

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

1. Survey Development

Step 1 (Expert Consultation and Evaluation): Once the research team drafted the first version of the survey, it underwent a review by one General Practitioner (GP) and two academic experts specialising in adolescent mental health research and primary care research. Each expert assessed the survey items, categorising them as 1) essential, 2) should be retained, or 3) should be modified. They provided free response feedback on each item, focusing on relevance, appropriateness for the target sample, interpretability, and suitability of response options. Additionally, the experts offered broad advice on each survey section and identified any missing concepts. The research team then analysed the expert feedback and decided whether to remove, retain, or modify each item. Items were retained if at least two of the three experts recommended retention.

Step 2 (Expert GP Advisory Board Consultation): The Black Dog Institute GP Advisory group was provided with a comprehensive overview of the project, its objectives, and specific questions regarding survey items. Members were asked to submit written responses to these questions. This feedback helped the research team understand how to phrase questions, the ease of reporting certain information, suitable response options, definitions of concepts, their standard procedures, and the perceived importance of wait times for youth mental health services. Subsequently, a meeting was held to further discuss the survey. Topics included terminology, response options for additional questions, optimal presentation of questions, and key concepts. Following these discussions, the survey was revised by the research team.

Step 3 (Research Team Consultation and Review): The survey was sent to the research team for review and feedback. The team examined each survey item, offering suggestions on wording, response options, and identifying any missing elements. Based on their feedback, the survey was revised and subsequently uploaded into Qualtrics.

Step 4 (Piloting with GPs): Four GPs were recruited from the Black Dog GP Advisory group to assess their experience of completing the survey. Eight evaluation questions were included at the end of the survey which provided information on the clarity of the questions, intelligibility of the instructions, and the adequacy of the format. Information was also

gathered on the average time it took to complete the survey in full. Based on this feedback, final adjustments were made before the commencement of data collection.

2. Survey

BACKGROUND FACTORS	
1. What is your first name?	Free Response
2. What is your age?	Numeric
3. What is your current gender identity?	1. Female 2. Male 3. Non-binary 4. Different identity (please state):
4. How many years of experience do you have working as a registered General Practitioner?	Numeric
5. Do you currently work full-time or part-time?	1. Full time 2. Part time
6. How many centres or practices do you currently work in?	Numeric
7. Which state or territory do you work in?	1. New South Wales 2. Victoria 3. Queensland 4. Australian Capital Territory 5. Northern Territory 6. Western Australia 7. South Australia 8. Tasmania
8. To help us determine the type of location (i.e. metropolitan, regional, rural/remote), please tell us the postcode of your current practice? <i>**Note. If you work at more than 1, please select the practice where you see the most youth patients or spend the most time at.</i>	Numeric
9. What is your local Primary Health Network?	Free Response
WORKING WITH YOUTH WITH DEPRESSION AND/OR ANXIETY	

We would like to hear about your experiences and opinions regarding wait times for in-person (including both face-to-face and telehealth) mental health services for your youth patients with symptoms of depression and/or anxiety.

For the purposes of this survey, we define “youth patients” as adolescents aged 12 to 17 years.

We define “wait time” as the number of days young people typically wait to access the in-person mental health treatment or services that you have referred them to.

<p>1. In a typical week, how frequently do you see youth patients aged 12-17 years?</p>	<p>1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Occasionally 4. Frequently 5. Very frequently</p>
<p>2. Considering your <u>entire youth patient load</u>, would you describe the proportion of youth patients who present with symptoms of depression and/or anxiety as...</p>	<p>1. Very low 2. Low 3. Moderate 4. High 5. Very high</p>
<p>3. In the past 12 months, do you believe that the proportion of your youth patients presenting with symptoms of depression and/or anxiety has:</p>	<p>1. Increased 2. Remained stable/Unchanged 3. Decreased</p>
<p>4. How often do your youth patients have their parent, carer or guardian present in their consultation?</p>	<p>1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always</p>
<p>6. Have you completed any additional training in mental health? (i.e. above your University-level and General Practitioner training).</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p>
<p>➔ If yes, has any of this additional training specifically targeted youth mental health?</p>	<p>1. Yes 2. No</p>

7. What is the Medicare Benefits Schedule number for a Mental Health Treatment plan?	Free response (correct answer: 2715)
--	--------------------------------------

WAIT TIME EXPERIENCE AND REFERRAL PRACTICES QUESTIONNAIRE

We know that there are many factors that influence your decisions when it comes to treating youth patients with anxiety and depression. This part of the survey aims to examine the specific impact of wait times on your decisions to refer youth patients with anxiety and/or depression to mental health services such as psychologists, psychiatrists, and other providers.

<p>1. How often do you refer or recommend the following treatments or services to your youth patients with symptoms of depression and/or anxiety?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Psychologist <input type="checkbox"/> Psychiatrist <input type="checkbox"/> Headspace <input type="checkbox"/> Local Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS) <input type="checkbox"/> Inpatient centres (specialised overnight admitted patient mental health care centres/specialised psychiatric wards or units within hospitals) <input type="checkbox"/> Paediatrician <input type="checkbox"/> Allied health care provider (excluding those listed here) <input type="checkbox"/> Relationships Australia <input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing care with GP <input type="checkbox"/> School counsellor/psychologist <input type="checkbox"/> A structured in-person therapeutic program or service that targets specific mental health diagnoses like depression or anxiety (e.g. Cool Kids) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Support group (e.g., a group of people meeting to share information, experiences, problems, and solutions) <input type="checkbox"/> Phone helplines (e.g. Kids Helpline, Beyond Blue) <input type="checkbox"/> Printed information or brochures about mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Websites that provide information about mental health <input type="checkbox"/> Digital interventions or apps designed to improve symptoms of depression or anxiety <input type="checkbox"/> Medication (e.g. anti-depressants) <input type="checkbox"/> Lifestyle modifications (e.g. diet changes, exercise/physical activity) <input type="checkbox"/> Sleep hygiene measures <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) ... 	
<p>The following are presented to participants who select “rarely”, “sometimes”, “often”, or “always” in the previous question for psychologist, psychiatrist, headspace, Local Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS), Inpatient centres (specialised overnight admitted patient mental health care centres/specialised psychiatric wards or units within hospitals)</p>	
<p>1. When you have made a referral to a psychologist, approximately how many <u>days</u> do you think your youth patients have to wait to access them? (We understand this is difficult, please just provide your best guess).</p> <p>2. On the scale provided, please rate how acceptable you consider the wait times for a psychologist</p>	<p>__ Days</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> I don't know <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable 2. Slightly unacceptable 3. Neutral 4. Slightly acceptable 5. Acceptable <p>__ Days</p>

3. What do you consider to be an acceptable wait time for a **psychologist** (in days)?

__ Days

- I don't know

4. When you have made a referral to a **psychiatrist**, approximately how many days do you think your youth patients have to wait to access them?

__ Days

- I don't know

5. On the scale provided, please rate how acceptable you consider the wait times for a **psychiatrist**.

1. Unacceptable
2. Slightly unacceptable
3. Neutral
4. Slightly acceptable
5. Acceptable

6. What do you consider to be an acceptable wait time for a **psychiatrist** (in days)?

__ Days

7. When you have made a referral to **headspace**, approximately how many days do you think your youth patients have to wait to access them?

__ Days

- I don't know

8. On the scale provided, please rate how acceptable you consider the wait times for a **headspace**.

1. Unacceptable
2. Slightly unacceptable
3. Neutral
4. Slightly acceptable
5. Acceptable

9. What do you consider to be an acceptable wait time for a **headspace** (in days)?

__ Days

10. When you have made a referral to a **Local Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS)**, approximately how many days do you

__ Days

- I don't know

<p>think your youth patients have to wait to access them?</p> <p>11. On the scale provided, please rate how acceptable you consider the wait times for a Local Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS).</p> <p>12. What do you consider to be an acceptable wait time for a Local Child and Adolescent Mental Health services (CAMHS) (in days)?</p> <p>13. When you have made a referral to an inpatient centre, approximately how many <u>days</u> do you think your youth patients have to wait to access them?</p> <p>14. On the scale provided, please rate how acceptable you consider the wait times for an inpatient centre.</p> <p>15. What do you consider to be an acceptable wait time for an inpatient centre (in <u>days</u>)?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable 2. Slightly unacceptable 3. Neutral 4. Slightly acceptable 5. Acceptable <p>__ Days</p> <p>__ Days</p> <p>○ I don't know</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unacceptable 2. Slightly unacceptable 3. Neutral 4. Slightly acceptable 5. Acceptable <p>__ Days</p>
<p>16. Does your practice actively track wait times of the mental health services that you frequently refer to?</p> <p>→ If yes, how do they do this?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes 2. No <p>Free response</p>
<p>17. How helpful would up-to-date information on service wait times be for your treatment decisions and referrals?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all helpful 2. Slightly helpful 3. Moderately helpful

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Very helpful 5. Extremely helpful
<p>18. How often do you refer a patient to a different service because the most appropriate service for them has a wait time that is likely to be too long?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
<p>19. How often do you find yourself increasing your GP care for your youth patients with symptoms of anxiety and/or depression (rather than referring them to a service) because wait times are too long?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always
<p>20. The following list outlines negative consequences of long wait times for mental health treatment. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times create additional burden and pressure on the duty of care for GPs (e.g. having to independently manage patients when preferred service is not available) <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times negative impact patient adherence to treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to greater likelihood of treatment drop out/discontinuation <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times exacerbate self-harm and suicide risk <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to unhelpful coping strategies and behaviours (e.g. substance misuse) <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to increased rates of hospitalization 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly agree

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to greater deterioration of symptoms or illness/condition <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to greater chances of relapse <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lower the likelihood of future help-seeking <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to patients feeling abandoned, neglected, or forgotten <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to patients feeling their issues are not important <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to school disengagement/absenteeism <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to social withdrawal and dysfunction (e.g. family conflict and impaired relationships) <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times delay remission/recovery of illness/condition <input type="checkbox"/> Long wait times lead to an increased use of medication 	
<p>21. Have you experienced any other negative consequences of long wait times?</p>	<p>Free response</p>
<p>22. How important do you think it is that GPs provide mental health strategies or resources to their youth patients while they await in-person treatment?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all 2. Slightly 3. Moderately 4. Very 5. Extremely
<p>23. How often do you recommend the following interventions to your youth patients to help them manage their mental health while they await in-person treatment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Scheduling additional appointments <input type="checkbox"/> Medication 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Monitoring phone calls from practice staff <input type="checkbox"/> Exercise/Physical activity <input type="checkbox"/> Diet improvements <input type="checkbox"/> Mindfulness <input type="checkbox"/> Referral to the school counsellor or wellbeing team <input type="checkbox"/> Hand-outs with mental health information/psychoeducation <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health mobile phone apps <input type="checkbox"/> Mental health websites (e.g. ReachOut, Beyond Blue) <input type="checkbox"/> Online mental health programs or services (e.g. eHeadspace) <input type="checkbox"/> Telephone helplines (e.g. Kids helpline) <input type="checkbox"/> Sleep hygiene measures <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) 	
<p>24. Thinking about your recent experiences referring youth patients to in-person treatments and services, please answer the following questions.</p> <p>i) On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate the quality of clinical support you provided to your youth patients while they awaited in-person treatment?</p> <p>ii) On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate the quality of clinical support you provided to the parents/guardians of your youth patients while their child awaited in-person treatment?</p>	<p>1. Very poor 2. Poor 3. Fair 4. Good 5. Excellent</p> <p>1. Very poor 2. Poor 3. Fair 4. Good 5. Excellent</p> <p>1. No knowledge</p>

<p>iii) On a scale of 1 to 5, how would you rate your level of knowledge about what strategies and resources are most helpful for your youth patients who are awaiting in-person treatment?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Minimal knowledge 3. Basic knowledge 4. Adequate knowledge 5. Superior knowledge
<p>25. Overall, what do you think is the optimal intervention for youth patients awaiting in-person treatment/services for depression and/or anxiety?</p>	<p>Free response</p>
<p>26. On a scale of 1 to 5, how confident are you in recommending mobile mental health apps to your youth patients experiencing symptoms of depression and/or anxiety?</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all confident 2. Slightly confident 3. Somewhat confident 4. Fairly confident 5. Completely confident
<p>27. On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how helpful you think the each of the following types of mobile apps would be for youth patients with symptoms of depression and/or anxiety who are awaiting in-person treatment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An app that helps improve a young person's sleep. • An app that provides safety planning for suicidality and self-harm. • An app that provides psychoeducation about depression and anxiety in youth. • An app that delivers mindfulness strategies or meditation skills (e.g. breathing exercises, relaxation techniques). • An app that provides self-directed psychological therapy to reduce negative thinking (e.g. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not at all helpful 2. Slightly helpful 3. Moderately helpful 4. Very helpful 5. Extremely helpful

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An app that connects the young person directly with the referred healthcare provider (e.g. updates on upcoming appointment, reminders) • An app that helps a young person improve their relationships and social functioning. • An app that helps a young person focus on resilience and personal strengths (e.g. Positive Psychology). • An app that helps improve communication and self-disclosure skills. • An app that helps increase a young person’s physical activity. • An app that provides self-tracking tools for medication reminders and physical exercise. • An app that uses mood tracking to build emotional awareness. • An app that encourages journaling and personal reflection. • An app that provides moderated peer support for young people to build support and connect with others with similar experiences. 	
<p>Please re-enter your current Allied Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) registration number</p>	<p>Free response</p>
<p>This survey is now complete. [End of survey]</p>	

3. Management of Fraudulent Respondents and Data Cleaning Processes

a) Existing security measures and deterrents

The initial survey incorporated several security measures. The Qualtrics survey platform employed various prevention settings, such as fraud detection mechanisms including bot detection, security scan monitoring, RelevantID, and features to prevent indexing and multiple submissions. Furthermore, Qualtrics software can detect IP address locations, enabling the blocking of foreign IP addresses. To reduce the likelihood of bot completion, the survey also included multiple free-text response sections throughout.

b) Fraudulent survey sign-ups

Despite the existing security measures, fraudulent activity was identified on the 17th May 2022, and again sporadically between the 2nd and 15th of June 2022. During the first attack in May, the sign-ups were quickly suspected to be fraudulent due to the large number of responses (>150) that came through within a day compared to the previous recruitment rate (1-2 responses per day or none). Some survey completions were completed in quick succession, and some were completed at unusual times of the day such as early mornings (before 6.00 am) or evenings (after 11.00 pm). Moreover, these increases in survey completions did not coincide with increased recruitment efforts, particularly during advertising campaigns. An initial review of the survey responses revealed that they were qualitatively different from those received previously. Taking all these factors into account, our team suspected that the study had been targeted by fraudulent respondents. This same pattern of unusual activity was detected in the subsequent attacks that occurred in June 2022.

c) Response to fraudulent survey respondents:

In response to the May 2022 attack, we paused recruitment and closed the survey, and contact was made with the University of New South Wales Human Research Ethics Committee (UNSW HREC) on the 18th of May 2022 to provide details of the attack. The research team consulted with other researchers at the Black Dog Institute who had encountered similar issues and reviewed the literature for guidance on managing the situation. The research team conducted a thorough review of all completed surveys and examined our processes to identify factors that may have contributed to the attack. Based on these discussions and our initial review, we developed a protocol aimed at 1) enhancing measures to prevent future attacks; 2)

detailing the process for identifying fraudulent or illegitimate respondents, and 3) outlining the procedure for managing suspected fraudulent respondents. The protocol was reviewed by the chief investigator of the project and the Trial Steering Committee. In response to the June 2022 attacks, we paused recruitment and closed the survey several times. Contact was made with UNSW HREC on the 21st June 2022 and other measures were implemented (see below). The protocol was updated to reflect these changes.

d) Prevention of fraudulent survey respondents:

Following the initial attack in May 2022, we implemented reCAPTCHA software at the beginning of the survey to prevent bot attacks. After consulting with UNSW HREC, we revised the participant information sheet and consent form (PISCF) and updated the survey instructions to state, "You will only be able to complete the survey once" and "Please note that only one voucher will be issued per participant." Each voucher was manually sent by a member of the research team after reviewing the survey data and confirming the respondent as a 'genuine responder.' The research team also obtained ethics approval for the inclusion of the two integrity check questions:

Question 1: What is the Medicare Benefits Schedule number for a Mental Health Treatment plan? (Correct Answer: 2715. Nonsense or incorrect numbers indicated that the survey responses may be invalid or fraudulent).

Question 2: What is your local Primary Health Network (PHN)? (Free response: this was checked against the postcode and State or Territory listed).

Following the further attacks in June 2022, the research team sought approval from UNSW HREC to de-anonymise the survey and request the participants' Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) number twice during the survey along with their first name. This information was used to confirm whether a participant was a registered GP in Australia via the national AHPRA register. Changes were made to the survey information and consent form to provide context as to why this information was being gathered and the following questions were added to the survey:

1. What is your current Allied Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) registration number? This question was asked early in the survey after eligibility questions
2. Please re-enter your current Allied Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA) registration number”? This question was asked toward the end of the survey following the Experience and Recommendation of Mobile Health Applications Questionnaire section
3. What is your first name? This is to be included in the demographics and background questionnaire section.

The research team also employed several strategies, guided by the literature¹, to systematically identify and remove fraudulent or illegitimate respondents. This procedure is outlined below.

e) Identifying and withdrawing fraudulent or invalid survey responses:

After the first attack in May 2022 and the subsequent attacks in June 2022, two members of the research team manually checked IP and email addresses. The research team developed a list of criteria to identify patterns in survey data that were invalid, inconsistent, and likely fraudulent (see Table 1). During the cleaning process, a response was deemed invalid and removed from the dataset if it met one or more of the following criteria:

1. **Duplicate Responses:** Multiple responses from the same IP or email address indicated that one individual was completing the survey multiple times. Any partial or incomplete survey responses were also removed.
2. **Suspicious Postcodes:** Invalid postcodes or postcodes that did not match the reported Australian state or territory were flagged as suspicious. Additionally, a large number of postcodes from the same area reported by multiple respondents within a short timeframe was also flagged as suspicious.
3. **Rapid Completion:** Any participant who completed the survey faster than 40% of the average completion time for the entire sample was flagged as a possible illegitimate or fraudulent responder. This was based on findings that data from 'speeders' significantly differed from those above the 40% threshold¹.

4. **Age:** Participants' age and number of years of experience as registered GPs were collected. By subtracting the reported years of experience from their reported age, we determined the age at which they began practicing as registered GPs. The GP advisory board provided information on the minimum age a person could realistically claim to be a GP. Based on this, it was decided to label any reported starting age of 23 years or younger as invalid or potentially fraudulent.
5. **Invalid AHPRA number or inconsistent/incongruent information:** The AHPRA number was manually cross-checked against the participant's name, postcode, state, and PHN. If someone had fraudulently obtained a number and it did not match both entries, or if the other details (i.e., name, postcode, state, and PHN) did not match, this indicated an invalid or potentially fraudulent participant.

Other suspicious activity included the survey responses within a single survey. Specifically, we examined the pattern of survey responses and the content of free-text responses to the questions (see Table 1 for more details). Based on these criteria, two members of the research team (TB, BP or MSK) independently reviewed each response and noted whether it should be removed or retained. Any discrepancies were discussed, and the final decision was made by consensus. Duplicate email and IP addresses, along with foreign IP addresses, were clear indicators of fraud. These entries were automatically removed if both independent researchers flagged the same multiple email or IP addresses. Any reported starting age of 23 years or younger was deemed invalid or potentially fraudulent. If an AHPRA number was fraudulently obtained and did not match in both entries or if the AHPRA number did not align with the other details provided, it indicated an invalid or potentially fraudulent participant.

Some of the individual variables listed in Table 1 alone could not identify a potential fraudulent responder. Instead, the combination of one or more of these characteristics within a single survey completion and the similarities between different survey respondents signing up in quick succession or at unlikely times of the day raised suspicion. Additionally, two researchers from the team had to fully agree on the fraudulent or illegitimate categorisation for a respondent to be removed. Data quality checks were conducted regularly to promptly identify suspicious sign-ups and patterns until the survey concluded in November 2022.

Table 1. Indicators of fraudulent activity

Data Category	Variable	Response characteristic or pattern
Personal information	IP address	IP address from a country outside of Australia, or a duplicate IP address
	Email address	The same email address used
	Post code	Invalid postcode or postcode that did not match the Australian state or territory; Large number of postcodes from the same area within a short timeframe; Postcode that did not match the state or territory they were practicing in (i.e., PHN listed)
	Age	The number of years of experience was subtracted from the participant's age to determine the age at which they would have begun practicing as a registered GP. Any age ≤ 23 years were excluded.
	First Name	If the first name provided did not match the name listed against their AHPRA number, this indicated an invalid or potentially fraudulent participant.
	AHPRA number	If a number was fraudulently obtained and did not match in both entries, or if the other details (first name, postcode, state, and PHN) did not align, this indicated an invalid or potentially fraudulent participant.
Speed responders	Time spent in survey	Survey completions that take less than 40% of the average time of legitimate respondents
Survey responses	Response patterns within a single survey	Survey entries where the respondent has consistently provided the same or similar responses or answered in a pattern for all questions, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All questions answered were "Yes" or all "1's"

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All questions answered were “Yes”, “No”, “Yes”, “No” and so forth • Answers in a zig zag (e.g., “1, 2, 3, 4, 3, 2, 1”)
	Free-text responses	<p>Overuse of Not Applicable. Legitimate free-text responses are predominantly thoughtful and detailed and answer the question being asked. Fraudulent responses mostly use a version of “Not Applicable” in the form of “na”, “NA” “none”, and this response is often repeated across the free response questions.</p> <p>Examples of potential fraudulent responses included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using previous matrix question options as answers for future questions • Commonly starting free-text responses in the same way • Duplicate responses across multiple participants • Answers that don’t match the question that was asked • Responses indicating that the participant may not practice in Australia (e.g., incorrect or nonsense Medicare Benefits Schedule number for Mental Health Treatment Plan)

References

1. Cobanoglu C, Cavusoglu M, Turktarhan G. A beginner’s guide and best practices for using crowdsourcing platforms for survey research: The case of Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk). *Journal of Global Business Insights*. 2021;6(1):92-7.

Supplementary Table 2. Participant characteristics of the total sample (N=192)

	<i>n</i>	%
Female	138	71.9
Different gender identity	1	0.5
Worked in one centre only	137	71.7
Full-time employment	115	59.9
Metropolitan	133	69.3
State		
New South Wales	87	45.3
Victoria	35	18.2
Queensland	29	15.1
Australian Capital Territory	3	1.6
Northern Territory	1	0.5
Western Australia	21	10.9
South Australia	9	4.7
Tasmania	7	3.6

^aOne invalid response was excluded

Supplementary Table 3. Differences in estimated wait times across GPs' region of work.

	Metropolitan		Regional/Remote		P value
	<i>n</i>	M (SD)	<i>n</i>	M (SD)	
Psychologist	124	55.24 (44.22)	51	61.31 (56.6)	.495
Psychiatrist	124	126.4 (84.78)	51	83.4 (3.81)	<.001
Headspace	92	65.2 (88.75)	39	51.75 (41.90)	.370
CAMHS	80	64.40 (81.62)	40	28.38 (59.84)	.007
Inpatient unit	64	40.34 (125.47)	20	21.85 (43.33)	.521

Supplementary Table 4. Interventions recommended by GPs in Australia to help adolescents manage their mental health during the wait time (N=192).

	Often or Always <i>n</i> (%)	Rarely or Sometimes <i>n</i> (%)	Never <i>n</i> (%)
<i>In-person support</i>			
Ongoing GP appointments	171 (89.1)	21 (11.9)	0 (0)
Referral to school service	93 (48.4)	97 (56.3)	2 (1.0)
Monitoring phone calls from GP or practice staff	21 (11.0)	109 (84.1)	62 (32.3)
<i>Health behaviour change</i>			
Sleep hygiene	163 (84.9)	29 (17.0)	0 (0)
Exercise or physical activity	162 (84.4)	30 (17.1)	2 (1.0)
Mindfulness	143 (74.5)	47 (27.8)	2 (1.0)
Diet modifications	127 (66.1)	64 (36.7)	1 (0.5)
<i>Digital</i>			
Digital psychoeducation (e.g. mental health websites)	130 (67.7)	60 (35.1)	2 (1.0)
Web-based mental health programs or services	97 (50.6)	88 (55.9)	7 (3.6)
Mental health smartphone apps	106 (55.2)	67 (43.0)	19 (9.9)
Telephone helplines (e.g., Kids Helpline)	100 (52.1)	75 (46.7)	7 (3.6)
<i>Other</i>			
Psycho-education handouts (e.g. brochures)	85 (44.3)	92 (61.8)	15 (7.8)
Medication prescribing (e.g. anti-depressants)	28 (14.6)	158 (82.3)	6 (3.1)