

# “We’re here to help them if they want to come”: A qualitative exploration of hospital staff perceptions and experiences with outpatient non-attendance

Shayma Mohammed Selim<sup>1</sup>, Steven M McPhail<sup>1,2</sup>, Hannah E Carter<sup>1</sup>, Christina Malatzky<sup>3</sup>, Sanjeewa Kularatna<sup>1,4</sup>, Sundresan Naicker<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Australian Centre for Health Services Innovation and Centre for Healthcare Transformation, School of Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology, Kelvin Grove, Queensland, Australia

<sup>2</sup>Digital Health and Informatics Directorate, Metro South Health, Woolloongabba, Queensland, Australia

<sup>3</sup>Centre for Justice and Centre for Decent Work and Industry, School of Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

<sup>4</sup>Health Services and Systems Research, Duke-NUS Medical School, Singapore

## Authors’ Information:

Name	Details
Shayma Mohammed Selim <sup>1</sup>	<i>Email:</i> shayma.mohammedselim@hdr.qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0002-0120-6559
Steven M McPhail <sup>1,3</sup>	<i>Email:</i> steven.mcphail@qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0002-1463-662X
Hannah E Carter <sup>1</sup>	<i>Email:</i> hannah.carter@qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0002-0046-4126
Christina Malatzky <sup>2</sup>	<i>Email:</i> christina.malatzky@qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0002-9078-9601
Sanjeewa Kularatna <sup>1,2</sup>	<i>Email:</i> sanjeewa.kularatna@qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0001-5650-154X
Sundresan Naicker <sup>1</sup>	<i>Email:</i> sundresan.naicker@qut.edu.au <i>ORCID:</i> 0000-0002-2392-4981

## Corresponding Author:

Shayma Mohammed Selim, Australian Centre for Health Services Innovation, 60 Musk Avenue, Kelvin Grove Queensland 4159, Australia.

**Email:** shayma.mohammedselim@hdr.qut.edu.au

## 1 **Abstract**

### 2 **Background**

3 Patient non-attendance remains a major challenge for health services. Few studies  
4 have examined how health service providers think about, potentially address, and  
5 prioritise non-attendance within the scope of their practice. This study aimed to (1)  
6 explore healthcare professionals' perspectives, beliefs, and opinions about the impact  
7 of patient non-attendance within a publicly-funded outpatient physiotherapy clinic  
8 context; (2) explore perceived barriers and facilitators associated with the  
9 implementation of non-attendance mitigation strategies; and (3) identify health service  
10 staff generated solutions to address perceived barriers and enhance facilitators.

11

### 12 **Methods**

13 A focus group discussion and semi-structured interviews were conducted between  
14 June 2023 to January 2024 with 27 physiotherapy department clinic outpatient staff  
15 involved in operationalising clinic referral processing, appointment scheduling, or  
16 providing care to patients. Data was analysed using a hybrid inductive/deductive  
17 framework analysis approach.

18

### 19 **Results**

20 Participants indicated that non-attendance had predominantly negative implications  
21 for the health service, healthcare provider, and patient. The interconnected issue of  
22 non-attendance encompassed multiple areas and were broadly categorised into five  
23 inductively identified themes: impact of non-attendance, perceptions of value, material  
24 deprivation, service delivery and built environment, and professional role and identity.  
25 Non-attendance mitigation strategies generated by participants were deductively  
26 mapped to the theoretical domains framework (TDF) to explore behavioural  
27 determinants that may influence successful implementation. This included knowledge,  
28 reinforcement, goals, optimism, memory, attention and decision-making,  
29 environmental resources and context, and emotions.

30

### 31 **Conclusions**

32 Staff identified multiple strategies for reducing non-attendance; implementing many  
33 of these strategies would require additional resourcing. Research determining the

34 effectiveness of such strategies both in the short-term and long-term following  
35 implementation into practice remains a priority for future investigation.

36

37 **Keywords:** *Non-attendance, Healthcare professionals, Theoretical Domains*

38 *Framework, Mitigation strategies*

## 39 Introduction

40 Unplanned non-attendance at outpatient appointments negatively impacts patients by  
41 contributing to delayed or missed treatment and negatively impacts healthcare  
42 services through missed reimbursement opportunities.<sup>1,2</sup> Non-attendance can also  
43 contribute to ineffective and inefficient use of clinician time due to an inability to redirect  
44 time towards other productive tasks.<sup>3</sup> While addressing non-attendance remains a  
45 significant challenge within modern healthcare systems, there is a general belief that  
46 a one-size-fits-all approach for mitigating non-attendance does not exist.<sup>4</sup> Rather,  
47 mitigation strategies should be tailored to the scale and specific needs of healthcare  
48 systems, providers, and the patients they serve.<sup>4,5</sup>

49

50 Several factors are known to be associated with non-attendance, often relating to  
51 patient-level and system-level determinants, such as patient forgetfulness, scheduling  
52 conflicts, miscommunication between the service and the patient, and many other  
53 complicated scenarios.<sup>6</sup> Research has often focused on evaluating reasons for non-  
54 attendance from the patients' perspective.<sup>7,8</sup> However, there is a paucity of research  
55 examining how health service providers think about, potentially address and prioritise  
56 non-attendance within the scope of their practice.<sup>7-9</sup> Some evidence suggests that  
57 perceptions and related evaluations about the reasons for non-attendance influence  
58 how health service providers may use and consider mitigation strategies.<sup>10</sup> In the  
59 absence of such information, qualitative exploration may facilitate the analysis of  
60 nuanced perspectives.<sup>11</sup>

61

62 Physiotherapy plays an increasingly important role in facilitating the prevention and  
63 management of acute and chronic health conditions.<sup>12,13</sup> As a consequence of  
64 population growth and ageing, demand for physiotherapy services is expected to  
65 continue to grow and can span the provision of a range of specialised treatments in  
66 areas such as geriatrics, sports physiotherapy, women's health, and musculoskeletal  
67 physiotherapy, among others.<sup>14</sup> In contexts such as Australia, publicly-funded  
68 physiotherapy services have often been deemed essential and effective for almost 7  
69 million people with musculoskeletal conditions (e.g., osteoarthritis or back pain).<sup>14,15</sup>  
70 In 2020–21, healthcare expenditure for these conditions was estimated to be AU\$14.7  
71 billion, representing the country's highest spending of all disease groups.<sup>15</sup> Globally,

72 musculoskeletal disorders are estimated to affect more than 1.6 billion people.<sup>16</sup> As  
73 such, patient non-attendance remains an ongoing concern within this clinical context  
74 because evidence suggests that the targeted specialist outpatient waiting list  
75 timeframes are often exceeded, which could potentially be detrimental to patient  
76 health. It may further contribute to decreased patient satisfaction and lead to sub-  
77 optimal healthcare service delivery.<sup>17</sup>

78

79 This study had three principal aims: (1) explore healthcare professionals' perspectives,  
80 beliefs, and opinions about the impact of patient non-attendance within a publicly-  
81 funded outpatient physiotherapy clinic context; (2) explore perceived barriers and  
82 facilitators associated with the implementation of non-attendance mitigation strategies;  
83 and (3) identify health service staff generated solutions to address perceived barriers  
84 and enhance facilitators.

## 85 **Methods**

### 86 **Study design**

87 This cross-sectional qualitative study was conducted with a focus group discussion  
88 and semi-structured interviews. The Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative  
89 Research Checklist (COREQ) was used to guide the transparent and complete  
90 reporting of study methods (See Supplementary Material).<sup>18</sup> This study received  
91 ethical approval from the Metro South Health Human Research Ethics Committee  
92 (HREC/2021/QMS/81605) and written informed consent was obtained from all  
93 participants.

94

### 95 **Setting**

96 This study was conducted at three physiotherapy outpatient clinics at two large tertiary  
97 metropolitan hospitals in the Metro South Hospital and Health Service (MSHHS)  
98 region in Queensland, Australia. The MSHHS serves an estimated 1.2 million people  
99 in its designated catchment area.<sup>19</sup> The first participating clinic (Clinic 1) specialises in  
100 vestibular, rehabilitation, and musculoskeletal physiotherapy. The second clinic (Clinic  
101 2) specialises in women's, men's, and pelvic health physiotherapy, and the third clinic  
102 (Clinic 3) specialises in only musculoskeletal physiotherapy. Each of these clinics are  
103 publicly funded and free to access for Australian residents with eligible referrals.

104

### 105 **Methodological approach**

106 This study used an implementation science methodology to inform the overall  
107 approach, which was organised according to the following steps: initial context  
108 assessment including a stakeholder discussion and document review; triangulation of  
109 findings to inform an initial set of semi-structured interview questions; conducting one-  
110 on-one interviews and a focus group discussion; iteration and refinement of questions  
111 to ensure richness of data<sup>20</sup>; inductive analysis of the interview and focus group data  
112 using an interpretive description (ID) approach, and deductive framework mapping to  
113 the theoretical domains framework (TDF) adapted from the Atkins et al.  
114 methodology.<sup>20–23</sup> The approach followed is presented in Figure 1.

115

116 < Insert Figure 1 >

117

### 118 ***Inductive approach using interpretive description (ID)***

119 To understand healthcare professionals' lived experience of patient non-attendance,  
120 an interpretive description (ID) approach was used.<sup>22</sup> This approach primarily focuses  
121 on capturing and interpreting participants' views surrounding the meaning of a  
122 particular experience under inquiry (i.e., a phenomenon).<sup>22</sup> Additionally, using an ID  
123 approach, qualitative inquiry aims to develop contextually-relevant knowledge that  
124 may inform improvements in healthcare service delivery.<sup>22</sup> Physiotherapists and  
125 administrative staff both encounter non-attendance, often on a day-to-day basis.  
126 Hence, understanding their perspectives of this phenomenon is crucial to providing  
127 insights into prospective improvements to non-attendance mitigation strategies. This  
128 approach thus informed the inductive analysis of data, which then formed the basis for  
129 deductively mapping participant-identified approaches for mitigating non-attendance  
130 to the theoretical domains framework (TDF), a well-established theoretical framework  
131 of behaviour change.<sup>23–25</sup>

132

### 133 ***Deductive approach using a behaviour change framework***

134 Implementing acceptable and suitable interventions within healthcare requires  
135 changes in behaviour on an individual (i.e., those who use the intervention) and  
136 collective (i.e., the system in which the intervention is used) level.<sup>23</sup> Facilitating  
137 behaviour change is a complex activity that requires understanding the influences on  
138 behaviour in the context in which it occurs.<sup>23,24</sup> The TDF provides a structured, theory-  
139 based approach to understanding healthcare professionals' perspectives of the  
140 contextually relevant barriers and facilitators to change associated with implementing  
141 non-attendance mitigation strategies and a mechanism to categorise staff-generated  
142 solutions against behaviours to target that are integral to successful  
143 implementation.<sup>23,26</sup> Deductive themes, as identified using the ID approach, were  
144 mapped to TDF domains where relevant to identify described mitigation strategies and  
145 related barriers and facilitators.<sup>27</sup> This two-tiered inductive-deductive approach  
146 allowed for analytical flexibility, as recommended by McGowan et al.<sup>27</sup>.

147

### 148 **Study participants and recruitment**

149 Physiotherapy department clinic outpatient staff involved in operationalising clinic  
150 referral processing, appointment scheduling, or the provision of care to patients were  
151 purposively sampled to ensure a mix of junior and senior staff perspectives were

152 represented. This included administrative staff, clinic managers, and physiotherapists.  
153 Potential participants were invited by a member of the research team, who is not in an  
154 unequal relationship with potential participants (but may be known to some  
155 participants) to participate in a context assessment, one-on-one interviews, and/or  
156 focus group discussion via email. Participant information sheets and consent forms  
157 were emailed with the invitation to participate. Based on ID methodological  
158 recommendations, the final sample size was not determined by data saturation.<sup>22</sup>  
159 Instead, an estimated sample size of 25 to 30 participants was initially established to  
160 enable analytical depth.

161

## 162 **Data collection**

### 163 ***Developing interview materials***

164 An initial discussion with key stakeholders was conducted to clearly define and explore  
165 the issue of outpatient non-attendance within the physiotherapy outpatient context.  
166 These key stakeholders included a clinic director (n=1), physiotherapist clinic  
167 managers (n=2), and an administrative manager (n=1). The discussion centred on  
168 understanding relevant work processes and latent protocols as they related to the  
169 experience of non-attendance within their practice so that the interview guide  
170 questions were contextually relevant to participating physiotherapy clinic staff. Topics  
171 were developed to explore participants' thoughts on the impacts of non-attendance,  
172 perceptions of the barriers and facilitators to patient attendance, and opinions about  
173 current or prospective non-attendance mitigation strategies (See Supplementary  
174 Material).

175

### 176 ***Research participation and facilitation of focus group/interviews***

177 Data collection via focus group discussion and one-on-one semi-structured interviews  
178 was conducted between 01 June 2023 and 31 January 2024. Based on participants'  
179 preferences and availability, participants were provided with the option to participate  
180 in either a one-on-one interview or a focus group with up to 8 other participants. Both  
181 could be conducted face-to-face or virtually (videoconference via Microsoft Teams),  
182 with the exception of the additional option of virtual delivery via telephone for  
183 interviews. Interviews were approximately 45-minutes in length, while the focus group  
184 was conducted for approximately one-hour. The interviews and focus groups were  
185 audio or video recorded (depending on the interview media used), with informed



186 consent obtained prior to commencement and transcribed verbatim. The focus group  
187 discussion was led by SMM, an experienced health services researcher and clinician  
188 (male, PhD qualified, embedded in the health service and known to some participants).  
189 SN, an experienced mixed-methods health services researcher and implementation  
190 scientist (male, PhD qualified), and SMS, a female PhD student with a research focus  
191 on health economics, were also present during the focus group. All semi-structured  
192 interviews were conducted by SMS. Participation was voluntary, and participants could  
193 withdraw without penalty at any time during the data collection process. Consistent  
194 with an interpretive description approach, member checking, a form of post-interview  
195 validation in which participants have the opportunity to review, comment, or change  
196 their responses, was not used. This may potentially limit the risk of interpretations  
197 being swayed and for the formation of meaningful clinical implications being  
198 impeded.<sup>22,28–31</sup> As described below, data from the interviews and focus group  
199 discussion were reviewed and analysed iteratively to allow recruitment to cease when  
200 the research team felt an adequate and deep understanding of participants’  
201 experiences with the phenomenon under inquiry was achieved.<sup>22,32</sup>

202

### 203 **Data analysis**

204 To address the study aims, we applied a hybrid inductive/deductive framework  
205 analysis approach for data analysis.<sup>21,33</sup> Data analysis was conducted using NVivo  
206 software (release 1.6.1).<sup>34</sup>

207

### 208 ***Inductive analysis***

209 Firstly, we used an inductive analysis approach that was concordant with an ID  
210 methodology. The focus group and interviews were transcribed verbatim and de-  
211 identified. Transcripts were checked for accuracy by SMS and were corrected where  
212 necessary. To become immersed in and familiar with the data, members of the  
213 research team (SMS and SN) thoroughly read through each transcript and listened to  
214 the corresponding audio/video recordings. One interview transcript was then broken  
215 down into portions by SMS and SN, with each portion representing a distinct opinion  
216 or concept. Representative quotes were extracted for each of these portions where  
217 appropriate. Information was then organised into distinct sub-themes, and these were  
218 classified into higher-order themes, or general concepts. This process was repeated  
219 for each transcript, and a series of discussions were held between the two researchers

220 to discuss and further develop the arising concepts and subthemes identified.  
221 Throughout this process, caution was taken to ensure that derived concepts  
222 authentically reflected the participant's voices.

223

### 224 ***Deductive analysis***

225 As described above, barriers and facilitators associated with the use of non-  
226 attendance mitigation strategies were inductively identified from the data. These were  
227 then deductively mapped into one of the 14 theoretical domains of the TDF to inform  
228 categorisation of staffs' suggestions for future intervention options.<sup>24</sup>

229

### 230 **Rigor**

231 The research team sought to be open and reflective throughout the data collection and  
232 analysis stages of this study about the influence of the researchers' subjectivities and  
233 preconceived assumptions on the research process.<sup>22,35</sup> This included critically  
234 assessing what the research team already knew or expected to find out about how  
235 patient non-attendance impacts and is experienced by healthcare professionals. This  
236 process was facilitated using a reflection journal in which thoughts, questions, or ideas  
237 arising during data collection and analysis were recorded and were then brought into  
238 team discussions. During the focus group and interviews, the facilitator consciously  
239 made the effort to provide space for participants to explain and elaborate on their  
240 views. This aimed to ensure that a diverse range of views were captured. This process  
241 involved using open-ended questions, avoiding leading questions, and adopting a  
242 non-judgmental approach to interviewing.<sup>36,37</sup> Additionally, the facilitators conducted  
243 regular debriefing sessions during data collection to clarify thoughts, and where  
244 necessary, adjust interview questions.

## 245 **Results**

### 246 **Participant characteristics**

247 A total of 27 consenting participants took part in the study: focus group (n=1 (with 8  
248 participants, 30%)) and interviews (n=19, 70%). Most participants were  
249 physiotherapists (n = 22, 81%) and belonged to one of three clinical divisions as  
250 described in Table 1. All administrative staff worked within the allied health service  
251 department and had experience working across multiple disciplines including but not  
252 limited to physiotherapy, occupational therapy, and dietetics.

253

254 < Insert Table 1 >

255

### 256 **Themes**

257 Five major themes were inductively identified from the data as described in Figure 2.

258

259 < Insert Figure 2 >

260

### 261 **Impact of non-attendance**

262 This theme explains the extent to which non-attendance affects the health service,  
263 healthcare provider and the patient as described by staff.

264

#### 265 ***Impact on the health service***

266 The inability to get a patient into a vacant appointment slot was deemed the key  
267 concern associated with non-attendance at the health service level. This had  
268 implications for other patients on the wait list who may have lost the opportunity to be  
269 seen at an earlier date.

270

271 *“We've got wait lists and we can't get those patients in... So yes, it definitely...  
272 impacts the service, but it also impacts all of the patients that are waiting that  
273 want the appointments.” – P11 (Admin)*

274

275 In addition, non-attendance may lead to loss of revenue to the department, and the  
276 potential inefficient use of resources resulting from patients requiring further  
277 management in the future to address the recurrence of symptoms.

278 *“I think it's lost income, it's lost opportunity for the patient and for the clinician.”*

279 *– P15 (Physiotherapist)*

280 *“...at the end of the day, a complication or a recurrence will cost more to the*  
281 *service.” – P12 (Physiotherapist)*

282

### 283 ***Impact on healthcare providers***

284 For healthcare providers, including both administrative and clinical staff, there was  
285 consensus that non-attendance often had differential impacts on workflow. In some  
286 instances, patient non-attendance enabled clinical staff to catch up on other work or  
287 rest during a busy shift.

288

289 *“And then sometimes also, like, a selfish personal thing is like, if you're*  
290 *overbooked or like, feel really stressed and you have other things, sometimes*  
291 *it's a breath of fresh air. I feel like ‘oh my god, great, I can catch up with all my*  
292 *other notes” – P14 (Physiotherapist)*

293

294 In other instances, clinical staff described how non-attendance significantly increased  
295 the workload and decreased the efficiency of service delivery. When patients miss  
296 appointments, it could disrupt the continuity of care, making it difficult to consistently  
297 schedule them with the same clinician. As a result, new clinicians may need to spend  
298 time relearning a patient's history and treatment plan, which may often require re-  
299 evaluation based on their experience. This not only consumes valuable staff time but  
300 can also lead to the provision of treatment plans that may not align with patient  
301 preferences, ultimately impacting the overall quality of care.

302

303 *“One of the things that I find that impacts on us is... when we have a patient...  
304 we try to see the same patient, we understand what is going on and we learn  
305 this patient, how they usually like to be treated, how they respond to therapy,  
306 and how we can progress them. When we have to change their appointments  
307 and they... reschedule with another clinician, the new clinician has to have all  
308 that learning process again, which... takes time... The other thing... is that the  
309 patient, because of any changes of clinicians or time wasted, is also potentially  
310 going to take a little bit longer to recover. So, it has an impact on the patient as*

311 *well because if you see the same clinician, we really know what is going on.” –*  
312 *P12 (Physiotherapist)*

313

314 Similarly, non-attendance impacted administrative staff by increasing the number of  
315 tasks required to facilitate patient attendance. One participant described this  
316 experience as, *“It does create work for us. If the patient was to show up, we would*  
317 *simply make them another appointment if they needed one or discharge them,*  
318 *whereas if they fail to attend, we have to cancel their appointment, put an appointment*  
319 *back on the waitlist, send the patient a letter. Then in two weeks’ time, check to see if*  
320 *they've made an appointment, and if they haven't, send them another letter to let them*  
321 *know that they've been discharged.” – P11 (Admin).*

322

### 323 ***Impact on patients***

324 Staff believed that non-attendance impacted both new and current patients. For  
325 patients who were still on wait lists, non-attendance potentially contributed to delayed  
326 access to care. In contrast, for patients who were already seeing the service and failed-  
327 to-attend, continuity of care was often hampered. Vacant appointment slots that aren't  
328 able to be filled could have potentially been allocated to patients who may benefit from  
329 earlier access to treatment. This delay in access to care may lead to their condition  
330 not improving or plateauing, which could have ramifications for a patient being able to  
331 return to work or how they function day-to-day.

332

333 *“...puts risk on the patients because patients can't get treated in a timely*  
334 *manner anymore because the blank spots are taken up by no shows.” – P03*  
335 *(Admin)*

336

337 In instances where there are big breaks in care resulting from inconsistent  
338 appointment attendance, reinforcing appropriate adherence to treatment was often  
339 considered challenging because there may be a higher likelihood of patients forgetting  
340 how to do the prescribed treatment plans (e.g., exercise).

341

342 *“...it just prolongs the... rehab times by not being able to progress exercise*  
343 *plans and treatment as we would like and as based on evidence-based practise*  
344 *would suggest.” – P16 (Physiotherapist)*

345 **Perceptions of value**

346 This theme explores how healthcare professionals think about patients' views  
347 regarding the value (i.e., the usefulness or importance) of attending scheduled clinic  
348 appointments.

349

350 ***Perceived benefits***

351 There was consensus amongst staff that a contributing factor to attendance was  
352 whether patients perceived positive benefits from attending. These benefits were  
353 varied and could include seeing improvements in their condition, the ability to ward off  
354 social isolation through interaction with clinicians, and feeling a sense of ownership in  
355 addressing their healthcare concerns. One participant described their thoughts on the  
356 perception of benefit as, *"I think for patients that continue to come it's usually because*  
357 *they are seeing a benefit from doing it, which is kind of the way we work in society, if*  
358 *we see a benefit, we keep doing something, if we don't see a benefit, maybe we won't*  
359 *do that so much anymore."* – P02 (Physiotherapist).

360

361 Staff indicated that therapeutic rapport between the patient and provider was a key  
362 component affecting patient engagement with the health service. One participant  
363 summarised this as, *"they're feeling positive and good about their healthcare*  
364 *experience thus far, so that sort of helps set a positive mindset towards continuing*  
365 *health care."* – P10 (Physiotherapist).

366

367 For some participants, there was belief that patients who often felt socially isolated  
368 significantly valued the interaction they would receive by attending an appointment,  
369 particularly because it gave them a platform from which to be heard.

370

371 *"There are... some that feel like there's someone to talk to... if they don't have*  
372 *close family, friends, they live alone, they see the physio, even if it's only once*  
373 *a month... they get to come out of the house... they come and see someone...*  
374 *they have a chat to someone."* – P02 (Physiotherapist)

375

376 However, staff also highlighted that though it could feel rewarding to see that patients  
377 are engaging with the health service, this could become difficult to navigate when  
378 patients are no longer clinically progressing but do not want to be discharged from the

379 service because they would lose the ability to continue to see someone who listens to  
380 them.

381

382 *“...despite finishing treatment... not seeing any further effect... they decline to*  
383 *be discharged... I usually give them opportunities. I won't see them as quick as*  
384 *I probably will with another patient, but I will book them for a month or six weeks*  
385 *and say, 'OK, this is going to be your last review', and it comes to the last review*  
386 *and they're still not (ready).” – P12 (Physiotherapist)*

387

388 Patient readiness, characterised as the state in which a patient is ready to receive and  
389 engage with a care plan at the point at which they are given an appointment, was  
390 deemed as an important consideration relating to the prospect that a patient may place  
391 value in attending an appointment. Whilst patients may indicate to administrative staff  
392 that they are available to attend a scheduled appointment during the booking process,  
393 they may not necessarily be ready to receive care at that time for several different  
394 reasons. This may include but is not limited to being mentally prepared to accept and  
395 accommodate the need for following treatment plans for their condition.

396

397 *“...some people aren't ready to engage or its they can't quite engage because*  
398 *they probably need more mental health support... financial support, transport*  
399 *support.” – P05 (Physiotherapist)*

400

401 Some staff highlighted that accountability and ownership of one's health condition/s  
402 and initiative to engage with care needs are up to the patient as autonomous agents  
403 and that healthcare providers aim to cater to patient needs when a patient is ready for  
404 care.

405

406 *“It's also, like, ready to initiate... almost somebody that's like, 'I'm going to have*  
407 *to do these things'... ready to like, get to the headspace of, 'I accept that I need*  
408 *to also do all of these things... for me to see treatment outcomes'.” – P14*  
409 *(Physiotherapist)*

410 *“It has to be patient-driven, and we're here, ready to help them if they want to*  
411 *come.” – P06 (Physiotherapist)*

412



413 Some staff indicated the difficulty of instilling motivation in patients to attend when  
414 there is a lack of patient ownership and the trickiness of determining how best to  
415 mitigate non-attendance in such cases.

416

417 *“You could try to motivate someone and educate someone to like the cows*  
418 *come home, but if they don't wanna like, find that within themselves, you can't*  
419 *like force out upon somebody. They have to be ready to do physio, to want to*  
420 *participate.” – P04 (Physiotherapist)*

421 *“I think the ownership should be... put back on the patient. Our job shouldn't be*  
422 *going around chasing... after them – why aren't they turning up to the*  
423 *appointment. And they're getting a lot of reminders already, like they get a text*  
424 *message, they get like a phone call, and then normally we send the letters. I'm*  
425 *not sure what else we can do.” – P06 (Physiotherapist)*

426

#### 427 **Level of knowledge/education**

428 Staff indicated that the perception of treatment benefits was linked to patients' level of  
429 knowledge about potential positive health outcomes relayed to them by their referrer  
430 and that without clear communication from referrers, there may not be a strong enough  
431 incentive for patients to attend appointments.

432

433 *“Often the seed is planted in primary care by the GP... in their mind they think*  
434 *they need to have some sort of surgical intervention... we provide education*  
435 *from day one... to challenge those beliefs, and for some people it's a relief, they*  
436 *don't want surgery. So, they're like, 'oh, great, you mean I don't need surgery'.*  
437 *So, they're very motivated.” – P09 (Physiotherapist)*

438

439 Some staff highlighted the importance of patient attendance at an initial appointment,  
440 which provides the space to educate the patient on the benefits that physiotherapy  
441 could offer them. However, this becomes difficult because of the uncertainty  
442 surrounding what the patient has been told by their referrer. One participant described  
443 this experience as, *“... it depends on who's the primary contact practitioner at the time.*  
444 *I think that is somehow out of our control... when they're here, we can educate them*  
445 *for sure, but you gotta go back to the source.... It's up to the medical doctor or*  
446 *practitioner to make sure they educate them.” – P06 (Physiotherapist).*



447 **Negative experience**

448 Negative previous and ongoing experiences with healthcare providers, such as poor  
449 communication, can deter patients from attending appointments. This includes  
450 experiences in primary care and physiotherapy care and can range from patients not  
451 receiving enough information throughout their health journey such as who they are  
452 being referred to and why they are being referred to that service; having experienced  
453 poor quality clinical care; and a lack of proper engagement with patients to ensure that  
454 they are being provided with sufficient information to decide on care that they feel is  
455 appropriate for them.

456

457 *“... they may already have tried physio and I know there’s variation between...  
458 how different physios manage the same condition – they might have a bad  
459 experience from physio. Physio hurt them so that’s why they don’t wanna  
460 come.” – P06 (Physiotherapist)*

461

462 Staff indicated the importance of building rapport with patients to combat non-  
463 attendance attributed to prior negative experiences. One participant summarised this  
464 as, *“...I think rapport... like if they (patients) have trust and have built a rapport with  
465 their clinician that will help with attendance because then I suppose you get the ‘I want  
466 to go to my appointment to get whatever advice, education, exercise, etcetera from it’.  
467 But in a way, and this is like personally too, like, I don’t want to miss some of my  
468 appointments because I’m like, ‘I don’t want to let the person down’”.* – P14  
469 *(Physiotherapist)*

470

471 **Fear of stigmatisation**

472 Staff indicated that patients may avoid seeking care because they have had prior or  
473 ongoing negative experiences, such as being stigmatised by healthcare providers,  
474 which may have resulted in the patient becoming fearful of engaging with a health  
475 service.

476 *“... lots of patients come in with a lot of psychosocial stuff... patients who come  
477 in and they’re in chronic pain for years and there’s no identifiable injury... they’ve  
478 got pre-contemplation and their fear avoidant... they’re fearful of a lot, of doing  
479 a lot of activity, fearful of engaging in activity, fearful of exercise” – P09  
480 (Physiotherapist)*

481 Other staff expressed that some patients may feel embarrassed to attend if they  
482 haven't completed the required treatment plan. One participant summarised this as,  
483 *"...they're either disappointed in themselves or too scared to like tell us, or they just*  
484 *haven't done their exercises or what we've asked so they just don't come"* – P04 –  
485 *Physiotherapist.*

486

## 487 **Consequences**

488 Some staff expressed that the lack of consequences for failing to attend appointments  
489 may play a role in the reduced accountability held by patients. This includes  
490 perceptions that the ability to easily reschedule appointments following non-  
491 attendance contributes to patients not placing value in attending appointments at the  
492 scheduled time.

493

494 *"I think it still kind of does come down to, we learn from consequences or we*  
495 *learn from action and so if we keep forgetting but we can still get the opportunity*  
496 *to come, then you're not ever really learning from those behaviours... I think*  
497 *that that also is kind of giving an indication of how much value they're really*  
498 *putting on the care that they're getting too."* – P05 (Physiotherapist)

499

500 Additionally, some staff contemplated the introduction of a monetary fine for non-  
501 attendance but acknowledged the use of such consequences would not be feasible  
502 within publicly-funded healthcare systems where services are often covered by  
503 Medicare, and which are aimed at providing equitable access to healthcare based on  
504 need as opposed to ability to pay for services. However, staff acknowledged that this  
505 practice may often be adopted for privately-provided services.

506

507 *"I wonder if that sort of forgetfulness happens a bit more frequently because...*  
508 *if they don't come, we give them a call, we might give them... a second*  
509 *chance... to come back and it doesn't seem to the patient like there's been*  
510 *any... personal consequence versus maybe like a private appointment where*  
511 *it's a fee paying service and failing to attend incurs a 50% fee or a \$20 fee or*  
512 *something... patients would, I don't know, feel that personal impact a bit more."*  
513 *– P10 (Physiotherapist)*

514 *“I think if people had to pay, they probably would be more inclined to come, but*  
515 *I don’t necessarily think that’s ever going to be feasible nor do I necessarily feel*  
516 *like that’s ethical in the public health system...” – P10 (Physiotherapist)*

517

### 518 **Material deprivation**

519 This theme describes how staff think about and perceive the impact of limited  
520 resources and related financial constraints on patients' ability to attend scheduled  
521 appointments.

522

### 523 **Access to transport**

524 Staff indicated that the inability to access transportation is one of the most direct  
525 means by which material deprivation can impact a patient’s capacity to travel to  
526 healthcare providers for scheduled healthcare appointments. This can be particularly  
527 challenging for patients who do not live within the vicinity of the clinic or in areas with  
528 limited public transportation options.

529

530 *“For our demographic... some of them say they can't physically afford to get*  
531 *here... there's no money on their go card. They can't afford... public, private*  
532 *transport.” – P11 (Admin)*

533 *“Some people don’t have anyone who they can ask to come and drop them off”*  
534 *– P12 (Physiotherapist)*

535

536 For those patients who may be able to drive to the healthcare provider for the  
537 appointment, the lack of free parking may be a potential deterrent for some patients.

538

539 *“...there's no free on-site car parking, they have to pay... being able to come*  
540 *here is like, ‘oh, either I come to my hospital appointment and have to pay for*  
541 *parking, but I don’t eat... I don’t have a day’s worth of food or something like*  
542 *that’. Like people are going to pick the cost of living over... having to pay to*  
543 *come to an appointment.” – P02 (Physiotherapist)*

544

545 Patients who may experience material deprivation may also have limited access to  
546 information about support programs. This could be attributed to a lack of awareness

547 by referrers or treating physiotherapists about schemes that their patients may be  
548 eligible to access or which patients may need to access such services.

549

550 *“...the patients, they don't have any education on the community transport that's*  
551 *available – so patients can go to their GPs and they can organise either very*  
552 *low cost or free community transport to bring them into the hospital. But most*  
553 *of them don't know about that... or they don't wanna bother anybody. So, then*  
554 *they just don't come for their appointments because they can't get here.” – P11*  
555 *(Admin)*

556

### 557 **Loss of opportunity**

558 Patients experiencing material deprivation may have competing responsibilities or  
559 priorities such as work or family commitments. This can often make it challenging to  
560 allocate time towards attending scheduled appointments.

561

562 *“...which is again, what I played to in terms of where they rate physio in terms*  
563 *of importance compared to everything else that's going on in their life. If they*  
564 *think it's more important for them to earn money and work rather than attend*  
565 *physio.” – P16 (Physiotherapist)*

566 *“Like, you know, got 5-6 kids and got no childcare... they don't have family*  
567 *support... and they can't leave with anybody they trust, I guess.” – P06*  
568 *(Physiotherapist)*

569 *“This is also probably important also, patient... they had a major trauma and*  
570 *they've already write up their sick leave – the fear of losing their job – probably*  
571 *under pressure to go back to work, that's really important and they can't avoid,*  
572 *especially if the appointment time doesn't work for them work wise.” – P06*  
573 *(Physiotherapist)*

574

### 575 **Service delivery & built environment**

576 This theme explores the impact of service delivery and the structural layout of  
577 healthcare services on patient attendance.

578

579

580

581 ***Appointment scheduling and flexibility (appointment times and types)***

582 Staff recognised that scheduling appointments during work hours (e.g., 9AM—5 PM)  
583 was a key limitation that may inhibit a patient’s ability to attend appointments. Some  
584 staff further indicated that they have often received requests from patients asking  
585 about the availability of weekend or after-hours appointments.

586

587 *“...we try and accommodate... as much as possible, and obviously does get to*  
588 *a point of, like, ‘well, if you really need out of hours type timeframes then the*  
589 *public service is probably not for you. You probably do need to go privately and*  
590 *see someone that way.’ But, if you can kind of manage it that, like, you know,*  
591 *as much as we can within the constraints we have within our service, we can*  
592 *see you and maybe every second or third appointment, like, we were just saying*  
593 *before, it is the face-to-face and in-between time, we do a phone call, if that’s*  
594 *going to mean your compliance and your ability to be able to attend*  
595 *appointments and make that more manageable. That does seem to make it*  
596 *worthwhile.” – P02 (Physiotherapist)*

597 *“We open Monday to Friday, we open at 7:00 and we close at 4:30... I think if*  
598 *they were going to open later, it would need to be till like 7:00 at night so that*  
599 *patients could come after work or Saturday morning appointments... that would*  
600 *solve a lot of the problems. – P11 (Admin)*

601

602 There was agreement amongst staff that offering alternative appointment types,  
603 including telehealth instead of face-to-face appointments, may be a good option to  
604 enable attendance, particularly for patients who may find it difficult to balance other  
605 work, healthcare or family commitments. However, within the physiotherapy discipline,  
606 providing remote appointment options may not be suitable as hands-on assessment  
607 and treatment may be required.

608

609 *“...phone calls or telehealth are always a good option, not necessarily for every*  
610 *patient or for every appointment. But... there’s lots of appointments that we can*  
611 *do it for, the phone calls can sometimes be really appreciated, especially... if*  
612 *they have transport issues or live far away.” – P03 (Admin)*

613 *“I think sometimes trying to book their appointment on the same day that they’re*  
614 *seeing the doctor, some like you know, they’re going to be attending so they’re*

615 *going to come to both are all little things that I'll try to do to just make it more*  
616 *convenient for patients to come into the hospital.” – P04 (Physiotherapist)*

617

618 ***Built environment (mobility and navigation)***

619 The built environment and structure of healthcare facilities specifically, can greatly  
620 influence patients' ability to attend appointments. Patients with mobility issues or other  
621 disabilities may find it difficult to navigate through environments with inaccessible  
622 entrances and relatively long distances to their destination.

623

624 *“Our patients are physio patients – it is a hike from the car park to us. So, I had*  
625 *a patient who had [the pain management course], he got here, realised there*  
626 *was no parks anywhere near a door and rang us and said ‘I'm not coming*  
627 *because I can't physically walk the distance from the car park to the clinic’. So*  
628 *he left.” – P11 (Admin)*

629

630 Additionally, the structural layout and displayed signage within healthcare facilities  
631 may impact a patient's ability to find their appointment locations.

632

633 *“It's a real rabbit hole of trying to find your way around and how to get from A to*  
634 *B, and honestly, there are certain parts of the hospital, I have no idea how you*  
635 *get to... So, I can hardly imagine as a patient coming in... last time they were*  
636 *here, it looked like this and they knew how to get somewhere and then all of a*  
637 *sudden next time they're there, it's completely different... I imagine, for some*  
638 *people... [not] being able to find where you need to be and when you need to*  
639 *be there by, that could possibly be a little bit off putting and might be a bit*  
640 *daunting for some patients as well in terms of access.” – P02 (Physiotherapist)*

641

642 Improving information on how to get to an appointment location or introducing digital  
643 maps that are accessible, interactive, and easy to understand may help patients find  
644 their way around the facility. This could reduce the likelihood of patients getting lost or  
645 arriving late for appointments.

646

647 *“Some people don't know their way to get into hospital and they don't know that*  
648 *probably there are quicker and shorter ways to get into hospital and when they*



649           *come to our appointments... we need to figure out... 'OK, how we can help*  
650           *you? Do we need to call a porter or do we need to get someone to physically*  
651           *assist you to bring you here?'" – P12 (Physiotherapist)*

652

### 653 **Professional role and identity**

654 This theme describes clinical staffs' perceptions of their job role and related identity in  
655 relation to facilitating appointment attendance, service delivery and patient care.

656

### 657 ***Duty of care***

658 Several staff had a strong sense of duty of care in their role as healthcare providers,  
659 both in the process of treating patients and facilitating attendance. One physiotherapist  
660 described their role as, "*we're public servants and we're here to do a job, and that's to*  
661 *treat patients.*" - P09. However, the perceptions of the responsibilities constituting duty  
662 of care varied, particularly in relation to how to engage with patients. Some staff  
663 highlighted that when a patient does not attend an appointment, depending on the  
664 pathology (i.e., level of severity of the patient's clinical condition), there is concern that  
665 the patient's condition may have worsened.

666

667           "*...I think as clinicians, we have a duty of care... if you've got concerns about a*  
668           *patient and then they've got some serious pathology, then you'll probably keep*  
669           *calling until you get hold of them and say, 'is everything OK', because you need*  
670           *to safety net those patients"* - P09 (Physiotherapist)

671

672 However, there was also an indication that often staff are left wondering if the patient  
673 who missed the scheduled appointment is interested in receiving care for their  
674 condition.

675

676           "*So, when they don't come, my first concern is, is the patient OK?... When we*  
677           *contact the patients back because they haven't shown – usually that's my first*  
678           *question – is the patient OK? Have they had a fall? Has something happened*  
679           *at home? Then obviously the second concern, besides the clinical one would*  
680           *be like 'OK, is this patient interested in coming and seeing us?', because if the*  
681           *patient is not interested, it is the cost to the service and basically our time that*  
682           *has been allocated and not used in the best way. And probably the third one*

683            *will be – is the patient, because he is or is not interested and is not attending,*  
684            *is that going to cause recurrence or any complications?” – P12*  
685            *(Physiotherapist)*

686

### 687 **Mitigation strategies mapped to the TDF**

688 Participants described a range of current and prospective non-attendance mitigation  
689 strategies, in addition to related barriers and facilitators associated with their adoption  
690 in practice. These were deductively mapped to one of the 14 domains of the TDF with  
691 the aim of identifying suggestions for future interventions that could positively impact  
692 patient engagement. Seven out of the 14 TDF domains were identified as relevant,  
693 including: knowledge; reinforcement; goals; optimism; memory, attention and  
694 decision-making; environmental resources and context; and emotions (see Table 2).

695

696 < Insert Table 2 >



## 697 Discussion

698 Exploring healthcare professional's views on non-attendance may provide insights into  
699 the development and implementation of pragmatic, acceptable and contextually  
700 appropriate solutions. Hence, this study sought to explore clinic staff's thoughts on the  
701 impacts of non-attendance, the barriers and facilitators associated with the  
702 implementation of non-attendance mitigation strategies, and to identify health service  
703 staff-generated solutions to address the perceived barriers and enhance facilitators.

704

705 In this study, non-attendance was indicated to have predominantly negative  
706 implications for the health service, healthcare provider, and patient. This aligns with  
707 findings from other studies that illustrate how non-attendance continues to be an  
708 ongoing concern for many healthcare providers. Across the globe, non-attendance  
709 puts a strain on healthcare systems' resources, has the ability to reduce efficiency and  
710 quality of service provision, and can disproportionately impact the health of population  
711 groups who experience vulnerability.<sup>3,38-40</sup>

712

713 Findings from this study suggest an interplay between several different factors that  
714 contribute to patient non-attendance. These factors can be considered on a structural  
715 or organisational (pertaining to the health system or service), relational (pertaining to  
716 the relationship between the provider and patient), or individual (pertaining to the  
717 patient) level. Structural factors identified in this study include access to transport,  
718 appointment scheduling and flexibility, and built environment. Relational factors  
719 include negative experiences, fear of being stigmatised, and level of knowledge and  
720 education. Individual factors include perceived benefits and competing commitments  
721 (loss of opportunity). These factors often interact with one another and can transcend  
722 beyond their designated levels. For example, staff perceived that the types of patients  
723 who were more likely to attend an appointment were often those who saw tangible  
724 benefits from attending (e.g., those who saw an improvement in their condition). On  
725 the flip side, staff expressed that transportation difficulties such as the lack of  
726 affordable parking options at the service or lack of transport provision (e.g., availability  
727 of someone to drop them off) were potential contributors to non-attendance. Patients  
728 experiencing this form of material deprivation may potentially perceive value in  
729 attending appointments but be restricted by the lack of access to affordable transport

730 options that would enable them to attend. Some staff indicated that a potential solution  
731 to address transportation difficulties could be financial assistance schemes. However,  
732 staff emphasised that there appears to be a lack of awareness about these schemes  
733 among providers and patients. Thus, exploring ways to better disseminate information  
734 on support schemes and whether access to such schemes translates to improved  
735 attendance remains a priority for future investigation.

736

737 Perception of value may vary depending on the level of knowledge a patient has on  
738 the benefits of physiotherapy treatment. Staff indicated that a patient who may not  
739 understand why they were referred to physiotherapy may be more likely to not attend  
740 an appointment. This is another example of how factors associated with non-  
741 attendance may not necessarily exist within one level (e.g., both a relational and  
742 individual factor), and thus mitigation strategies will need to consider this complexity.  
743 Suggestions for non-attendance mitigation strategies associated with addressing  
744 issues surrounding knowledge included educating referrers, standardising information  
745 levels that referrers communicate to patients, and demystifying physiotherapy. These  
746 suggestions resonate with recommendations in other studies that highlight the need  
747 for effort to be placed on improving the mechanisms for communication between  
748 healthcare providers and their patients, and between health professions (e.g., referrer  
749 and specialists).<sup>4,9,41</sup> Further, an example of how provider-patient communication may  
750 be improved, as identified in this study, includes developing a platform that enables  
751 information to be shared between the health service provider and patient in order to  
752 ensure that care plans are able to be maintained and continually optimised to meet  
753 set goals. This may facilitate better engagement with the health service and give  
754 patients the opportunity to take ownership of their condition by providing a means to  
755 make informed decisions about the treatment they receive.

756

757 The ability to track patients throughout the care continuum was considered by some  
758 staff as an integral feature that would enable them to be alerted if a patient had  
759 rescheduled multiple appointments. This would provide a means to prompt strategies  
760 for re-engaging the patient with the health service rather than having them go  
761 unnoticed. This suggested mitigation strategy sheds light on a key concern related to  
762 what does and does not constitute non-attendance (i.e., operational definition and  
763 classification of non-attendance). Non-attendance has often been characterised as a

764 person who does not attend an appointment, and whose absence may lead to a vacant  
765 appointment slot that cannot be filled by other patients.<sup>41,42</sup> Those who reschedule  
766 multiple times or who cancel too late (e.g., 5 minutes before the scheduled  
767 appointment time) may also impact the health system in the same way, where a vacant  
768 slot is unable to be filled. In addition, both rescheduling and cancelling, unless  
769 otherwise specified, may result in inconsistent appointment attendance, which could  
770 be equally detrimental to patient health outcomes. Thus, consideration may need to  
771 be given to whether the operational definition of non-attendance needs to change, if a  
772 subcategory should be created, or if current characterisations should remain.  
773 Evaluating current definitions may provide the healthcare system with more precise  
774 language to distinguish between different issues being faced by healthcare providers.  
775 It may also enable more appropriate metrics to be used for the evaluation of service  
776 delivery.

777

778 This study had three main limitations. First, the findings from this study would likely be  
779 applicable for clinical and administrative staff within a publicly-funded physiotherapy  
780 outpatient clinic, or for those working in clinic settings with similar characteristics.  
781 Future research may explore other settings (e.g., endocrinology, radiology) and  
782 systems (e.g., privately-funded), which may draw other contextually relevant  
783 considerations surrounding non-attendance. Second, several findings from this study  
784 appear similar to studies that have explored patient's perspectives on reasons for non-  
785 attendance. For instance, patients who found it complicated to reach a healthcare  
786 provider either in terms of lack of affordable parking or insufficient transport provision  
787 were more likely to fail-to-attend an appointment.<sup>4</sup> In another study, patients who  
788 prioritised appointment attendance were those who attached value to them either  
789 because they had healthcare concerns, were symptomatic or recognised the need for  
790 regular check-ups.<sup>43</sup> The same study also found that patients may often be reluctant  
791 to attend appointments due to not being aware that they had been referred to a  
792 specialist and lacked the understanding of why they may need the referred  
793 appointment.<sup>43</sup> Despite these similarities, it is unknown if the findings would be the  
794 same for patients who have attended the clinics involved in this study. Thus, the views  
795 of patients on current and prospective non-attendance mitigation strategies remain a  
796 key area to explore in future research. Third, it must be noted that this study was a  
797 qualitative exploration of healthcare professionals' perceptions of the many

798 intersecting factors associated with patient non-attendance and potential interventions  
799 for addressing this issue. Further empirical work is required to identify causal  
800 mechanisms and to test the effectiveness of intervention strategies.

801

## 802 **Conclusion**

803 Non-attendance is a complex phenomenon. For new practices to be implemented  
804 and/or existing practices to be altered within healthcare organisations, changes are  
805 required collectively between the health system and healthcare providers.<sup>24</sup>  
806 Additionally, to change behaviour, a clear understanding of the barriers and facilitators  
807 influencing behaviour in the context in which they occur is required.<sup>24</sup> This study found  
808 that staff acknowledged the complexities of addressing non-attendance and  
809 expressed an understanding of the range of circumstances that contribute to patient  
810 non-attendance. Staff identified multiple strategies for reducing non-attendance; many  
811 of these strategies would require additional resourcing. Research determining the  
812 effectiveness, scalability and sustainability of these strategies both in the short- and  
813 long-term following adoption into practice remains a priority for future investigation.

## 814 **Declarations**

## 815 **Author contributions**

816 SMS, SN, SM, HC and SK conceived the study. SMS, SN, SM recruited participants  
817 and conducted the focus group/interviews. SMS, SN, CM analysed the data. SMS  
818 drafted the manuscript. SMS, SN, CM, SM, HC and SK revised and edited the  
819 manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

820

## 821 **Funding**

822 This work was supported by funding from Digital Health CRC Limited ("DHCRC").  
823 DHCRC is funded under the Commonwealth's Cooperative Research Centres (CRC).  
824 SM was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council administered  
825 fellowship (#1181138). The funders had no role in study design or decision to submit  
826 for publication.

827

## 828 **Competing interests**

829 None declared.

830

## 831 **Ethics statement**

832 This study received ethical approval from the Metro South Health Human Research  
833 Ethics Committee (HREC/2021/QMS/81605) and written informed consent was  
834 obtained from all participants.

835

## 836 **Data availability statement**

837 The dataset (which includes individual transcripts) is not publicly available due to  
838 confidentiality policies.

## References

1. Molfenter, T. Reducing appointment no-shows: going from theory to practice. *Subst. Use Misuse* **48**, 743–749 (2013).
2. Wolff, D. L. *et al.* Rate and predictors for non-attendance of patients undergoing hospital outpatient treatment for chronic diseases: a register-based cohort study. *BMC Health Serv. Res.* **19**, 1–11 (2019).
3. Bech, M. The economics of non-attendance and the expected effect of charging a fine on non-attendees. *Health Policy* **74**, 181–191 (2005).
4. Wilson, R. & Winnard, Y. Causes, impacts and possible mitigation of non-attendance of appointments within the National Health Service: a literature review. *J. Health Organ. Manag.* **36**, 892–911 (2022).
5. Campbell, K., Millard, A., McCartney, G. & McCullough, S. Who is least likely to attend? An analysis of outpatient appointment 'did not attend'(DNA) data in Scotland. *Edinb. NHS Health Scotl.* (2015).
6. Schwalbe, D. *et al.* Causes of Patient Nonattendance at Medical Appointments: Protocol for a Mixed Methods Study. *JMIR Res. Protoc.* **12**, e46227 (2023).
7. Lacy, N. L., Paulman, A., Reuter, M. D. & Lovejoy, B. Why we don't come: patient perceptions on no-shows. *Ann. Fam. Med.* **2**, 541–545 (2004).
8. Ofei-Dodoo, S., Kellerman, R., Hartpence, C., Mills, K. & Manlove, E. Why patients miss scheduled outpatient appointments at urban academic residency clinics: a qualitative evaluation. *Kans. J. Med.* **12**, 57 (2019).
9. Akter, S., Doran, F., Avila, C. & Nancarrow, S. A qualitative study of staff perspectives of patient non-attendance in a regional primary healthcare setting. *Australas. Med. J.* **7**, 218 (2014).
10. Husain-Gambles, M., Neal, R. D., Dempsey, O., Lawlor, D. A. & Hodgson, J. Missed appointments in primary care: questionnaire and focus group study of health professionals. *Br. J. Gen. Pract.* **54**, 108–113 (2004).
11. Pyo, J., Lee, W., Choi, E. Y., Jang, S. G. & Ock, M. Qualitative research in healthcare: necessity and characteristics. *J. Prev. Med. Pub. Health* **56**, 12 (2023).
12. Amin, J. *et al.* Is physiotherapy an underused approach to prevent surgery in selective musculoskeletal disorders? *Bangladesh J. Med. Sci.* **20**, 409–413 (2021).
13. Fransen, M. When is physiotherapy appropriate? *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Rheumatol.* **18**, 477–489 (2004).
14. Australian Physiotherapy Association. Value of Physiotherapy in Australia. (2020).
15. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Chronic musculoskeletal conditions. *Aust. Gov.* (2023).
16. Gill, T. K. *et al.* Global, regional, and national burden of other musculoskeletal disorders, 1990–2020, and projections to 2050: a systematic analysis of the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021. *Lancet Rheumatol.* **5**, e670–e682 (2023).
17. Duckett, S. Getting an initial specialists' appointment is the hidden waitlist. *The Conversation* (2018).
18. Tong, A., Sainsbury, P. & Craig, J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int. J. Qual. Health Care* **19**, 349–357 (2007).
19. Queensland Government. Metro South Health - About Us. (2023).
20. Bearman, M. Eliciting rich data: A practical approach to writing semi-structured interview schedules. *Focus Health Prof. Educ. Multi-Prof. J.* **20**, 1–11 (2019).
21. Noyes, J. *et al.* Cochrane Qualitative and Implementation Methods Group guidance series—paper 1: introduction. *J. Clin. Epidemiol.* **97**, 35–38 (2018).



22. Thorne, S. *Interpretive Description: Qualitative Research for Applied Practice*. (Routledge, 2016).
23. Atkins, L. *et al.* A guide to using the Theoretical Domains Framework of behaviour change to investigate implementation problems. *Implement. Sci.* **12**, 1–18 (2017).
24. Cane, J., O'Connor, D. & Michie, S. Validation of the theoretical domains framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research. *Implement. Sci.* **7**, 1–17 (2012).
25. French, S. D. *et al.* Developing theory-informed behaviour change interventions to implement evidence into practice: a systematic approach using the Theoretical Domains Framework. *Implement. Sci.* **7**, 1–8 (2012).
26. Avent, M. L., Franks, W., Redmond, A., Allen, M. J. & Naicker, S. Developing an intervention package to optimise the management of vancomycin therapy using theory informed co-design. *Res. Soc. Adm. Pharm.* (2024).
27. McGowan, L. J., Powell, R. & French, D. P. How can use of the Theoretical Domains Framework be optimized in qualitative research? A rapid systematic review. *Br. J. Health Psychol.* **25**, 677–694 (2020).
28. Thorne, S. & Darbyshire, P. Land mines in the field: A modest proposal for improving the craft of qualitative health research. *Qual. Health Res.* **15**, 1105–1113 (2005).
29. Thompson, A. P., MacDonald, S. E., Wine, E. & Scott, S. D. Understanding parents' experiences when caring for a child with functional constipation: interpretive description study. *JMIR Pediatr. Parent.* **4**, e24851 (2021).
30. Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C. & Walter, F. Member checking: a tool to enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation? *Qual. Health Res.* **26**, 1802–1811 (2016).
31. Motulsky, S. L. Is member checking the gold standard of quality in qualitative research? *Qual. Psychol.* **8**, 389 (2021).
32. Duff, J., Bowen, L. & Gumuskaya, O. What does surgical conscience mean to perioperative nurses: An interpretive description. *Collegian* **29**, 147–153 (2022).
33. Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *Int. J. Qual. Methods* **5**, 80–92 (2006).
34. Lumivero. NVivo (Release 1.6.1). (2017).
35. Thompson Burdine, J., Thorne, S. & Sandhu, G. Interpretive description: A flexible qualitative methodology for medical education research. *Med. Educ.* **55**, 336–343 (2021).
36. King, N., Brooks, J. & Horrocks, C. Interviews in qualitative research. (2018).
37. Sellars, M., White, B. P., Yates, P. & Willmott, L. Medical practitioners' views and experiences of being involved in assisted dying in Victoria, Australia: A qualitative interview study among participating doctors. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **292**, 114568 (2022).
38. Bedford, L. K., Weintraub, C. & Dow, A. W. Into the storm: a mixed methods evaluation of reasons for non-attendance of appointments in the free clinic setting. *SN Compr. Clin. Med.* **2**, 2271–2277 (2020).
39. George, A. & Rubin, G. Non-attendance in general practice: a systematic review and its implications for access to primary health care. *Fam. Pract.* **20**, 178–184 (2003).
40. Alturbag, M. Factors and Reasons Associated With Appointment Non-attendance in Hospitals: A Narrative Review. *Cureus* **16**, (2024).

41. Mohammed Selim, S., Kularatna, S., Carter, H., Bohorquez, N. G. & McPhail, S. M. Digital Health Solutions for Reducing the Impact of Non-Attendance: A Scoping Review. *Health Policy Technol.* 100759 (2023).
42. Mbada, C. E. *et al.* Impact of missed appointments for out-patient physiotherapy on cost, efficiency, and patients' recovery. *Hong Kong Physiother. J.* **31**, 30–35 (2013).
43. Copeland, S., Muir, J. & Turner, A. Understanding Indigenous patient attendance: a qualitative study. *Aust. J. Rural Health* **25**, 268–274 (2017).



## Tables

Table 1. Participant characteristics

Characteristics	Number of participants (n = 27)
<b>Sex</b>	
Male	9 (33%)
Female	18 (67%)
<b>Role</b>	
Admin	5 (19%)
Physiotherapist	22 (81%)
<b>Physiotherapy Division*</b>	
Vestibular, rehabilitation, and musculoskeletal	8 (30%)
Women's, men's, and pelvic health	7 (26%)
Musculoskeletal	7 (26%)
<i>*division only applicable to physiotherapists</i>	

Table 2. Suggestions for non-attendance mitigation strategies

TDF domain	Barriers to be addressed or facilitators to leverage	Suggestions for non-attendance mitigation strategies	Example quotes
Knowledge	<p><b>Barriers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of standardised level of information that referrers provide to patients surrounding physiotherapy treatment</li> <li>• Misconceptions about the physiotherapy treatment held by patients due to a lack of information</li> <li>• Lack of awareness of the existence of subsidised transport options by multiple stakeholders (e.g., referrers, patients)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Educating referrers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a process for informing referrers of treatments that may be of benefit to patients (e.g., alternative to surgery)</li> </ul> <p><b>Standardising information levels</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a standardised level of information that referrers can disseminate to patients to ensure that they have enough information about the physiotherapy appointment (e.g., what it is and how they can benefit from it)</li> </ul> <p><b>Demystifying physiotherapy treatment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide sufficient information to patients surrounding what to expect at physiotherapy appointments to enable them to make an informed decision on whether physiotherapy treatment is right for them (e.g., use information brochure/videos)</li> </ul> <p><b>Improving dissemination of information on subsidised transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide all stakeholders with sufficient information on subsidised transport options (e.g., where and how to access support schemes)</li> </ul>	<p><i>“I think the person referring the patient to physio spending more time talking about what physio is and what they can expect would be good. So, that involves... more staff to patient ratios in general everywhere.” – P10 (Physiotherapist)</i></p> <p><i>“I know that within our service... have been working on like information videos and brochures and stuff that can go out to the patient prior to like... when we get the referrals, we can go, OK, you're on our wait list – here's some information for you, here's a video, go watch that so you have an idea about why you are coming to physio, why you've been referred to us. So, they can make a bit more of an informed choice. And I guess hopefully mean that they're more likely to turn up to the appointment.” – P02 (Physiotherapist)</i></p>

<i>Reinforcement</i>	<p><b>Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arranging a 'contract' between the health service and the patient surrounding the provision of care</li> </ul>	<p><b>Setting expectations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gently reinforce the 'failure-to-attend' policy at the initial appointment to provide clarity surrounding expectations on appointment attendance</li> <li>• Set expectations related to treatment outcomes to challenge beliefs that patients may hold and to promote an environment of shared decision-making on care plan</li> </ul>	<p><i>"At my initial assessment, I like to make sure they understand... what's involved and like set those expectations because I think if their expectations are... it's just going to fix. Well, of course, they're not gonna come back and see me after the session because I didn't fix it. So, yeah, I like to sort of set those expectations to try to assist with that." – P04 (Physiotherapist)</i></p>
<p><i>Goals; Optimism</i></p>	<p><b>Barriers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to share information in between appointments by multiple stakeholders (e.g., referrers, physiotherapists, patients) to enable goal-setting</li> <li>• Ability to evaluate patient needs to modify strategies</li> </ul>	<p><b>Information sharing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a platform that enables information to be shared between multiple stakeholders in order to ensure that the care plan is able to be maintained and continually optimised to meet set goals</li> </ul> <p><b>Ongoing strategy improvement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enable continued improvement of service delivery and relevant strategies through the provision of regular quality improvement initiatives (e.g., patient satisfaction survey)</li> </ul>	<p><i>"As a clinician, having certain, like... 'yeah, so, next time when you come to your appointment, make sure you've looked at this part and this part, I need you to fill these out before you come to your appointment kind of thing'. Or for them to be able to fill things out... to be able to access that... because they have no way of being able to easily contact you... And it's reliant on them turning up to that face-to-face and printing it off and bringing it in with them... So, a bit more of communication both ways would be good, as at the moment in the hospital system, that's probably chaos." – P02 (Physiotherapist)</i></p>

<p><i>Memory, Attention and Decision Processes</i></p>	<p><b>Barrier</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easier view of the electronic scheduling management system to track patients</li> </ul> <p><b>Barrier and Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reminding patients of upcoming scheduled appointments (prompts patients, but can lead to overreliance)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Tracking patients throughout the care continuum</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a mechanism to alert staff if a patient has rescheduled multiple appointments to prompt strategies for re-engaging the patient</li> </ul> <p><b>Appointment reminders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide reminders (e.g., SMS reminders) that are sent with sufficient information on the appointment (may include additional features such as a link to view information video prior to appointment)</li> </ul>	<p><i>“...there's nothing in the system that flags that... have to look at their diary and think, 'hmm, it's been a while since I've seen them', and look back to see how many times they've rescheduled their appointment. You have to do that manually, which we don't have time to do every time a patient, so then a clinician will let us know, 'hey, this patient has rescheduled 5 times, can you put a note on their next appointment?'. So, then we can see that note when they call up again, that says, 'do not rebook this patient – speak to the clinician first'.” – P11 (Admin)</i></p> <p><i>“I think implementing the automatic text message reminder made a huge difference. I think that is like the best thing since I've been here that this hospital has done with regards to like reducing FTA's.” – P04 (Physiotherapist)</i></p>
			<p><i>“We also have an... automated text system... If that doesn't send the text out, which happens frequently, we get a lot of no shows because they rely on the text messages, even</i></p>

---

			<p><i>though we tell them not to rely on the text messages. People do, and I understand that. When they don't get the text, they don't remember that the appointments there so. P03 - Admin"</i></p>
<p><i>Environmental Context and Resources</i></p>	<p><b>Barriers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to transport</li> <li>• Built environment not optimised for patients with mobility issues; difficult to navigate</li> </ul> <p><b>Barrier &amp; Facilitator</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scheduling appointments to suit patients' availability</li> </ul>	<p><b>Improving access to subsidised transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide financial assistance or support schemes that may enable patients to access affordable and convenient transport to-and-from the health service</li> </ul> <p><b>Improving built environment</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide and/or develop a mechanism for patients to easily navigate the health service (e.g., through virtual maps or having volunteers at the entrance to provide guidance on how to find the appointment location)</li> </ul> <p><b>Patient-centric appointment booking system</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate a time that works for both the patient and the health service provider (e.g., through admin calling patients to book an appointment rather than a pre-determined time allocated to a patient)</li> <li>• Develop a mechanism to easily modify and/or cancel an appointment (e.g., online booking system, ability to respond with yes/no)</li> </ul>	<p><i>"Oh my god, what about like a chauffeur like service that they physically, like bring them here and it's just like automatic and they don't have to think about it and have to pay for parking... It just takes out so many things. Like, even people who don't want to be like, 'oh, but the cars here, maybe I'll just go'." – P04 (Physiotherapist)</i></p> <p><i>"Other solutions could be financial assistance, with parking, with transport, but again, it's not something we have the resources to support" – P15 (Physiotherapist)</i></p> <p><i>"I know a lot of places also let you book and change things online. I can also see how that could be slightly problematic as well. But I guess from a patient's perspective that could be helpful that they can actually like see</i></p>

---


---

<i>Emotion</i>	<b>Barrier</b>	<b>Building rapport with patients</b>	<i>and change things themselves.” – P04 (Physiotherapist)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combating prior negative experiences that patients may have had when accessing healthcare services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the instance of patient non-attendance, physiotherapists check in with the patient to understand the reason for non-attendance and discuss a plan for engaging with the service (i.e., trying to get patients to be more proactive)</li> </ul>	<p><i>“So, currently our clinicians will... if they have a patient that doesn't show up for their appointment, they will call them and leave a message and just find out if there's something else going on, if they're alright, just check in with them and then they may find out then that they're not actually interested in coming anymore or they're sick or they've forgotten... So, in those cases, I guess knowing that your physio is actually taking the time to call you as well, saying, 'look, you know, you didn't show. Is there a reason for it and are you OK', then I think they're more likely to be proactive about their appointments.”</i></p> <p><i>– P01 (Admin)</i></p>

---

# Figures

Figure 1. Flowchart of methodological approach



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.14.24313685>; this version posted September 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

Figure 2. Thematic schema of physiotherapy staff perspectives surrounding patient non-attendance

