support system demands on healthcare providers**

368 *CMO configuration 5 (n=5 pieces of literature)*

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

374 Work-focussed healthcare is acknowledged as important for recovery among
375 workers with LBP among workers with LBP, yet some clinicians do not address this.

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

389 **Theory 3 – Employer choice of healthcare provider**

390 *CMO configuration 6 (n=3 pieces of literature)*

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

395 In the US, the length of disability was lower when the employer could choose
396 healthcare providers, which was attributed to selection of work-focussed healthcare
397 providers who were familiar with the workplace [27]. This aligned with results from
398 interviews. The experts suggested this theory might hold, although the employer is
399 likely to focus on wage replacement duration as a function of total premium costs
400 and not healthcare quality. Experts further explained that employers in their

401 respective countries have little to no influence on healthcare. Further US literature
402 measured the effect of limiting treatment provider choice as part of a composite cost
403 containment score. While cost containment was shown to have an adverse effect on
404 healthcare quality and work outcomes, it was not possible to isolate treating provider
405 choice from the composite measure, and it is unclear how initial treating provider
406 choice contributed to this outcome [33, 58].

407 **Theory 4 – Employer incentives**

408 *CMO configuration 7 (n=2 pieces of literature)*

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

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

423 **Theory 5 – Income support system impact on the worker**

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

427 *CMO configuration 8*

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

432 Where workers are required to prove they are disabled due to their LBP and ‘defend
433 their legitimacy’, they may have worse work outcomes. It is possible that the
434 presence of financial incentives motivate workers to have their disability recognised.
435 Interviewed experts suggested that where workers have to prove their LBP causes
436 disability (i.e., cause-based systems); they may seek tests that are more complex
437 and treatments to legitimize their pain with the income support system or employer.
438 Workers funded by workers’ compensation tended to have worse functional
439 outcomes than workers funded by disability pensions or disability insurance (i.e.,
440 where a specific cause is not required), and motor vehicle accident insurance [65-
441 67]. In a motor vehicle accident compensation system, a switch from a tort to no-fault
442 scheme significantly reduced claims for LBP as well as the median duration of
443 disability [68]. These data conflicted with a single study. However, the latter study
444 compared types of benefits in a region with a disability-based income support
445 system, making comparisons challenging [69]. It was hypothesised that the
446 adversarial environment associated with tort law may delay claim closure. Experts
447 also noted that LBP tends to carry more stigma than other ‘more credible’ conditions,

448 and that the associated residual pain issues and diagnostic uncertainty can frustrate
449 workers. Nevertheless, one study comparing multiple countries demonstrated that
450 requirement for medical certification to receive benefits was not a significant
451 predictor of engagement in return to work [70].

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

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

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

473 workers' compensation bodies had begun paying lump sums to some workers,
474 however, the effect of this was unknown.

475 *CMO configuration 10 (n=1 piece of literature)*

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

479 Certain 'rules and practices' of the system such as 'right to case appeal' and 'slow or
480 dissatisfactory case management' have been cited as detrimental to worker recovery
481 [60]. Interviewed experts suggested such features and waiting periods may stop the
482 worker from working, and that if the worker feels unsupported during these periods
483 they may be less likely to ultimately return to work. One expert also pointed to
484 requirements for approval for certain healthcare providers or volumes of healthcare
485 by some income support systems, possibly leading to worse functional outcomes.

486 **DISCUSSION**

487 This realist review sought to understand how and in what contexts income support
488 systems impact healthcare quality and functional capacity in workers with LBP. We
489 have found those healthcare providers, employers, and workers' responses to
490 income support system policies and features, can impact healthcare quality and
491 worker functional capacity. These effects are context specific and only operate in
492 certain types of income support and healthcare systems or in workers with certain
493 sociodemographic features. While contemporary literature has previously identified
494 the impact of income support systems on these outcomes, we believe this review
495 provides a new understanding of the causes of these events.

496 **Trends in included literature and theories**

497 Several trends emerged in the included literature. The use of a successionist model
498 of causality meant the majority of included studies treated income support systems
499 as single entities or statuses, which may miss certain nuances inherent to large
500 systems such as income support. The majority of included literature also did not
501 discuss context in detail, or even at all. In particular, there was limited discussion of
502 the context of parallel systems or regions. For example, few pieces of literature
503 investigating income support systems also described the local healthcare system
504 despite the potentially important relationship between the two. Finally, we found that
505 most literature originated in regions with similar system types.

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

513 **Supporting evidence from work disability literature not specific to** 514 **people with LBP**

515 We identified some evidence that was ineligible for inclusion, but may have
516 contributed to the development and refinement of our theories. This evidence was
517 usually excluded as the sample did specifically include workers with LBP. For the
518 most part, work disability literature not specific to LBP aligns with our already
519 established theories. For example, healthcare providers have previously found
520 difficulties with workers' compensation systems and the return to work process in

521 workers who had “multiple injuries, gradual onset or complex illnesses, chronic pain,
522 and mental health conditions” [26]. In some cases healthcare providers were found
523 to refuse to treat compensated workers, citing additional “clinical complexities” and
524 “time and financial burdens” [78]. Such evidence aligns with our established *Theory*
525 2. However, additional insights indicate that differences in doctors’ roles within
526 systems may affect work outcomes [79], financial incentives may be used
527 successfully to influence healthcare provider adoption of occupationally-focussed
528 healthcare programs [80], and fee schedules can achieve intended cost-containment
529 objectives [81]. Furthermore, a shift of funding income support responsibility from the
530 state to employers was found to be beneficial for worker return to work times [82].
531 There is also evidence to suggest that specific financial incentives for employers
532 may encourage actions such as claim reporting time [83].

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

542 However, we sought to identify and understand the impact of income support
543 systems specifically on outcomes of workers with LBP as this is the greatest
544 contributor to disability worldwide [4]. In the majority of cases it is not possible to
545 identify a specific pathoanatomic cause of LBP, and the diagnosis of non-specific

546 LBP typically depends upon ruling out much rarer specific and or serious causes.

547 The subjective nature and causative ambiguity of LBP appears to lend itself to a

548 certain amount of stigma or challenged integrity [86], that is not reflected in other

549 musculoskeletal conditions such as osteoarthritis [87]. This may lead to particular

550 challenges for a worker seeking wage replacement from a cause-based system. The

551 US interviewee even suggested worker attempts “to prove the legitimacy of their pain

552 and disability” might lead to greater utilisation of tests such as imaging, as reflected

553 in *Theory 5*.

554 **The role of context and system types**

555 The mechanisms identified in the review were conceptually reliant on underlying

556 contextual factors. There is likely substantial complexity to the number and layer of

557 contextual factors not elucidated in this review. However, we were able to

558 understand the theoretical influence that some high-level contextual factors, such as

559 system typology, had over some mechanisms. For example, the income

560 maintenance behaviour demonstrated by healthcare providers appears to be reliant

561 on a commodified healthcare system type [51, 88].

562 Healthcare system type is one feature of a larger policy landscape. Some included

563 literature suggested that different income support system types (i.e., cause-based or

564 disability-based systems) might lead to different outcomes. In one circumstance

565 disability-based systems such as unemployment benefits appeared to have better

566 outcomes than time-limited benefits [67]. Furthermore, it has previously been

567 suspected that the tightening of US workers’ compensation policies lead workers to

568 move to social security disability insurance. That is, a move from cause-based

569 systems to a disability-based system. However, identifying causality for this inter-

570 system movement has previously been debated [89, 90].

571 High level system features may also have the potential to affect how policy
572 mechanisms in neighbouring systems react; incentives for physician performance
573 (i.e., pay-for-performance) may function more effectively in regions within more
574 commodified welfare systems [91]. There is potential for future research into the role
575 of such contextual factors.

576 **Strengths and limitations**

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

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

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

592 Included literature was published between 1988 and 2018. There has been
593 substantial development the evidence-base for LBP, as well as in the design of
594 income support systems, during this time. We did not account for this temporality

595 issue in our review. Finally, we also had a small and relatively homogenous sample
596 of expert interviewees. Although interviews were not the primary activity of this
597 review, we could have benefited from a larger and more role-diverse sample.

598 **Recommendations for future research**

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

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

615 We found a paucity of literature regarding the impact of income support system
616 policies on the employer in cases where workers have LBP. This may be due to
617 challenges associated with research methodologies in this cohort, or simply an
618 under-researched area. We recommend future exploration of the impact of policies,
619 such as financial incentives, on employers of workers with LBP.

620 Finally, we recommend additional policy research to examine how policies may have
621 population-scale impact on persons and workers with LBP. This could be achieved
622 by investigating the influence of policies in existing administrative data; a method
623 employed by several studies included in this review.

624 **Recommendations for future policy development**

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

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

638 **Conclusion**

639 This realist review has provided an understanding of how and in what contexts
640 income support systems impact healthcare quality for and functional capacity of
641 workers with LBP. This impact occurs through multiple underlying context-dependent
642 mechanisms triggered by financial incentive and control policies, regulatory
643 procedures, and administrative events. Future research would benefit from utilising

644 realist review methods, and should make efforts to define relative contextual factors
645 local to research. Future policy development should focus on understanding the
646 biopsychosocial aspects of LBP, and how income support systems may interact with
647 one another and with other systems such as healthcare.

648 **List of abbreviations**

649 CMO configuration – Context-Mechanism-Outcome configuration

650 LBP – Low Back Pain

651 MRI – Magnetic Resonance Imaging

652 NHS – National Health Service

653 OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

654 RAMESES – Realist And Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses: Evolving Standards

655 SSDI – Social Security and Disability Insurance

656 **Declarations**

657 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

658 The Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC) approved
659 the semi-structured interviews performed in this review, Project ID 14144 (July
660 2018).

661 *Consent for publication*

662 Not applicable.

663 *Availability of data and material*

664 Literature included in this review is available through the relevant journals.

665 Transcripts of interviews conducted in this review are not publicly available.

666 *Competing interests*

667 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

668 *Funding*

669 Mr Di Donato receives funding from an Australian Government Research Training
670 Program (RTP) Scholarship Stipend. Professor Buchbinder is supported by an
671 Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) Senior Principal
672 Research Fellowship. Professor Collie is supported by an Australian Research
673 Council (ARC) Discovery Project Grant (DP190102473) and Future Fellowship
674 (FT190100218).

675 *Author contributions*

676 All authors conceptualised the review. MDD conducted searches for academic and
677 grey literature. MDD and TL screened literature for eligibility. MDD, TL, and RI
678 extracted data from included literature. MDD drafted the syntheses. All authors had
679 input on refining the syntheses. MDD drafted the manuscript. All authors provided
680 feedback on and approved the final manuscript.

681 *Acknowledgements*

682 The authors would like to acknowledge the experts who participated in the semi-
683 structured interviews of this realist review.

684

685

686 **FIGURES AND TABLES**

687

688

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706

707

708

709

710





Figure 1 Results of searching, screening, and sorting






Figure 2 CMO configurations

Table 1 Details of included studies

| First Author (year) [ref] | ST ¹ | Rel. ² | Rig. ³ | Region(s) | Sample / Sample size | Study design | Data sources | Outcomes measured | Relevant results to each theory |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Anema (2009) [70] | 1 | ●●● ⁴ | ●●● | 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 | <i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – 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 | <i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – 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) | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – Workers receiving workers' compensation benefit less from surgical intervention – No differences were found at 2 years between workers' compensation and non-workers' |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|----|-----|----------|--|-------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | Receiving workers' compensation n = 113 Not receiving workers' compensation n = 811 | | | | compensation non-operative workers – '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 |
| Bartys (2017) [60] | 1 | •• | ••• | Multiple | Critical appraisal of various forms of literature – sample not applicable | Literature review | Literature | Work disability, work participation | <p><i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – Some healthcare professionals may avoid workers in receipt of income support due to a perceived insufficient funding for the necessary labour involved with compensated workers</p> <p><i>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</i> – Healthcare professionals 'generally regard' work issues as outside their 'professional remit', and may not address them due to 'a lack of financial incentive, a lack of time and standard procedures, and increasing job demands'</p> <p><i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – When workers with LBP are required to prove their disability and 'defend legitimacy' of LBP they may have worse outcomes – More benevolent wage replacement may reduce the likelihood of returning to work – Certain administrative hurdles and rules of systems may be detrimental to worker recovery</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----|-----|--------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Carnide (2018) [93] | 3 | • | ••• | Canada | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP in a single Canadian province Total claimants n = 97,124 | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Opioid, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory (NSAID, and skeletal muscle relaxant (SMR) prescription | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – 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 Total claimants n = 4473 | Prospective cohort | Administrative, questionnaire | Work disability duration, functional and pain status (SF-36 Questionnaire), mood (CES-D Questionnaire) | <i>Theory 5</i> – Switch from tort to no-fault system decreased 6-month incidence of claims from 256 per 100,000 adults to 175 and 177 per 100,000 adults in first and second following months – Switch from tort to no-fault systems associated with decrease in median time to claim closure from 505 days to 216 and 203 days in first and second following months – 'Adversarial environment' associated with tort law thought to delay claim closure and recovery – 'When benefits are tied to pain and suffering, the insurance system acts in opposition to modern rehabilitation methods that emphasise mobility and ability over pain and disability' |
| Fujii (2012) [65] | 1 | • | •• | Japan | Japanese citizens who had experienced any LBP Total n = 52,650 Received workers' compensation n = 588 | Prospective observational | Questionnaire | Demographic characteristics, receipt of compensation for LBP, | <i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – Receipt of workers' compensation and motor vehicle accident compensation significantly associated with chronic LBP |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|--|-------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | Received motor vehicle accident compensation n = 576 | | | duration and severity of LBP | (adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 3.27 (95%CI 2.56-4.16), and aOR 1.85, 95%CI 1.36-2.50) respectively). Workers' compensation recipients more likely than motor vehicle accident compensation recipients to have chronic LBP |
| Graves (2018) [94] | 1 | ••• | ••• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP in USA state of Washington Total claimants n = 76,119 | Interrupted time-series | Administrative | Healthcare costs, healthcare utilization, disability status | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – 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 – 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) – Trends observed in this study may reflect a national long-term decline in advanced imaging utilization |
| Gum (2013) [66] | 3 | • | •• | USA | Workers who underwent spinal fusion and received workers' compensation or disability compensation Received workers' compensation n = 37 | Case-control study | Questionnaire | Pain, functional status (Oswestry Disability Index, SF-36 Questionnaire) | <i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – Workers receiving workers' compensation have significantly worse functional outcomes compared to matched controls than disability compensation cases compared to matched |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|----|-----|--------|---|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Received disability compensation (SSDI, Medicaid, Medicare) n = 51 Matched controls n = cases | | | | controls after lumbar spinal fusion for LBP – Workers' compensation appears to have a negative influence on recovery from spinal fusion for LBP compared to disability compensation |
| Jamison (1988) [67] | 1 | •• | •• | USA | Workers referred to single pain centre in USA Total n = 110 Not receiving financial compensation n = 44 Receiving time-limited (workers compensation) benefits n = 27 Receiving unlimited (no time limit) benefits n = 39 | Prospective observational | Questionnaire, physical examination | Pain, functional status (activities possible), healthcare utilization | <i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i> – Workers receiving disability benefits (unlimited time benefits) use more narcotic pain medication and sedatives, and experienced worse recovery than workers receiving time-limited compensation or no compensation |
| Laliberte (2017) [56] | 1 | •• | • | Canada | Physical therapy professionals Total n = 846 | Cross-sectional | Questionnaire | (Hypothetical) healthcare delivery (Wait time, treatment frequency, treatment duration, treatments) | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – 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. |
| Pransky (2015) [33] | 1 | •• | ••• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states Total n = 5,359 Received early MRI n = 1,590 Did not receive early MRI n = 3,769 | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Healthcare utilization (MRI within 30 days post-onset of LBP) | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i> – Workers' compensation cost containment efforts were not associated with MRI use in the first 30 days of the onset of LBP. It was hypothesised that cost containment efforts could a reactive approach to increasing medical costs in workers' compensation schemes |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----|----|-----------|--|--|----------------|--------------------------|---|
| | | | | | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - 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 - Greater severity associated with 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 <p><i>Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cost containment score was not predictive of early MRI use in the fully adjusted model - This composite score contained whether the employer or insurer could choose healthcare |
| Schonstein (2002) [61] | 1 | •• | •• | Australia | Physiotherapists treating compensated workers with LBP | Retrospective case review of NOC forms | Administrative | Work-focussed healthcare | <p><i>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Treatment goals made by physiotherapists were of mixed |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | Notification of Commencement Form (NOC) n = 219 | | | (quality of treatment goals) | quality with reference to clinical practice guidelines, despite 'emphasis from WorkCover'. Hypothesised that some physiotherapists not believe that 'achieving return to work is an integral part of their physiotherapy role' (Theory 2) |
| Shraim (2015) [27] | 1 | ••• | ••• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states Total claimants n = 59,360 | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Work disability duration, medical costs | <p><i>Theory 1 – ISS role in funding healthcare</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 <p><i>Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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' |
| Shraim (2017) [28] | 1 | • | ••• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states Total claimants n = 59,360 | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Work disability duration, medical costs | <p><i>Theory 5 – ISS impact on the worker</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Higher state unemployment rate is associated with increased average length of disability in workers with low back pain. It was suggested that injured workers who live in areas of |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|----|-----|-----|--|----------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | 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 |
| Simmonds (1996) [57] | 2 | •• | • | USA | Physical therapists (PTs) PTs at acute care hospitals n = 20 PTs at rehabilitation centres n = 21 PTs at private physiotherapy clinics n = 21 Total PTs n = 62 | Double-blind RCT | Questionnaire | Physical assessment (i.e., range of movement), degree of disability, need for healthcare | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding</i> – PTs more likely to be recommended workers' compensation workers to physiotherapy and expect worse outcomes – this may be due to an unconscious bias <i>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</i> – Among physical therapists, knowledge of patient compensation status did not affect judgement of physical assessments – Workers' compensation workers expected to have worse outcomes, |
| Sinnott (2009) [62] | 1 | •• | ••• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from USA state of California | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Disability status (chronic disability >= 91 days of work disability) | <i>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</i> – 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 |
| Wasiak (2006) [59] | 1 | • | •• | USA | Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | Healthcare utilization (visits per person, services per | <i>Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding</i> – Amount of reimbursement is positively associated with costs |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p>Claimants who received chiropractic services n = 8,894</p> <p>All other claimants n = 4,840</p> <p>Total claimants n = 13,734</p> | | | <p>person, and person-mean services per visit)</p> | <p>and number of visits to chiropractic care. Fee schedules showed no association. Specific features such as limits on number of visits demonstrated reduced medical costs. It was hypothesised that the level of reimbursement for services triggered a 'perverse' response by chiropractors 'in response to price controls'</p> |
| Watson (2004) [69] | 1 | • | • | UK | <p>Persons unemployed for >6 months receiving incapacity benefit or unemployment benefit with LBP >6 months</p> <p>Incapacity benefits (i.e., medically determined) n = 39</p> <p>Unemployment benefits (not medically determined) n = 45</p> <p>Total n = 86</p> | Prospective cohort | Questionnaire, interview, physical examination | <p>Work status, functional status / disability (Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire), pain (VAS), psychological measures, physical measures</p> | <p><i>Theory 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 |
| Webster (2009) [58] | 1 | ••• | ••• | USA | <p>Workers' compensation claimants for LBP from several USA states</p> <p>Claimants who received at least one early opioid prescription proportion = 21.3%</p> <p>Total claimants n = 8,262</p> | Retrospective cohort | Administrative | <p>Healthcare utilization (early opioid prescription; <15 days post-injury)</p> | <p><i>Theory 1 – ISS role in healthcare funding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 (<15 days). It was hypothesised that higher 'physician concentrations result in greater peer-to-peer interaction, with more |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|---|----------|---|-------------------|------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | <p>communication of information and peer influences related to the risks of opioid use in working populations'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 <p><i>Theory 3 – Employer choice of HCP</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The cost containment score was a composite score that contained the employer choice of healthcare provider |
| Werner (2009) [63] | 2 | ●●● | ● | Multiple | Critical appraisal of various forms of literature – sample not applicable | Literature review | Literature | <p>Characteristics of sick-listed worker, sick-listing person, workplace, cultural, economic conditions</p> <p><i>Theory 2 – ISS demands on HCPs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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' |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---|-----|----|--------|---|-----------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | <i>Theory 4 – ISS incentives for employers</i> – A single trial of employer-based peer adviser found a reduction in LBP-related sick leave by 49% and total sickness absence of 27% |
| Wong (2014) [64] | 3 | ●●● | ●● | Canada | Yearly aggregates of lost-time claims for LBP in Canada | System dynamics model | Administrative | Submitted and accepted lost-time claims for LBP | <i>Theory 4 – ISS incentives for employers</i> – 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 coverage’ – This coincides with legislation aimed to increase worker accommodation – No-lost time claims increased could be a reporting issue though |

¹: ST = Search Tranche, ²: Rel. = Relevance, ³: Rig. = Rigour, ⁴: ●●● = relevant / rigorous, ●● = moderately relevant / rigorous, ● = less relevant / rigorous

Table 2 Characteristics and features of income support and healthcare systems in included studies [51, 53, 54]

| Country | Disability Policy Model | Employment Injury Protection Scheme | Unemployment Protection Scheme | Healthcare System Type |
|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Australia | Liberal (A) | Employer liability | Social assistance | National health insurance |
| Canada | Liberal (B) | Social insurance | Social insurance | National health insurance |

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Denmark | Social-democratic (A) | Direct provision (private insurance for accidents / public insurance for occupational disease) | Subsidized voluntary insurance and social assistance | National health service |
| Germany | Social-democratic (B) | Social insurance | Social insurance and social assistance | Social health insurance |
| Israel | | Social insurance | Social insurance | Etatist social health insurance |
| Japan | Liberal (B) | Social insurance | Social insurance | Etatist social health insurance |
| Netherlands | Social-democratic (A) | Social insurance | Social insurance and social assistance | Etatist social health insurance |
| Sweden | Social-democratic (B) | Social insurance | Voluntary income-related insurance and social assistance | National health service |
| UK | Liberal (A) | Social insurance; social assistance | Social insurance and social assistance | National health service |
| USA | Liberal (B) | Employer liability | Social insurance and unemployment aid | Private health system |

APPENDIX

Appendix Table 3 Summary of results from semi-structured interviews

| Section | Key points |
|----------|---|
| Theory 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 |

| Section | Key points |
|---|---|
| Theory 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 |

REFERENCES

1. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). *Back Problems - What role do GPs play in treating back problems?* 2017 [cited 2018 15 May]; Available from: <https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/arthritis-other-musculoskeletal-conditions/back-problems/what-role-do-gps-play-in-treating-back-problems>.
2. Dunn, K.M., L. Hestbaek, and J.D. Cassidy, *Low back pain across the life course*. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol, 2013. **27**(5): p. 591-600.
3. Duthey, B., *Background Paper 6.24 Low back pain*. 2013, World Health Organisation (WHO).
4. Hartvigsen, J., et al., *What low back pain is and why we need to pay attention*. The Lancet, 2018.
5. GBD 2017 Disease and Injury Incidence and Prevalence Collaborators, *Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017*. Lancet, 2018. **392**(10159): p. 1789-1858.
6. Froud, R., et al., *A systematic review and meta-synthesis of the impact of low back pain on people's lives*. BMC Musculoskelet Disord, 2014. **15**: p. 50.
7. Walker, B.F., R. Muller, and W.D. Grant, *Low back pain in Australian adults: the economic burden*. Asia Pac J Public Health, 2003. **15**(2): p. 79-87.
8. Wasiak, R., J. Kim, and G. Pransky, *Work disability and costs caused by recurrence of low back pain: longer and more costly than in first episodes*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2006. **31**(2): p. 219-25.

9. Young, A.E., R. Wasiak, and D.P. Gross, *Recurrence of work-related low back pain and disability: association between self-report and workers' compensation data*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2013. **38**(26): p. 2279-86.
10. Collie, A., M. Di Donato, and R. Iles, *Work Disability in Australia: An Overview of Prevalence, Expenditure, Support Systems and Services*. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation, 2018.
11. Collie, A., et al., *Recovery Within Injury Compensation Schemes: A System Mapping Study*. J Occup Rehabil, 2018.
12. Lippel, K. and F. Lötters, *Public Insurance Systems: A Comparison of Cause-Based and Disability-Based Income Support Systems*, in *Handbook of Work Disability: Prevention and Management*, P. Loisel and J.R. Anema, Editors. 2013, Springer New York: New York, NY. p. 183-202.
13. Agency for Clinical Innovation (ACI), *Management of people with acute low back pain*. 2016, ACI: Chatswood, Australia.
14. Chetty, L., *A Critical Review of Low Back Pain Guidelines*. Workplace Health Saf, 2017. **65**(9): p. 388-394.
15. Foster, N.E., et al., *Prevention and treatment of low back pain: evidence, challenges, and promising directions*. The Lancet, 2018.
16. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), *Low back pain and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management*. 2016, NICE: London, UK.
17. Qaseem, A., et al., *Noninvasive Treatments for Acute, Subacute, and Chronic Low Back Pain: A Clinical Practice Guideline From the American College of Physicians*. Ann Intern Med, 2017. **166**(7): p. 514-530.
18. Stochkendahl, M., et al., *National Clinical Guidelines for non-surgical treatment of patients with recent onset low back pain or lumbar radiculopathy*. Vol. 27. 2017.

19. Webster, B.S., et al., *Iatrogenic consequences of early magnetic resonance imaging in acute, work-related, disabling low back pain*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2013. **38**(22): p. 1939-46.
20. Graves, J.M., et al., *Health care utilization and costs associated with adherence to clinical practice guidelines for early magnetic resonance imaging among workers with acute occupational low back pain*. Health Serv Res, 2014. **49**(2): p. 645-65.
21. Harris, I.A., et al., *Lumbar spine fusion: what is the evidence?* Intern Med J, 2018. **48**(12): p. 1430-1434.
22. Webster, B.S., et al., *The cascade of medical services and associated longitudinal costs due to nonadherent magnetic resonance imaging for low back pain*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2014. **39**(17): p. 1433-40.
23. Webster, B.S. and M. Cifuentes, *Relationship of early magnetic resonance imaging for work-related acute low back pain with disability and medical utilization outcomes*. J Occup Environ Med, 2010. **52**(9): p. 900-7.
24. Loisel, P., et al., *Prevention of work disability due to musculoskeletal disorders: the challenge of implementing evidence*. J Occup Rehabil, 2005. **15**(4): p. 507-24.
25. Kilgour, E., et al., *Interactions between injured workers and insurers in workers' compensation systems: a systematic review of qualitative research literature*. J Occup Rehabil, 2015. **25**(1): p. 160-81.
26. Kosny, A., et al., *The role of health-care providers in the workers' compensation system and return-to-work process: final report*. 2016: Ontario, Canada.
27. Shraim, M., et al., *Length of Disability and Medical Costs in Low Back Pain: Do State Workers' Compensation Policies Make a Difference?* J Occup Environ Med, 2015. **57**(12): p. 1275-83.

28. Shraim, M., et al., *Regional socioeconomic disparities in outcomes for workers with low back pain in the United States*. Am J Ind Med, 2017. **60**(5): p. 472-483.
29. Steenstra, I.A., et al., *Predicting time on prolonged benefits for injured workers with acute back pain*. J Occup Rehabil, 2015. **25**(2): p. 267-78.
30. Steenstra, I.A., et al., *Prognostic factors for duration of sick leave in patients sick listed with acute low back pain: a systematic review of the literature*. Occup Environ Med, 2005. **62**(12): p. 851-60.
31. Pawson, R., et al., *Realist review--a new method of systematic review designed for complex policy interventions*. J Health Serv Res Policy, 2005. **10 Suppl 1**: p. 21-34.
32. Di Donato, M., et al., *The impact of income support systems on healthcare quality and functional capacity in workers with low back pain: a realist review protocol*. Systematic Reviews, 2019. **8**(1): p. 92.
33. Pransky, G., et al., *Geographic Variation in Early MRI for Acute Work-Related Low Back Pain and Associated Factors*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2015. **40**(21): p. 1712-8.
34. Molnar, A., et al., *Protocol: Realist synthesis of the impact of unemployment insurance policies on poverty and health*. Evaluation and Program Planning, 2015. **48**: p. 1-9.
35. O'Campo, P., et al., *Social welfare matters: A realist review of when, how, and why unemployment insurance impacts poverty and health*. Social Science & Medicine, 2015. **132**: p. 88-94.
36. Wong, G., et al., *RAMESES Project Quality Standards for Realist Synthesis*. 2014: London, UK.
37. Wong, G., et al., *RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses*. J Adv Nurs, 2013. **69**(5): p. 1005-22.

38. Wong, G., et al., *Realist Synthesis - RAMESES Training Materials*. 2013, University of London: London, UK.
39. Westthorp, G., *Realist Impact Evaluation: an introduction*. 2014, ODI Research and Policy in Development, Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade: London, UK.
40. Westthorp, G., *Understanding Mechanisms in Realist Evaluation and Research*, in *Doing realist research*, N. Emmel, Editor. 2018, SAGE Publications Ltd.: London. p. 41-58.
41. International Labour Organization (ILO). *Database of national labour, social security and related human rights legislation (NATLEX)*,. 2017 [cited 2017 14 May]; Available from: http://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/natlex4.home?p_lang=en.
42. International Labour Organization (ILO). *Employment protection legislation database (EPLex)*,. 2017 [cited 2017 14 May]; Available from: <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/eplex/termmain.home>.
43. International Labour Organization (ILO). *Occupational Safety and Health (LEGOSH)*. 2017 [cited 2017 14 May]; Available from: <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/legosh/en/f?p=14100:1000:0::NO:::>
44. International Labour Organization (ILO). *Information System on International Labour Standards (NORMLEX)*. 2017 [cited 2017 14 May]; Available from: <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:1:0::NO:::>
45. United States of America Social Security Administration (SSA). *Social Security Programs Throughout the World*. 2017 [cited 2017 5 February 2018]; Available from: <https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/>.
46. International Social Security Association (ISSA). *ISSA Homepage*. 2018 [cited 2018 14 May]; Available from: <https://www.issa.int/en>.

47. The European Commission. *Mutual Information System on Social Protection (MISSOC)*. 2018 [cited 2018 15 June]; Available from: <https://www.missoc.org/>.
48. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *OECD iLibrary*. 2017 [cited 2018 14 May 2018]; Available from: <http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/>.
49. Microsoft Corporation, *Microsoft Excel 2018*. 2018, Microsoft Corporation: Redmond, Washington.
50. Manzano, A., *The craft of interviewing in realist evaluation*. *Evaluation*, 2016. **22**(3): p. 342-360.
51. Bohm, K., et al., *Five types of OECD healthcare systems: empirical results of a deductive classification*. *Health Policy*, 2013. **113**(3): p. 258-69.
52. Esping-Andersen, G., *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. 3 worlds of welfare capitalism. 1990, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press.
53. International Labour Organization (ILO), *World Social Protection Report 2017-19 - Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*. 2017, ILO: Geneva, Switzerland.
54. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *Sickness, Disability and Work: Breaking the Barriers*. 2010, OECD: France.
55. Bohm, K., et al., *Classifying OECD healthcare systems: a deductive approach*, in *TransState Working Papers*. 2012: Wandel, Bremen.
56. Laliberte, M., et al., *Low Back Pain: Investigation of Biases in Outpatient Canadian Physical Therapy*. *Physical therapy*, 2017. **97**(10): p. 985-997.
57. Simmonds, M. and S. Kumar, *Does knowledge of a patient's workers' compensation status influence clinical judgments?* *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 1996. **6**(2): p. 93-107.

58. Webster, B.S., et al., *Geographic variation in opioid prescribing for acute, work-related, low back pain and associated factors: a multilevel analysis*. Am J Ind Med, 2009. **52**(2): p. 162-71.
59. Wasiak, R. and E. McNeely, *Utilization and costs of chiropractic care for work-related low back injuries: Do payment policies make a difference?* Spine Journal, 2006. **6**(2): p. 146-153.
60. Bartys, S., et al., *System influences on work disability due to low back pain: An international evidence synthesis*. Health Policy, 2017. **121**(8): p. 903-912.
61. Schonstein, E., D.T. Kenny, and C.G. Maher, *WorkCover's physiotherapy forms: Purpose beyond paperwork?* Australian Journal of Physiotherapy, 2002. **48**(3): p. 221-225.
62. Sinnott, P., *Administrative delays and chronic disability in patients with acute occupational low back injury*. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 2009. **51**(6): p. 690-699.
63. Werner, E.L. and P. Cote, *Low back pain and determinants of sickness absence*. Eur J Gen Pract, 2009. **15**(2): p. 74-9.
64. Wong, J.J., et al., *Examination of the relationship between theory-driven policies and allowed lost-time back claims in workers' compensation: a system dynamics model*. J Manipulative Physiol Ther, 2014. **37**(1): p. 7-21.
65. Fujii, T., K. Matsudaira, and H. Oka, *The association between compensation and chronic disabling back pain*. Journal of Orthopaedic Science, 2012. **17**(6): p. 694-698.
66. Gum, J.L., S.D. Glassman, and L.Y. Carreon, *Is type of compensation a predictor of outcome after lumbar fusion?* Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2013. **38**(5): p. 443-8.

67. Jamison, R.N., D.A. Matt, and W.C.V. Parris, *Effects of time-limited vs unlimited compensation on pain behavior and treatment outcome in low back pain patients*. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 1988. **32**(3): p. 277-283.
68. Cassidy, J.D., et al., *Low back pain after traffic collisions: a population-based cohort study*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2003. **28**(10): p. 1002-9.
69. Watson, P.J. and C.J. Main, *Influence of benefit type on presenting characteristics and outcome from an occupationally orientated rehabilitation programme for unemployed people with chronic low back pain [corrected] [published erratum appears in PHYSIOTHERAPY 2004 Jun;90(2):110]*. Physiotherapy, 2004. **90**(1): p. 4-11.
70. Anema, J.R., et al., *Can cross country differences in return-to-work after chronic occupational back pain be explained? An exploratory analysis on disability policies in a six country cohort study*. J Occup Rehabil, 2009. **19**(4): p. 419-26.
71. Atlas, S.J., et al., *The impact of workers' compensation on outcomes of surgical and nonoperative therapy for patients with a lumbar disc herniation: SPORT*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2010. **35**(1): p. 89-97.
72. Atlas, S.J., et al., *What is different about workers' compensation patients? Socioeconomic predictors of baseline disability status among patients with lumbar radiculopathy*. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2007. **32**(18): p. 2019-26.
73. Bolduc, D., et al., *Workers' Compensation, Moral Hazard and the Composition of Workplace Injuries*. The Journal of Human Resources, 2002. **37**(3): p. 623-652.
74. Bronchetti, E.T. and M. McInerney, *Revisiting Incentive Effects in Workers' Compensation: Do Higher Benefits Really Induce More Claims?* ILR Review, 2012. **65**(2): p. 286-315.

75. Guo, X. and J.F. Burton, *Workers' Compensation: Recent Developments in Moral Hazard and Benefit Payments*. ILR Review, 2010. **63**(2): p. 340-355.
76. Krueger, A.B., *Incentive effects of workers' compensation insurance*. Journal of Public Economics, 1990. **41**(1): p. 73-99.
77. Lane, T.J., et al., *Increased Benefit Generosity and the Impact on Workers' Compensation Claiming Behavior: An Interrupted Time Series Study in Victoria, Australia*. J Occup Environ Med, 2019. **61**(3): p. e82-e90.
78. Brijnath, B., et al., *Is clinician refusal to treat an emerging problem in injury compensation systems?* BMJ Open, 2016. **6**(1): p. e009423.
79. Lippel, K., et al., *The structure and process of workers' compensation systems and the role of doctors: A comparison of Ontario and Quebec*. Am J Ind Med, 2016. **59**(12): p. 1070-1086.
80. Wickizer, T.M., et al., *Improving quality, preventing disability and reducing costs in workers' compensation healthcare: a population-based intervention study*. Med Care, 2011. **49**(12): p. 1105-11.
81. Schmid, F. and N. Lord, *The Impact of Physician Fee Schedule Introductions in Workers Compensation: An Event Study*. 2013, Causalty Actuarial Society.
82. Burkhauser, R.V., M.C. Daly, and P.R. de Jong, *Curing the Dutch Disease: Lessons for United States Disability Policy*. 2008, Michigan Retirement Research Center, University of Michigan: Michigan, United States.
83. Lane, T.J., et al., *Effectiveness of employer financial incentives in reducing time to report worker injury: an interrupted time series study of two Australian workers' compensation jurisdictions*. BMC Public Health, 2018. **18**(1): p. 100.

84. Murgatroyd, D.F., et al., *The effect of financial compensation on health outcomes following musculoskeletal injury: systematic review*. PLoS One, 2015. **10**(2): p. e0117597.
85. Grant, G. and D.M. Studdert, *Poisoned chalice? A critical analysis of the evidence linking personal injury compensation processes with adverse health outcomes*. Melbourne University Law Review, 2009. **33**: p. 865-1032.
86. Buchbinder, R., et al., *A validity-driven approach to the understanding of the personal and societal burden of low back pain: development of a conceptual and measurement model*. Arthritis Res Ther, 2011. **13**(5): p. R152.
87. Busija, L., R. Buchbinder, and R.H. Osborne, *A grounded patient-centered approach generated the personal and societal burden of osteoarthritis model*. J Clin Epidemiol, 2013. **66**(9): p. 994-1005.
88. Bambra, C., *Worlds of Welfare and the Health Care Discrepancy*. Social Policy and Society, 2005. **4**(1): p. 31-41.
89. Guo, X. and J.F. Burton Jr, *The Growth in Applications for Social Security Disability Insurance: A Spillover Effect From Workers' Compensation*. Social Security Bulletin, 2012. **72**(3): p. 69-88.
90. McInerney, M. and K. Simon, *The Effect of State Workers' Compensation Program Changes on the Use of Federal Social Security Disability Insurance*. Industrial Relations, 2012. **51**(1): p. 57-88.
91. Ammi, M. and G. Fortier, *The influence of welfare systems on pay-for-performance programs for general practitioners: A critical review*. Social Science & Medicine, 2017. **178**: p. 157-166.

92. Clay, F.J., J. Berecki-Gisolf, and A. Collie, *How well do we report on compensation systems in studies of return to work: a systematic review*. J Occup Rehabil, 2014. **24**(1): p. 111-24.
93. Carnide, N., et al., *Prescription Dispensing Patterns Before and After a Workers' Compensation Claim: An Historical Cohort Study of Workers With Low Back Pain Injuries in British Columbia*. J Occup Environ Med, 2018. **60**(7): p. 644-655.
94. Graves, J.M., et al., *Impact of an Advanced Imaging Utilization Review Program on Downstream Health Care Utilization and Costs for Low Back Pain*. Med Care, 2018. **56**(6): p. 520-528.