

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Physiotherapists' views on Choosing Wisely recommendations

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031360
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	30-Apr-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zadro, Joshua; University of Sydney, Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, School of Public Health Peek, Aimie L.; University of Sydney, Musculoskeletal Health Research Group, Faculty of Health Sciences Dodd, Rachael; University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health McCaffery, Kirsten; University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Maher, Christopher; University of Sydney, Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Back pain < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, Musculoskeletal disorders < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, Shoulder < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **1 Physiotherapists' views on Choosing Wisely recommendations**
4

5
6 2 Joshua R Zadro^{1,2*}, Aimie Peek³, Rachael Dodd¹, Kirsten McCaffery¹, Christopher G
7
8 3 Maher^{1,2}.

9
10 4 ¹School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Sydney,
11
12 NSW, Australia

13
14 5
15 6 ²Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, NSW, Australia

16
17 7 ³Discipline of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Lidcombe,
18
19 NSW, Australia

20
21 8
22 9 *Corresponding author: Joshua Robert Zadro – Level 10 North, King George V Building
23
24 10 (C39), Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, PO Box M179, Missenden Rd, Camperdown, NSW
25
26 11 2050, Australia. Telephone: +61 2 8627 6782. Email: joshua.zadro@sydney.edu.au
27
28
29
30 12

1
2
3 13 **ABSTRACT**
4

5 14 **Objectives:** Choosing Wisely holds promise for increasing awareness of low-value care in
6
7
8 15 physiotherapy. However, it is unclear how physiotherapists' view Choosing Wisely
9
10 16 recommendations. The aim of this study was to evaluate physiotherapists' feedback on
11
12 17 Choosing Wisely recommendations and investigate agreement with each recommendation.
13

14 18 **Setting:** The Australian Physiotherapy Association emailed a survey to all 20,029
15
16
17 19 physiotherapist members in 2015 seeking feedback on a list of Choosing Wisely
18
19 20 recommendations.
20

21 21 **Participants:** 9,764 physiotherapists opened the email invitation (49%) and 543 completed
22
23 22 the survey (response rate 5.6%). Participants were asked about the acceptability of the
24
25 23 wording of recommendations using a closed (Yes/No) and free text response option. Then
26
27 24 using a similar response format, participants were asked whether they agreed with each
28
29 25 Choosing Wisely recommendation.
30
31

32 26 **Primary and secondary outcomes:** We performed a content analysis of free-text responses
33
34 27 (primary outcome) and used descriptive statistics to report agreement and disagreement with
35
36 28 each recommendation (secondary outcome).
37
38

39 29 **Results:** There were 872 free-text responses across the six sections. The content analysis
40
41 30 revealed that physiotherapists felt that blanket rules were inappropriate (range across
42
43 31 recommendations: 13.9% to 30.1% of responses), clinical experience is more valuable than
44
45 32 evidence (11.7% to 28.3%) and recommendations would benefit from further refining or
46
47 33 better defining key terms (7.3% to 22.4%). 347 physiotherapists (63.9%) agreed with the
48
49 34 "don't" style of wording. Agreement with recommendations ranged from 52.3%
50
51 35 (electrotherapy for back pain) to 76.6% (validated decision rules for imaging).
52
53

54 36 **Conclusions:** Although most physiotherapists agreed with both the style of wording for
55
56 37 Choosing Wisely recommendations and with the recommendations, their feedback
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 38 highlighted a number of areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement. These
4
5 39 findings will support the development of future recommendations and are the first step
6
7
8 40 towards increasing the impact Choosing Wisely has on physiotherapy practice.
9

10 41 **Key words:** physiotherapy; Choosing Wisely; low-value care; qualitative; content analysis.
11
12

13 42
14
15

16 43
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3 44 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
4
5

- 6 45 - This is the first study to explore physiotherapists views on Choosing Wisely
7
8 46 recommendations
9
10 47 - Level of agreement between the two researchers coding responses from
11
12 48 physiotherapists ranged from ‘substantial’ to ‘almost perfect’
13
14 49 - Our qualitative data is robust and highlights possible targets to increase adoption of
15
16 50 Choosing Wisely recommendations among physiotherapists
17
18 51 - The main weakness is the low response rate to the survey (5.6%)
19
20 52 - Our sample might not be representative of all physiotherapist members of the
21
22 53 Australian Physiotherapy Association
23
24
25
26
27 54
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

Low-value care is defined as care that provides no benefit, causes harm, or provides a benefit that is too small when compared with its cost (1). In an effort to reduce low-value care, over 230 professional societies worldwide – such as the Australian Physiotherapy Association – have provided Choosing Wisely recommendations (2, 3). Choosing Wisely is a major public awareness campaign that aims to facilitate open patient-therapist communication about low-value care and ensure patients receive healthcare that is evidence-based, safe and necessary. Professional societies that endorse Choosing Wisely typically release a list of 5-10 Choosing Wisely recommendations. Choosing Wisely recommendations are brief statements that outline tests or treatments that are unnecessary and potentially harmful, and are likely provided by some society members.

Choosing Wisely holds promise for increasing awareness of the need to reduce low-value care in physiotherapy. This is particularly important as the profession is rapidly expanding across countries. In Australia, the number of physiotherapists has nearly tripled in just under 20 years (4, 5) and there are now more practising physiotherapists than any medical specialty (including general practice) (6, 7). In the United States, there are nearly 250,000 physical therapists, 250 physical therapy training programs (8) and the number of physical therapists is estimated to grow 29% within the next 10 years (9).

Audits of practice suggest that some physiotherapists provide low-value care and fail to provide evidence-based care. For example, 77% use traction for low back pain (survey of n=1001 physiotherapists) (10) and 83% use electrotherapy (e.g. ultrasound) (n=274) (11); both are considered low-value according to evidence-based clinical practice guidelines (12). Conversely, only 42% would provide advice to stay active and 51% prescribe home exercise for patients with chronic low back pain (n=410) (13); both recommended in guidelines (12).

1
2
3 79 Understanding physiotherapists' views towards adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations
4
5 80 could inform strategies to replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based
6
7
8 81 physiotherapy. Given that physiotherapists play a key role in the management of some of the
9
10 82 leading causes of disability worldwide (e.g. low back and neck pain) (14), facilitating
11
12 83 evidence-based physiotherapy has major implications for reducing healthcare costs and
13
14 84 improving the health of millions. The primary aim of this study was to evaluate
15
16 85 physiotherapists' feedback on a list of Choosing Wisely recommendations that were sent to
17
18 86 members of the Australian Physiotherapy Association before final recommendations were
19
20 87 endorsed and distributed. The secondary aim was to determine the proportion of
21
22 88 physiotherapists that agreed and disagreed with each recommendation.
23
24
25

27 89 **2. Methods**

29 90 **2.1. Study design**

31 91 We performed a content analysis of free-text responses from members of the Australian
32
33 92 Physiotherapy Association regarding a list of Choosing Wisely recommendations. The
34
35 93 University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee approved all study procedures
36
37 94 [Project number: 2018/518].
38
39
40

41 95 **2.2. Participants and recruitment**

43 96 In November 2015, the Australian Physiotherapy Association sent an email invitation to
44
45 97 20,029 physiotherapist members seeking feedback on a draft list of Choosing Wisely
46
47 98 recommendations (15). Participants were informed that the Australian Physiotherapy
48
49 99 Association would use their feedback to improve the Choosing Wisely recommendations. All
50
51 100 responses were anonymous as participants were not asked to provide any identifiable
52
53 101 information (e.g. age, gender, contact details). The draft Choosing Wisely recommendations
54
55 102 were largely similar to the current recommendations (Supplementary Table 1).
56
57
58
59

60 103 **2.3. Data collection**

1
2
3 104 The survey included six sections; each section included a recommendation that was linked to
4
5 105 a question (see Supplementary Table 2). First, participants were shown a Choosing Wisely
6
7 106 recommendation from the American Physical Therapy Association: “*Don’t employ passive*
8
9 107 *physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment*
10
11 108 *program*”. Participants were asked whether the style of wording (i.e. using "Don't") was an
12
13 109 acceptable method for engaging the physiotherapy profession in discussions about evidence-
14
15 110 based practice. Participants could answer ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ (or choose not to answer) and provide
16
17 111 feedback in a free-text field. The next five sections presented draft Choosing Wisely
18
19 112 recommendations from the Australian Physiotherapy Association. Participants were shown a
20
21 113 recommendation and a brief explanatory note to help them understand why the Australian
22
23 114 Physiotherapy Association selected the recommendation. Participants were then asked if they
24
25 115 agreed with the recommendation (Yes/No/No answer) and were prompted to provide
26
27 116 feedback in a free-text field.
28
29
30
31
32

33 117 **2.4. Analysis**

34
35 118 We used descriptive statistics (counts and percentages) to report agreement with each
36
37 119 question and performed a content analysis on all free-text responses (16). The content
38
39 120 analysis allowed us to report the content and frequency of codes expressed in responses; a
40
41 121 code is a pre-established category which reflects an important characteristic of a response.
42
43 122 The analysis represents the perspectives of physiotherapists working in an academic
44
45 123 healthcare setting and private musculoskeletal clinics. Two researchers (JZ and AP) read
46
47 124 through all the responses to familiarise themselves with their content, taking notes about key
48
49 125 characteristics of responses. The same researchers discussed and refined the characteristics
50
51 126 into codes (separately for each question), and re-read through all the responses to ensure the
52
53 127 codes captured all the important information expressed by participants. The researchers (JZ
54
55 128 and AP) then developed a coding framework and applied it to a random sample of responses
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 129 for each question (at least 20%) to test the reliability of the framework. Each response was
4
5 130 allocated up to five codes based on its content.
6
7

8 131 Kappa statistics (95% confidence intervals (CI)) and percent exact agreement were calculated
9
10 132 to assess level of agreement between JZ and AP for coding the responses for each question.
11
12 133 This analysis used 5,000 bootstrap replications to calculate the 95% Confidence Intervals
13
14 134 (CIs) and was performed using STATA statistical software (version 14.1). Kappa statistics
15
16 135 (k) were interpreted as follows: <0.00 =“poor”, $0.00-0.20$ =“slight”, $0.21-0.40$ =“fair”, $0.41-$
17
18 136 0.60 =“moderate”, $0.61-0.80$ =“substantial”, ≥ 0.81 =“almost perfect” (17). The coding
19
20 137 checklist for each question was refined until level of agreement on a random sample was
21
22 138 $k \geq 0.7$. All disagreements on the random sample were resolved by discussion. Two
23
24 139 researchers (JZ and AP) then applied the final framework to the remaining responses.
25
26
27
28

29 140 **2.5. Patient or Public Involvement**

30
31
32 141 Patients and members of the public were not involved in the design of this study
33
34

35 142 **3. Results**

36
37 143 There were 9,764 physiotherapists that opened the email invitation (49%) and 543 that
38
39 144 completed the survey (response rate 5.6%). There were 152 (28.0%) free-text responses for
40
41 145 section one, 106 (19.5%) for section two, 137 (25.2%) for section three, 180 (33.1%) for
42
43 146 section four, 143 (26.3%) for section five, and 154 (28.4%) for section six. Level of
44
45 147 agreement between the coding researchers was ‘almost perfect’ for sections one to five
46
47 148 (range: $k=0.86$ to 0.94) and ‘substantial’ for section six ($k=0.75$, 95% CI: 0.54 to 0.94) (Table
48
49 149 1).

50 51 52 53 54 150 **3.1. Feedback on recommendations**

55 56 151 **3.1.1. Section One: style of wording of Choosing Wisely recommendations**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 152 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: unqualified statements are
4
5 153 inappropriate (n=49, 32.2%), wording would benefit from further refining (n=34, 22.4%),
6
7 154 clinical experience is more valuable than evidence (n=19, 12.5%), shift the framing from
8
9 155 negative to positive (n=18, 11.8%), threat to autonomy or the profession (n=16, 10.5%), and
10
11 156 new evidence might change recommendations (n=4, 2.6%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
12
13
14
15 157 example:

16
17
18 158 *“Wording needs to be guidance, not definitive in most situations as individual cases*
19
20 159 *may require alternative approaches”* (unqualified statements are inappropriate)

21
22
23 160 *“Provocative. Too black and white...Are we going to drive our patients to masseurs*
24
25 161 *and quacks”* (threat to autonomy or the profession)

26
27
28 162 *“Evidenced base treatment are those that are proven, but they shouldn't exclude time*
29
30 163 *worn treatments that are yet to be proven ineffective”* (new evidence might change
31
32 164 recommendations).

33
34
35
36 165 For responses that suggested agreement, codes included: unqualified statements (i.e. those
37
38 166 without reservation or limitation) are important (n=22, 14.5%), recommendations provoke
39
40 167 discussion (n=20, 13.2%) and recommendations will help change practice (n=12, 7.9%)
41
42 168 (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

43
44
45 169 *“The wording of these statements should be like a pebble in every physio's shoe*
46
47 170 *challenging our thinking and processes. I personally think the style of wording does that”*
48
49 171 (unqualified statements are important)

50
51
52
53 172 *“I like the wording because it makes the recommendations clear and may be an alarming*
54
55 173 *prompt for clinicians to change their practice”* (recommendations will help change
56
57 174 practice).

175 **3.1.2. Section Two: validated decision rules for imaging**

176 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate
177 (n=27, 25.5%), clinical experience is more valuable than validated decision rules (n=21,
178 19.8%), and threat to autonomy or the profession (n=5, 4.7%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
179 example:

180 *“There will always be situations where there is a need to contravene these rules, the*
181 *statement leaves no scope for this”* (blanket rules are inappropriate)

182 *“In over 40 years of disciplined Physio Practice, I have personally discovered a*
183 *number of spinal and pelvic tumours in patients, that would otherwise have been*
184 *missed, had X-rays not been taken”* (clinical experience is more valuable than
185 validated decision rules).

186 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=43, 40.6%);
187 a small percentage highlighted that educating patients and clinicians will support the adoption
188 of imaging recommendations (n=10, 9.4%). A small percentage of responses suggested that
189 the wording of the above-recommendation would benefit from further refining (n=16, 15.1%)
190 and unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=3, 2.8%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
191 example:

192 *“There will need to be a great deal of re-education of the public for this to be seen as*
193 *reasonable for certain clients”* (educating patients and clinicians will support the
194 adoption of imaging recommendations)

195 *“Physios generally don’t use imaging of course, whereas advocate for imaging could be*
196 *a better phrase”* (benefit from further refining).

197 **3.1.3. Section Three: use of incentive spirometry**

1
2
3 198 A large percentage of respondents commented that they did not have expertise to provide
4
5 199 feedback on this recommendation (n=70, 51.1%). For responses that suggested disagreement,
6
7 200 codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate (n=19, 13.9%), clinical experience is more
8
9 201 valuable than evidence (n=16, 11.7%), questioning the purpose of the recommendation (n=5,
10
11 202 3.6%) and threat to autonomy or the profession (n=3, 2.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
12
13
14 203 example:

15
16
17 204 *“You could still use it if it's the only thing a patient will do to encourage larger tidal*
18
19 205 *volumes”* (blanket rules are inappropriate)

20
21
22
23 206 *“I do not want my practice methods dictated by anybody, Australian Physiotherapy*
24
25 207 *Association or otherwise”* (threat to autonomy or the profession).

26
27
28 208 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n= 17,
29
30 209 12.4%); a small percentage highlighted that the recommendation would help promote
31
32 210 evidence-based care (n=11, 8.0%). A small percentage of responses suggested that the
33
34 211 recommendation would benefit from further refining (n=10, 7.3%) and should shift the
35
36 212 framing from negative to positive (n=8, 5.8%) and that unqualified statements are
37
38 213 inappropriate (n=4, 2.9%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

39
40
41
42 214 *“Movement and walking are cheaper, more functional alternatives to improving lung*
43
44 215 *function”* (help promote evidence-based care)

45
46
47
48 216 *“Can we suggest what should be done instead of incentive spirometry?”* (shift the
49
50 217 framing from negative to positive).

51 52 53 218 **3.1.4. Section Four: electrotherapy for low back pain**

54
55 219 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: electrotherapy is appropriate to
56
57 220 use as an adjunct to evidence-based care (n=54, 30.0%), clinical experience is more valuable
58
59 221 than evidence (n=51, 28.3%), blanket rules are inappropriate (n=51, 28.3%), threat to

1
2
3 222 autonomy or the profession (n=11, 6.1%) and new evidence might change recommendations
4
5 223 (n=6, 3.3%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

6
7
8 224 *“It can [be] appropriate to use electrotherapy for low back pain to support other*
9
10 225 *evidence-based practice interventions”* (appropriate to use as an adjunct to evidence-
11
12
13 226 based care)

14
15
16 227 *“My long experience (40 years) as a Musculoskeletal Physiotherapist shows me that*
17
18 228 *pain, inflammation and muscle spasm is relieved by Interferential and sonophoresis,*
19
20 229 *in most low back pain patients”* (clinical experience is more valuable than evidence)

21
22
23 230 *“If we tell all other professions that electrotherapy are no longer used in*
24
25 231 *physiotherapy treatment for low back pain, I can't see any difference between our*
26
27 232 *work as a masseur or exercise physiologist in the years to come”* (threat to autonomy
28
29 233 or the profession).

30
31
32
33 234 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=23, 12.8%);
34
35 235 a small percentage highlighted that the use of electrotherapy needs to be reduced (n=13,
36
37 236 7.2%) and other evidence-based treatments are available (n=11, 6.1%). Codes for feedback
38
39 237 on wording included: better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy
40
41 238 (n=17, 9.4%), unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=9, 5.0%) and shift the framing
42
43 239 from negative to positive (n=4, 2.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

44
45
46
47 240 *“Rarely used in last 10 years - always teach movement short of pain as a baseline”* (other
48
49 241 evidence-based treatments are available)

50
51
52
53 242 *“This recommendation needs to be re-worded to be more specific about the chronicity of*
54
55 243 *the condition”* (better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy)

1
2
3 244 “Should the statement not be: ‘Don't use only electrotherapy modalities in the
4
5 245 management of patients with low back pain’” (shift the framing from negative to
6
7
8 246 positive).

11 247 **3.1.5. Section Five: ongoing manual therapy for adhesive capsulitis**

12
13 248 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate
14
15 249 (n=43, 30.1%), clinical experience is more valuable than evidence (n=28, 19.6%), threat to
16
17
18 250 autonomy or the profession (n=7, 4.9%), manual therapy is appropriate to use as an adjunct to
19
20 251 evidence-based care (n=7, 4.9%) and new evidence might change recommendations (n=6,
21
22 252 4.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

23
24
25 253 “This is true most of the time...but there are exceptions” (blanket rules are
26
27 254 inappropriate)

28
29
30 255 “In the subacute to chronic setting I have effectively used manual therapy to improve
31
32 256 shoulder range. I am at a loss as to how this evidence was derived” (clinical
33
34
35 257 experience is more valuable than evidence).

36
37
38 258 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=23, 16.1%);
39
40 259 a small percentage highlighted that other evidence-based treatments are available (n=14,
41
42 260 9.8%) and there is no evidence manual therapy alters natural history (n=4, 2.8%). Codes for
43
44
45 261 feedback on wording included: better define the disease presentation and type of manual
46
47 262 therapy provided (n=27, 18.9%) and unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=10, 7.0%)
48
49 263 (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

50
51
52 264 “Problem is perpetuated by poor active movement, so retrain this” (other evidence-based
53
54 265 treatments are available)

55
56
57
58 266 “[The statement] is too broad and encompassing to say never” (unqualified statements
59
60 267 are inappropriate).

1
2
3 268 **3.1.6. Section Six: ongoing physiotherapy without improvement in patient**

4
5 269 **outcomes**

6
7
8 270 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: physiotherapy could prevent or
9
10 271 reduce deterioration in patients' symptoms (n=46, 29.9%), blanket rules are inappropriate
11
12 272 (n=39, 25.3%), concern over the use of outcome measures (n=18, 11.7%) and threat to
13
14 273 autonomy or the profession (n=17, 11.0%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

15
16
17 274 *"Need also to consider situation where without contact with physio, patient*
18
19 275 *demonstrates deterioration"* (physiotherapy could prevent or reduce deterioration in
20
21 276 patients' symptoms)

22
23
24
25 277 *"Sometimes the patient may need to rely on the therapist's intervention as they may*
26
27 278 *not be able to independently exercise correctly"* (blanket rules are inappropriate)

28
29
30 279 *"In my clinic we have had a good example of why this is not a reasonable blanket*
31
32 280 *statement. We've had low back pain clients who have shown some activity of daily*
33
34 281 *living and subjective improvement, whilst their Oswestry outcome measure was*
35
36 282 *relatively insensitive to the improvement"* (concern over the use of outcome
37
38 283 measures).

39
40
41
42 284 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=38, 24.7%);
43
44 285 a small percentage highlighted that physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try to reduce
45
46 286 overtreatment (n=15, 9.7%). Codes for feedback on wording included: better define
47
48 287 ambiguous terms (n=27, 17.5%), unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=5, 3.2%) and
49
50 288 shift the framing from negative to positive (n=4, 2.6%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
51
52 289 example:
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 290 *“Physiotherapists have a role in being upfront to patients when no outcome has been*
4
5 291 *achieved from ongoing physiotherapy”* (physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try
6
7
8 292 to reduce overtreatment)

9
10 293 *“The reasons sweeping statements like these don't tend to work (with a few*
11
12
13 294 *exceptions), is that very few conditions are black and white, or can be covered by a*
14
15 295 *single statement”* (unqualified statements are inappropriate).

296 **3.2. Agreement and disagreement with recommendations**

297 Most physiotherapists agreed (and few disagreed) that validated decision rules should guide
298 the use of imaging (76.6% agreed; 3.7% disagreed). Fewer agreed (and more disagreed) that
299 physiotherapists should not provide incentive spirometry after abdominal and cardiac surgery
300 (60.4% agreed; 7.9% disagreed), not use electrotherapy for low back pain (52.3% agreed;
301 25.4% disagreed), not provide ongoing manual therapy for adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder
302 (59.3% agreed; 16.0% disagreed) and not provide ongoing treatment when there is no
303 improvement in measurable patient outcomes (62.8% agreed; 13.6% disagreed). Most
304 physiotherapists agreed that the wording of Choosing Wisely recommendations is an
305 acceptable method to engage the profession in discussions about evidence-based practice
306 (63.9% agreed; 24.7% disagreed) (Table 2).

307 **4. Discussion**

308 **4.1. Statement of principal findings**

309 The majority (63.9%) of physiotherapists agreed with the style of wording for Choosing
310 Wisely recommendations and with draft recommendations (ranging from 52.3% to 76.6%),
311 although a number of areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement were
312 identified. Many physiotherapists believe blanket rules are inappropriate, clinical experience
313 is more valuable than evidence, and the recommendations threaten physiotherapists'

1
2
3 314 autonomy and the profession. Many also suggested that the recommendations need to better
4
5 315 define key terms and shift the framing from negative to positive. Since there are few
6
7 316 differences between the draft Choosing Wisely recommendations and current
8
9
10 317 recommendations (Supplementary Table 1), the findings from this study are an important step
11
12 318 towards developing and testing strategies to increase adoption of Choosing Wisely
13
14
15 319 recommendations and replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.
16

17 320 **4.2. Strengths and weaknesses of the study**

18
19
20 321 A strength of this study is that level of agreement between the two researchers coding
21
22 322 responses ranged from 'substantial' (section six) to 'almost perfect' (sections one to five).
23
24 323 The main weakness is the low response rate to the survey (5.6%). Our sample might therefore
25
26 324 not be representative of all members of the Australian Physiotherapy Association; this
27
28 325 reduces our confidence in the quantitative results of our study. Nevertheless, our qualitative
29
30 326 data is robust and highlights possible targets to increase adoption of Choosing Wisely
31
32 327 recommendations among physiotherapists.
33

34 35 36 328 **4.3. Meaning of the study**

37
38
39 329 We found that some physiotherapists believe blanket recommendations should not guide
40
41 330 treatment choices and that clinical experience is more valuable than evidence. This is largely
42
43 331 consistent with a qualitative study of 31 physicians in emergency medicine, internal
44
45 332 medicine, hospital medicine, and cardiology from the United States (18). Many physicians
46
47 333 felt that Choosing Wisely recommendations should act as guide and not be a strict set of rules
48
49 334 for clinicians, while others disagreed with certain recommendations (e.g. general health
50
51 335 checks) based on their clinical experience.
52

53
54
55 336 Disagreement with blanket recommendations and valuing clinical experience over evidence
56
57 337 could explain why some physiotherapists do not use guidelines to inform their treatment
58
59 338 choices (10, 13, 19-21). For example, previous research found only 46% of physiotherapists

1
2
3 339 believe guidelines should inform the management of low back pain (survey of n=274) (19),
4
5 340 66% apply guidelines to more than half of their patients with acute ankle sprains (survey of
6
7 341 n=214) (20), and 39% use guidelines to inform the management of whiplash more than three-
8
9 342 quarters of the time (survey of n=237) (21). Challenging these beliefs could be an important
10
11 343 first step towards replacing low-value care with evidence-based care in physiotherapy.
12
13
14
15 344 Barriers to following Choosing Wisely recommendations emerged from our study. Some
16
17 345 physiotherapists expressed that recommendations do not consider clinical reasoning or
18
19 346 clinical experience, and make treatment 'recipe-based'. Others expressed that there will
20
21 347 always be exceptions to practice recommendations, such as patient preference and fear of
22
23 348 missing an important diagnosis. Similar barriers were identified in a Choosing Wisely report;
24
25 349 73% of physiotherapists were willing to perform low-value testing if requested by a patient
26
27 350 and 61% when uncertain of a diagnosis (22). However, a qualitative study of 19 physicians in
28
29 351 Canada identified different barriers of time pressure, uncertainty about what constitutes
30
31 352 necessary care, and fear of litigation (23). This highlights the importance of exploring
32
33 353 barriers to adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations across professions.
34
35
36
37
38 354 Physiotherapists appear to view practice recommendations as a recipe that does not allow for
39
40 355 clinical reasoning nor considering patient preference; this belief could make increasing
41
42 356 adoption of Choosing Wisely recommendations challenging. We believe that providing
43
44 357 individualised care and adhering to guideline recommendations are not mutually exclusive.
45
46 358 For example, physiotherapists need to tailor guideline-recommended treatments for low back
47
48 359 pain, such as education and exercise, because of patient-level factors including health literacy
49
50 360 and exercise preference. Clinical reasoning is also extremely important when it comes to
51
52 361 deciding whether a patient with low back pain requires imaging. This is illustrated by the fact
53
54 362 that 'clinical suspicion' is one of the few red flags endorsed in guidelines that are useful for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 363 identifying patients with a serious pathology (e.g. positive likelihood ratio ranging from 12 to
4
5 364 54 for identifying malignancy (24)).
6
7

8 365 Some physiotherapists expressed that research evidence is not consistent with the treatment
9
10 366 outcomes they observe in the clinic. This opens up an interesting debate about the value of
11
12 367 healthcare and potential issues with using clinical experience to justify treatment choices.
13
14 368 One argument is that it is reasonable to conclude a treatment is appropriate if the patient
15
16 369 improves and they are happy with the care provided. The counter argument is that many
17
18 370 factors could explain why clinicians observe improvement in patient outcomes despite
19
20 371 providing treatment not supported by strong evidence. These include the confounding effects
21
22 372 of natural history, regression to the mean, placebo effects and other non-specific treatment
23
24 373 effects. In other words, the same patient might have got similar results from no treatment or
25
26 374 better results from a treatment supported by evidence. Views about the value of clinical
27
28 375 experience versus evidence could be the most difficult barrier to replacing low-value
29
30 376 physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.
31
32
33
34
35

36 377 **4.4. Unanswered questions and future research directions**

37
38 378 This study provides insight into how physiotherapists view their Association's Choosing
39
40 379 Wisely recommendations, although a more in-depth understanding of the barriers and
41
42 380 facilitators to adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations is needed. We plan to conduct
43
44 381 qualitative research to address this knowledge gap and further explore the barriers and
45
46 382 facilitators to replacing low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.
47
48 383 Future research should explore how different aspects of the language of Choosing Wisely
49
50 384 could either support or discourage adoption of recommendations. Some physiotherapists
51
52 385 expressed that unqualified recommendations were key to changing practice, while others
53
54 386 believed that recommendations should be qualified to allow for clinical reasoning. Further,
55
56 387 some suggested that recommendations should focus on a positive message; either by
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 388 providing an alternative to low-value care or stating when a typically low-value intervention
4
5 389 could be provided. Choice experiments, such as discrete choice experiments or best-worst-
6
7 390 scaling surveys, are a useful tool for eliciting preferences in healthcare (25) and could be used
8
9 391 to determine whether modifying the language of Choosing Wisely recommendations could
10
11 392 increase clinicians' willingness to follow them. Understanding how language influences the
12
13 393 adoption of Choosing Wisely recommendations has implications for refining existing and
14
15 394 developing new recommendations for the Australian Physiotherapy Association; as well as
16
17 395 for the 230+ professional societies worldwide with Choosing Wisely lists.
18
19
20
21

22 396 **5. Conclusion**

23
24 397 Physiotherapists' views regarding Choosing Wisely recommendations highlight a number of
25
26 398 areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement. These findings could prove valuable
27
28 399 for developing and testing strategies to increase physiotherapists' willingness to follow
29
30 400 Choosing Wisely recommendations and so replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-
31
32 401 based physiotherapy.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 403 **Authors' contributions**
4

5 404 All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved
6
7 405 the final manuscript. Please find below a detailed description of the role of each author:

- 8
9
10 406 - Joshua R Zadro: conception and design, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of
11
12 407 data, drafting and revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be
13
14 408 published
15
16 409 - Aimie Peek: conception and design, acquisition and interpretation of data, drafting
17
18 410 and revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
19
20
21 411 - Rachael Dodd: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and revision of
22
23 412 the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
24
25
26 413 - Kirsten McCaffery: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and
27
28 414 revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
29
30 415 - Christopher G Maher: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and
31
32 416 revision of the manuscript and final approval of the version to be published
33
34

35 417 The Corresponding Author (JZ) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that
36
37 418 no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

38
39 419 **Competing interests:** All authors declare: no support from any organisation for the
40
41 420 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest
42
43 421 in the submitted work; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have
44
45 422 influenced the submitted work.

46
47 423 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the Australian Physiotherapy
48
49 424 Association for the study data.

50
51 425 **Ethics approval:** The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee approved all
52
53 426 study procedures [Project number: 2018/518].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

427 **Funding source:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
428 public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

429 **Data sharing:** No additional data available.

430

431

For peer review only

1
2
3 432 **References**
4

- 5 433 1. Scott IA, Duckett SJ. In search of professional consensus in defining and reducing
6
7 434 low-value care. *Med J Aust.* 2015;203(4):179-81.
8
9 435 2. Choosing Wisely. An initiative of the ABIM foundation.
10
11
12 436 <http://www.choosingwisely.org/>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
13
14 437 3. Choosing Wisely Australia. An initiative of NPS Medicine Wise.
15
16
17 438 <http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/home>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
18
19 439 4. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2013. Allied health workforce 2012.
20
21 440 National health workforce series no. 5. Cat. no. HWL 51. Canberra: AIHW.
22
23 441 5. The Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency and the National Boards.
24
25 442 Annual Reports 2010/11 to 2016/17.
26
27 443 6. Physiotherapy Board of Australia Registrant data. Reporting period: 1 October 2017 –
28
29 444 31 December 2017. <http://www.physiotherapyboard.gov.au/About/Statistics.aspx>. Accessed
30
31 445 18th Mar 2019.
32
33 446 7. Medical Board of Australia Registrant data. Reporting period: 1 October 2017 – 31
34
35 447 December 2017. <http://www.medicalboard.gov.au/News/Statistics.aspx>. Accessed 18th Mar
36
37 448 2019.
38
39 449 8. American Physical Therapy Association (APTA). Accredited PT and PTA Programs
40
41 450 Directory.
42
43 451 <http://aptaapps.apta.org/accreditedschoolsdirectory/default.aspx?UniqueKey&UniqueKey=>.
44
45 452 Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
46
47 453 9. Data USA: Physical Therapists. Growth Projections.
48
49 454 <https://datausa.io/profile/soc/291123/#growth>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
50
51 455 10. Madson TJ, Hollman JH. Lumbar Traction for Managing Low Back Pain: A Survey
52
53 456 of Physical Therapists in the United States. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2015;45(8):586-95.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 457 11. Li LC, Bombardier C. Physical therapy management of low back pain: an exploratory
4
5 458 survey of therapist approaches. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(4):1018-28.
6
7
8 459 12. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Guidelines. Low back pain
9
10 460 and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management. November 2016.
11
12 461 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng59>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
13
14
15 462 13. Ladeira CE, Cheng MS, da Silva RA. Clinical Specialization and Adherence to
16
17 463 Evidence-Based Practice Guidelines for Low Back Pain Management: A Survey of US
18
19 464 Physical Therapists. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2017;47(5):347-58.
20
21 465 14. Vos T, Abajobir A, Abate K, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence,
22
23 466 prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries,
24
25 467 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet.*
26
27 468 2017;390(10100):1211-59.
28
29
30 469 15. Weber RP. Content analysis. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California:
31
32 470 Sage, 1990:117–24.
33
34
35 471 16. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data.
36
37 472 *Biometrics.* 1977;33(1):159-74.
38
39
40 473 17. Bishop TF, Cea M, Miranda Y, et al. Academic physicians' views on low-value
41
42 474 services and the choosing wisely campaign: A qualitative study. *Healthc (Amst).* 2017;5(1-
43
44 475 2):17-22.
45
46
47 476 18. Leemrijse CJ, Plas GM, Hofhuis H, et al. Compliance with the guidelines for acute
48
49 477 ankle sprain for physiotherapists is moderate in the Netherlands: an observational study. *Aust*
50
51 478 *J Physiother.* 2006;52(4):293-9.
52
53
54 479 19. Corkery MB, Edgar KL, Smith CE. A survey of physical therapists' clinical practice
55
56 480 patterns and adherence to clinical guidelines in the management of patients with whiplash
57
58 481 associated disorders (WAD). *J Man Manip Ther.* 2014;22(2):75-89.
59
60

- 1
2
3 482 20. Choosing Wisely Australia. An initiative of NPS MedicineWise. Join the
4
5 483 conversation: 2017 Report. p.27. [http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-](http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx)
6
7 484 [4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx](http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx)
8
9
10 485 21. Embrett M, Randall GE. Physician perspectives on Choosing Wisely Canada as an
11
12 486 approach to reduce unnecessary medical care: a qualitative study. Health Res Policy Syst.
13
14 487 2018;16(1):95.
15
16
17 488 22. Verhagen AP, Downie A, Maher CG, et al. Most red flags for malignancy in low back
18
19 489 pain guidelines lack empirical support: a systematic review. Pain. 2017;158(10):1860-8.
20
21
22 490 23. Flynn TN, Louviere JJ, Peters TJ, et al. Best–worst scaling: What it can do for health
23
24 491 care research and how to do it. J Health Econ. 2007;26(1):171-89.
25
26
27 492
28
29
30 493
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Number of responses, codes, percent exact agreement and Kappa (95% Confidence Interval) for the level of agreement between reviews for coding a random sample of responses

Characteristic of recommendations	N (%)	Codes	Agreement	k	95% CI
All sections	114 (24.8)	165	86%	0.85	0.78-0.91
Section 1	16 (20.5)	24	91%	0.89	0.73-1.00
Section 2	15 (25.9)	18	94%	0.91	0.68-1.00
Section 3	21 (28.4)	24	91%	0.86	0.66-1.00
Section 4	29 (30.2)	46	86%	0.84	0.70-0.96
Section 5	14 (20.6)	23	94%	0.93	0.76-1.00
Section 6	19 (22.4)	28	80%	0.75	0.54-0.94

N: number of responses coded; k: kappa coefficient; CI: confidence interval.

494

495

Table 2. Agreement and disagreement with survey questions

Section	Question	Agree, n (%)	Disagree, n (%)	Neither, n (%)
One	In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?	347 (63.9%)	134 (24.7%)	62 (11.4%)
Two	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?	416 (76.6%)	20 (3.7%)	107 (19.7%)
Three	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?	328 (60.4%)	43 (7.9%)	172 (31.7%)
Four	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?	284 (52.3%)	138 (25.4%)	121 (22.3%)
Five	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?	322 (59.3%)	87 (16.0%)	134 (24.7%)
Six	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?	341 (62.8%)	74 (13.6%)	128 (23.6%)

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of draft and current Choosing Wisely recommendations from the Australian Physiotherapy Association

Supplementary Table 2. Draft recommendations and survey questions

Supplementary Table 3. Frequency of codes in response to Section One to Six

N: number of respondents; *: percent of respondents that completed the free-text field for this question.

For peer review only

Supplementary Table 1. Comparison of draft and current Choosing Wisely recommendations from the Australian Physiotherapy Association

Draft recommendations	Current recommendations	Modification
Don't use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.	Don't request imaging for patients with non-specific low back pain and no indicators of a serious cause for low back pain.	Split into 3 recommendations each specifying a different clinical scenario
	Don't request imaging of the cervical spine in trauma patients, unless indicated by a validated decision rule.	
	Don't request imaging for acute ankle trauma unless indicated by the Ottawa Ankle Rules. (localized bone tenderness or inability to weight-bear as defined in the Rules)	
Don't use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.	Don't routinely use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.	'Don't' was replaced by 'Don't routinely'
Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.	Avoid using electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.	'Don't use' was replaced by 'Avoid using'
Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder	Don't provide ongoing manual therapy for patients with adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.	'Don't use' was replaced by 'Don't provide'. The population was broadened from patients 'following acute adhesive capsulitis' to all patients with adhesive capsulitis
Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.	No recommendation	This recommendation was not included in the current list

Supplementary Table 2. Draft recommendations and survey questions

SECTION 1

CONTEXT: The Choosing Wisely format deliberately uses “don’t” or similar wording, and is expressly intended to incite discussion about interventions. One of the “5 Things Physical Therapists and Patients Should Question” by the American Physical Therapy Association in 2014 was:

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t employ passive physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program.

QUESTION: In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?

SECTION 2

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.

EXPLANATION: Imaging should only be requested when clinically appropriate. Physiotherapists should use appropriate clinical decision making tools such as Ottawa Ankle Rules, Canadian C-Spine Rule, Nexus, and should not be used in cases of non-specific low back pain with no signs of serious pathology.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?

SECTION 3

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should not routinely use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery. Physiotherapists should instead consider adding other interventions to standard care. For example, there is high level evidence for the addition of preoperative inspiratory muscle training when added to usual care.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?

SECTION 4

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.

EXPLANATION: Clinical practice guidelines don’t recommend electrotherapy modalities to manage low back pain. Physiotherapists should instead consider other interventions to manage low back pain, for example exercise prescription and education.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?

SECTION 5

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should consider a range of other interventions to manage acute adhesive capsulitis, like exercise to optimize function, education and appropriate management of pain.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?

SECTION 6

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn’t improvement in measurable patient outcomes.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should facilitate and empower the patient’s independent management of chronic conditions.

1
2
3 **QUESTION:** Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in
4 cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Supplementary Table 3. Frequency of codes in response to Section One to Six

SECTION ONE				
RECOMMENDATION: Don't employ passive physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program.				
QUESTION: In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?				
Code description	Example	N	%*	
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>				
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	I would prefer an alternative phrase such as 'don't routinely'. I think the absolute statement of 'don't' requires an exhaustive list of all of the possible, even if rare, exceptions.	49	32.2	
Would benefit from further refining	The statement is very broad which may need further refining in the actual discussion document.	34	22.4	
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	This is an entirely inappropriate blanket statement. For example, a 12 year old comes in with a first ever episode of an acute wry neck. This can be completely resolved in one passive treatment. It would be inappropriate to give them a home exercise program as there is no evidence that it would be useful and it could focus them on having a problem which could create hyper-vigilance.	19	12.5	
Shift framing from negative to positive	I would prefer a discussion point around the affirmative rather than the negative, e.g. only choose passive physical agents with demonstrable measurable outcomes.	18	11.8	
Threat to autonomy or the profession	Combative and deprecating approach to practitioners. Suggestive of disrespect of practitioner and lack of sincere care for our patients.	16	10.5	
New evidence might change recommendations	'Don't' is a strong word and if in the future an Australia Physiotherapy Association 'Don't' suggestion is found to be incorrect then the Australia Physiotherapy Association would have to provide an answer. More appropriate wording could be 'The current evidence suggests...'	4	2.6	
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>				
Using unqualified statements is important	Physiotherapy, like other health professions, is inherently conservative and resistant to change. Physiotherapists won't pay attention to vaguely worded advice. The DON'T format is the key to the effectiveness of the Choosing Wisely strategy.	22	14.5	
Provokes discussion	Especially where the explanation is provided as to why. I feel it is an emotive and engaging way to start a conversation/healthy debate.	20	13.2	
Will help change practice	Strong, directive language is appropriate to make clinicians realise that they are directions to follow not suggestions to consider.	12	7.9	

No further comment I would completely agree with this statement - can't think of a better way of wording this concept! 12 7.9

SECTION TWO

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Doesn't always correlate with patient's wishes - sometimes they just want peace of mind, despite our clinical judgement.	27	25.5
Clinical experience is more valuable than validated decision rules	X-rays can give important but subtle information about the presenting circumstances - DISH; functional instability. The rules were developed around a concept of sensitivity for specific diagnoses. What level of risk are you prepared to accept and are these the only pathologies where x-rays are useful to the clinically reasoned management? Consequently they are limited, if not conceptually flawed.	21	19.8
Threat to autonomy or the profession	The situations where I would recommend imaging is when the patient is over cautious and if I have had trouble establishing a professional rapport with them even after explaining decision making to them. It is important that the patient has a professional belief in us because often the doctor will say something that has not been based on clinical decision and the patient believes that. E.g. the doctor says...and with questioning they haven't even looked at the body part. The reason for this is they are likely to go back to their doctor who will recommend an X ray anyway. Some patients feel the need to have this investigated and if that gives them piece of mind and therefore aids/speeds up their recovery then I am not against it.	5	4.7
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	This is one area that there is clear evidence. The evidence supports that imaging can in fact do harm such as exposure to unnecessary radiation and in some cases impede progress and recovery. This is an important recommendation.	43	40.6
Educating patients and clinicians will support adoption	I think the APA should do a members value webinar promoting the Western Australia radiology imaging pathways website and mobile phone app. There is need for more education and easier access to the rules, as well as discussion on how to explain this to the modern client who wants images.	10	9.4
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Would benefit from further refining	Should we be a little more specific here and identify one area. It is still quite broad and worried that not ALL physios will understand validated decision rules or know of these.	16	15.1

Unqualified statements are inappropriate	Avoid using 'should not' - go for 'physiotherapists are urged to avoid imaging'... or 'Best practice indicates that physiotherapists follow validated decision rules regarding not imaging when contraindicated.'	3	2.8
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	This is not an area I have enough knowledge or experience to comment on.	3	2.8

SECTION THREE

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I don't work in this area so prefer not to comment.	70	51.1
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Another ideal recommendation that doesn't take health economics & workload into account. There are still plenty of patients who would never be seen pre-op, regardless of the planned surgery.	19	13.9
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	Patients are individuals and in my experience sometimes it has been indicated and also helpful but mass use is not indicated.	16	11.7
Questions the purpose of the recommendation	Patients enjoy and are encouraged by post-op increases in vital capacity etc. Negligible cost blowing in a machine.	5	3.6
Threat to autonomy or the profession	It is one tool in the toolbox, there is no reason not to use it other than that there is no evidence for its routine use. I really dislike these blanket DONT statements. They go against clinical judgement and reasoning...	3	2.2
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	Love this!	17	12.4
Will help promote evidence-based care	Getting this out there with the medical professions' recommendations is exciting. Hopefully it will help us get the message to them to help influence a change in the hospital setting.	11	8.0
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Would benefit from further refining	The statement should mention evidence regarding early mobility rather than just inspiratory muscle training.	10	7.3

Shift framing from negative to positive	Statement doesn't address recommended therapy AFTER these surgeries at all - what about mobilization?	8	5.8
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	Don't infer it should never be used. This is not a safety issue that warrants a 'DONT'. Incentive spirometry may still be appropriate in some select patients who otherwise have difficulty taking/coordinating deep breaths, or who are post-operatively confused, or need motivation.	4	2.9

SECTION FOUR

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Appropriate to use as adjunct to evidence-based care	Used in conjunction with appropriate education, active exercise etc. may provide enough short term relief to encourage full participation in the before mentioned strategies.	54	30.0
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	Very few physios just use electro of anything and they need to [be] educated. However, in the real world of quality musculoskeletal practice, many physios use electro +/- heat/cold therapy as an adjunct to manual, exercise and other therapies. It is patient specific may be short term analgesia or easing for the muscle spasm and this may improve movement quality and exercise compliance. Used well there is no down side clinically and costs the patient and system nothing.	51	28.3
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Lower back pain can present with lots of erector spinae spasm. Studies have shown that Interferential Therapy and Transcutaneous Electro-Nerve Stimulation are effective analgesics and do not have side effects. Unlike Codeine. How the heck do you expect to establish trust with a patient if we are not reducing their fear and pain before touching them when they are in strong pain?	51	28.3
Threat to autonomy or the profession	Why would the college/panel of experts see this as one of the top 5 thing going wrong in physio practice? Incredible really. I employ a dozen physios, am a titled MS and Sports physio and have not found a colleague who agrees with this one! The feeling is that the Australian Physiotherapy Association has lost touch for even starting down this track!	11	6.1
New evidence might change recommendations	Research published in the Lancet regarding the effectiveness of low level laser to treat cervical pain may indicate a place for this in low back pain but I am not aware of any research to show this is effective or not so I am not happy about a blanket ban of use of all modalities. Laser may well prove to be of use.	6	3.3

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

Response suggests agreement

No further comment	100% agree.	23	12.8
The use of electrotherapy must be reduced	Physiotherapists are intelligent people who should be able to use a multitude of more successful and evidence based treatments for low back pain patients. Anyone resorting to the passive electrophysical modalities is either trying to pump through as many patients as they can to make money or hasn't done a course recently enough to give them up to date treatment approaches.	13	7.2
Other evidence-based treatments are available	Physiotherapists have so many more manual and exercise skill sets to offer patients with low back pain.	11	6.1
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy provided	This is a very general statement about many types of applications. It would be better to see electrotherapy replaced with a specific modality for which there is Level 1 evidence.	17	9.4
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	This statement I think reflects academics who are not working in the clinical setting for most of their practice. Ask any clinician and they would comment that to put a blanket ban so to speak on electrotherapy is probably exceeding the actual value of the evidence we have. That said, there is no doubt that long-term management of backs should not be based upon electrotherapy of course, but clients will tell you that TENS and such actually do provide the ability to improve their activities of daily living. Hence my concern with 'Don't'. Rather something like 'it should not be the mainstay of therapy' or similar...	9	5.0
Shift framing from negative to positive	Is the statement: " <i>Clinical practice guidelines don't recommend electrotherapy modalities to manage low back pain. Physiotherapists should instead consider other interventions to manage low back pain, for example exercise prescription and education</i> " going to be included in our statement, if so I like this recommendation.	4	2.2
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I don't know the latest evidence to comment here.	3	1.7

SECTION FIVE

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?

Code description	Example	N	%*
-------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------

<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>		
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Another concern with the wording is that limited manual therapy may be used to improve scapula position and control which is usually a problem in these cases.	43 30.1
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	In the subacute to chronic setting I have effectively used manual therapy to improve shoulder range. I am at a loss as to how this evidence was derived. In the acute setting I agree, but this statement appears to put a blanket ban on all manual therapy for all such shoulders.	28 19.6
Threat to autonomy or the profession	It does not matter what works in 2 or 3 studies, physiotherapists must be free to choose a variety of techniques and use more than one and education for each patient. Look at the way sports people are treated. I am thinking specific exercise type angles, timing and repetitions. Your committee could do well to stop 10 reps practice for all patients of all ages in hospital. More fruitful than this witch hunt against Private Practice practitioners.	7 4.9
Appropriate to use as adjunct to evidence-based care	This is never performed in isolation, but in conjunction with appropriate range of motion and strengthening exercises as range returns.	7 4.9
New evidence might change recommendations	As the recent Cochrane review concluded that “ <i>No trial compared a combination of manual therapy and exercise versus placebo or no intervention</i> ” I don't think we can dismiss the use of manual therapy so quickly in the management of this condition.	6 4.2
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>		
No further comment	Respect the process of physiology with this disorder	23 16.1
Other evidence-based treatments may be available	Hydrodilatation should be utilised by medical staff on a more regular basis.	14 9.8
No evidence manual therapy alters natural history	There is clear evidence that not only does manual therapy not facilitate recovery, but may actually impede recovery. Ongoing manual treatment reduces patients' self-efficacy and promotes dependency.	4 2.8
<u>Feedback on wording</u>		
Better define the disease presentation and manual therapy provided	Not sure here what is meant by ongoing how ongoing days. Months, years?	27 18.9
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	I don't think we know enough about this condition to be making clear and decisive statements. Maybe a statement saying “ <i>Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients (who do not respond) with adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.</i> ” Ideally, we shouldn't be doing anything ongoing if the patient does not respond.	10 7.0

<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I can't comment on this clinically as I'm not across the evidence for this	12	8.4
-------------------------------------	--	----	-----

SECTION SIX

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Physiotherapy could prevent/reduce deterioration in symptoms	I work with a number of patients with palliative conditions. For them, the goal may be MAINTAINING as opposed to IMPROVING function. In these cases, it can be hard to anticipate the trajectory of the disease progression, but I think physiotherapy still plays a vital role in maintaining the patients' independence.	46	29.9
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Occasionally there are chronic patients with chronic conditions that still need our help/support/advice/symptomatic relief. Do we just turn our backs on them?	39	25.3
Concern over use of outcome measures	What you can objectively measure and the response or benefit the patient receives, are often quite divergent. What I mean is that if the patient doesn't believe they are getting anywhere and the physiotherapist is ethical, of course they would cease treatment. However, if the patient 'feels better' by getting physiotherapy intervention, who are you to say they can't access it. After all it is their money they are spending.	18	11.7
Threat to autonomy or the profession	I have seen it time and again where physio has been written off because of failed physio interventions - however the failure has not been because physio cannot work, but because ineffective, non-evidence-based strategies have been administered often by junior or burnt-out physios.	17	11.0
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	Patient and therapist both have better things to do.	38	24.7
Physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try to reduce overtreatment	Absolutely, it diminishes the value of our profession and gives the appearance we are revenue raising, when treatment is continued when there is no change in measureable outcomes (or in fact I suspect sometimes, no initial assessment of outcome measures to review).	15	9.7
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Better define ambiguous terms	I feel this is too vague and doesn't really mean anything. There is no time limit imposed and in some cases there won't be improvement, but rather a prevention of decline in outcomes. Also, what is meant by	27	17.5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

	physiotherapy - is this just the application of physical interventions, or a broader scope of practice like education, self-management support , cognitive behavioural therapy, etc.		
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	To say 'Don't' worries me. Obviously we want to achieve positive client outcomes and these might include their own functional improvement, validated outcome scores, subjective and objective findings. My concern is that this statement needs qualification in that it appears that if outcome scores are not improving then physio should cease.	5	3.2
Shift framing from negative to positive	For a start the facilitation and empowerment is physiotherapy! Needs rewording to something like physiotherapy management should focus on.....	4	2.6
Unclear response	I am unsure and the details of a service that HCF audited and confirmed that 8 years of exercise therapy, twice weekly was appropriate for average back patients. Are there any normative statistics of the average length of back care programs in our industry?	1	0.6

N: number of respondents; *: percent of respondents that completed the free-text field for this question.

BMJ Open

Physiotherapists' views on the Australian Physiotherapy Association's Choosing Wisely recommendations: a content analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-031360.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Zadro, Joshua; University of Sydney, Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, School of Public Health Peek, Aimie L.; University of Sydney, Musculoskeletal Health Research Group, Faculty of Health Sciences Dodd, Rachael; University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health McCaffery, Kirsten; University of Sydney, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health Maher, Christopher; University of Sydney, Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Health policy, Rehabilitation medicine
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, Back pain < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, Musculoskeletal disorders < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY, Shoulder < ORTHOPAEDIC & TRAUMA SURGERY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 1 **Physiotherapists' views on the Australian Physiotherapy Association's Choosing Wisely**
4
5
6 2 **recommendations: a content analysis**
7

8 3 Joshua R Zadro^{1, 2*}, Aimie Peek³, Rachael Dodd¹, Kirsten McCaffery¹, Christopher G
9
10 4 Maher^{1,2}.

11
12
13 5 ¹School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney, Sydney,
14
15 6 NSW, Australia

16
17 7 ²Institute for Musculoskeletal Health, Sydney Local Health District, Sydney, NSW, Australia

18
19 8 ³Discipline of Physiotherapy, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, Lidcombe,
20
21
22 9 NSW, Australia

23
24 10 *Corresponding author: Joshua Robert Zadro – Level 10 North, King George V Building
25
26
27 11 (C39), Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, PO Box M179, Missenden Rd, Camperdown, NSW
28
29 12 2050, Australia. Telephone: +61 2 8627 6782. Email: joshua.zadro@sydney.edu.au
30
31

32 13
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

14 ABSTRACT

15 **Objectives:** Choosing Wisely holds promise for increasing awareness of low-value care in
16 physiotherapy. However, it is unclear how physiotherapists' view Choosing Wisely
17 recommendations. The aim of this study was to evaluate physiotherapists' feedback on
18 Choosing Wisely recommendations and investigate agreement with each recommendation.

19 **Setting:** The Australian Physiotherapy Association emailed a survey to all 20,029
20 physiotherapist members in 2015 seeking feedback on a list of Choosing Wisely
21 recommendations.

22 **Participants:** 9,764 physiotherapists opened the email invitation (49%) and 543 completed
23 the survey (response rate 5.6%). Participants were asked about the acceptability of the
24 wording of recommendations using a closed (Yes/No) and free text response option (Section
25 1). Then using a similar response format, participants were asked whether they agreed with
26 each Choosing Wisely recommendation (Sections 2 to 6).

27 **Primary and secondary outcomes:** We performed a content analysis of free-text responses
28 (primary outcome) and used descriptive statistics to report agreement and disagreement with
29 each recommendation (secondary outcome).

30 **Results:** There were 872 free-text responses across the six sections. 347 physiotherapists
31 (63.9%) agreed with the "don't" style of wording. Agreement with recommendations ranged
32 from 52.3% (electrotherapy for back pain) to 76.6% (validated decision rules for imaging).
33 The content analysis revealed that physiotherapists felt that blanket rules were inappropriate
34 (range across recommendations: 13.9% to 30.1% of responses), clinical experience is more
35 valuable than evidence (11.7% to 28.3%) and recommendations would benefit from further
36 refining or better defining key terms (7.3% to 22.4%).

37 **Conclusions:** Although most physiotherapists agreed with both the style of wording for
38 Choosing Wisely recommendations and with the recommendations, their feedback

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

39 highlighted a number of areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement. These
40 findings will support the development of future recommendations and are the first step
41 towards increasing the impact Choosing Wisely has on physiotherapy practice.

42 **Key words:** physiotherapy; Choosing Wisely; low-value care; qualitative; content analysis.

For peer review only

1
2
3 45 **Strengths and limitations of this study**
4
5

- 6 46 - This is the first study to explore physiotherapists views on Choosing Wisely
7
8 47 recommendations
9
10 48 - Two researchers developed a reliable coding framework to code written feedback
11
12 49 from physiotherapists regarding Choosing Wisely recommendations
13
14 50 - Our qualitative data highlights possible targets to increase adoption of Choosing
15
16 51 Wisely recommendations among physiotherapists
17
18 52 - The main weakness is the low response rate to the survey (5.6%)
19
20 53 - Our sample might not be representative of all physiotherapist members of the
21
22 54 Australian Physiotherapy Association
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

Low-value care is defined as care that provides no benefit, causes harm, or provides a benefit that is too small when compared with its cost (1). In an effort to reduce low-value care, over 230 professional societies worldwide – such as the Australian Physiotherapy Association – have provided Choosing Wisely recommendations (2, 3). Choosing Wisely is a major public awareness campaign that aims to facilitate open patient-therapist communication about low-value care and ensure patients receive healthcare that is evidence-based, safe and necessary. Professional societies that endorse Choosing Wisely typically release a list of 5-10 Choosing Wisely recommendations. Choosing Wisely recommendations are brief statements that outline tests or treatments that are unnecessary and potentially harmful, and are likely provided by some society members.

Choosing Wisely holds promise for increasing awareness of the need to reduce low-value care in physiotherapy. This is particularly important as the profession is rapidly expanding across countries. In Australia, the number of physiotherapists has nearly tripled in just under 20 years (4, 5) and there are now more practising physiotherapists than any medical specialty (including general practice) (6, 7). In the United States, there are nearly 250,000 physical therapists, 250 physical therapy training programs (8) and the number of physical therapists is estimated to grow 29% within the next 10 years (9).

Audits of practice suggest that some physiotherapists provide low-value care and fail to provide evidence-based care. For example, 77% use traction for low back pain (survey of n=1001 physiotherapists) (10) and 83% use electrotherapy (e.g. ultrasound) (n=274) (11); both are considered low-value according to evidence-based clinical practice guidelines (12). Conversely, only 42% would provide advice to stay active and 51% prescribe home exercise for patients with chronic low back pain (n=410) (13); both recommended in guidelines (12).

1
2
3 80 Understanding physiotherapists' views towards adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations
4
5 81 could inform strategies to replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based
6
7 82 physiotherapy. Given that physiotherapists play a key role in the management of some of the
8
9 83 leading causes of disability worldwide (e.g. low back and neck pain) (14), facilitating
10
11 84 evidence-based physiotherapy has major implications for reducing healthcare costs and
12
13 85 improving the health of millions. The primary aim of this study was to evaluate
14
15 86 physiotherapists' feedback on a list of Choosing Wisely recommendations that were sent to
16
17 87 members of the Australian Physiotherapy Association before final recommendations were
18
19 88 endorsed and distributed. The secondary aim was to determine the proportion of
20
21 89 physiotherapists that agreed and disagreed with each recommendation.
22
23
24
25
26

27 90 **2. Methods**

28 29 91 **2.1. Study design**

30
31 92 We performed a cross-sectional online survey that utilised a content analysis of free-text
32
33 93 responses from members of the Australian Physiotherapy Association regarding a list of
34
35 94 Choosing Wisely recommendations. The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics
36
37 95 Committee approved all study procedures [Project number: 2018/518].
38
39
40

41 96 **2.2. Participants and recruitment**

42
43 97 In November 2015, the Australian Physiotherapy Association sent an email invitation to
44
45 98 20,029 physiotherapist members seeking feedback on a draft list of Choosing Wisely
46
47 99 recommendations. The draft list of recommendations were developed by a process of
48
49 100 consensus over a series of meetings between 6-8 physiotherapists (clinicians and academics)
50
51 101 from different sub-disciplines (e.g. musculoskeletal, cardiorespiratory) and a Choosing
52
53 102 Wisely representative. Participants were informed that the Australian Physiotherapy
54
55 103 Association would use their feedback to improve the draft Choosing Wisely
56
57 104 recommendations. All responses were anonymous as participants were not asked to provide
58
59
60

1
2
3 105 any identifiable information (e.g. age, gender, contact details). The draft Choosing Wisely
4
5 106 recommendations were largely similar to the current recommendations (Table 1).
6
7

8 107 **2.3. Data collection**

9
10 108 The survey included six sections; each section included a recommendation that was linked to
11
12 109 a question (Table 2). First, participants were shown a Choosing Wisely recommendation from
13
14 110 the American Physical Therapy Association: *“Don’t employ passive physical agents except*
15
16 111 *when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program”*. Participants were
17
18 112 asked whether the style of wording (i.e. using "Don't") was an acceptable method for
19
20 113 engaging the physiotherapy profession in discussions about evidence-based practice.
21
22 114 Participants could answer ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ (or choose not to answer) and provide feedback in a
23
24 115 free-text field. The next five sections presented draft Choosing Wisely recommendations
25
26 116 from the Australian Physiotherapy Association. Participants were shown a recommendation
27
28 117 and a brief explanatory note to help them understand why the Australian Physiotherapy
29
30 118 Association selected the recommendation. Participants were then asked if they
31
32 119 agreed/disagreed with the recommendation (or neither agreed/disagreed) and were prompted
33
34 120 to provide feedback in a free-text field.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 121 **2.4. Analysis**

42
43 122 We used descriptive statistics (counts and percentages) to report agreement with each
44
45 123 question and performed a content analysis on all free-text responses (15). The content
46
47 124 analysis allowed us to report the content and frequency of codes expressed in responses; a
48
49 125 code is a pre-established category which reflects an important characteristic of a response.
50
51 126 The analysis represents the perspectives of physiotherapists working in an academic
52
53 127 healthcare setting and private musculoskeletal clinics. Two researchers (JZ and AP) read
54
55 128 through all the responses to familiarise themselves with their content, taking notes and
56
57 129 developing codes to represent the key characteristics of responses. The same researchers
58
59
60

1
2
3 130 discussed and refined these codes (which was done separately for each question), and re-read
4
5 131 through all the responses to ensure the codes captured all the important information expressed
6
7
8 132 by participants. The researchers (JZ and AP) developed a coding framework using an
9
10 133 inductive approach, as the aim was to generate new ideas from the data. This coding
11
12 134 framework was then applied to a random sample of responses for each question (at least
13
14 135 20%) to test the reliability of the framework (see below). Each response was allocated up to
15
16 136 five codes based on its content. A detailed outline of the coding framework is in
17
18 137 Supplementary Table 1.
19
20
21
22 138 Kappa statistics (95% confidence intervals (CI)) and percent exact agreement were calculated
23
24 139 to assess level of agreement between JZ and AP for coding the responses for each question.
25
26 140 This analysis used 5,000 bootstrap replications to calculate the 95% Confidence Intervals
27
28 141 (CIs) and was performed using STATA statistical software (version 14.1). Kappa statistics
29
30 142 (k) were interpreted as follows: <0.00="poor", 0.00–0.20="slight", 0.21–0.40="fair", 0.41–
31
32 143 0.60="moderate", 0.61–0.80="substantial", ≥ 0.81 ="almost perfect" (16). The coding
33
34 144 checklist for each question was refined until level of agreement on a random sample was
35
36 145 $k \geq 0.7$, with all disagreements resolved by discussion. Two researchers (JZ and AP) then
37
38 146 applied the final framework to the remaining responses.
39
40
41
42

43 147 **2.5. Patient or Public Involvement**

44
45
46 148 Patients and members of the public were not involved in the design of this study.
47
48

49 149 **3. Results**

50
51 150 There were 9,764 physiotherapists that opened the email invitation (49%) and 543 that
52
53 151 completed the survey (response rate 5.6%). There were 152 (28.0%) free-text responses for
54
55 152 section one, 106 (19.5%) for section two, 137 (25.2%) for section three, 180 (33.1%) for
56
57 153 section four, 143 (26.3%) for section five, and 154 (28.4%) for section six. Level of
58
59
60

154 agreement between the coding researchers was ‘almost perfect’ for sections one to five
155 (range: $k=0.86$ to 0.94) and ‘substantial’ for section six ($k=0.75$, 95% CI: 0.54 to 0.94)
156 (Supplementary Table 2).

157 **3.1. Agreement and disagreement with recommendations**

158 Most physiotherapists agreed that validated decision rules should guide the use of imaging
159 (76.6% agreed; 3.7% disagreed). Fewer agreed that physiotherapists should not provide
160 incentive spirometry after abdominal and cardiac surgery (60.4% agreed; 7.9% disagreed),
161 not use electrotherapy for low back pain (52.3% agreed; 25.4% disagreed), not provide
162 ongoing manual therapy for adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder (59.3% agreed; 16.0%
163 disagreed) and not provide ongoing treatment when there is no improvement in measurable
164 patient outcomes (62.8% agreed; 13.6% disagreed). Most physiotherapists agreed that the
165 wording of Choosing Wisely recommendations is an acceptable method to engage the
166 profession in discussions about evidence-based practice (63.9% agreed; 24.7% disagreed)
167 (Table 3).

168 **3.2. Feedback on recommendations**

169 **3.2.1. Section One: style of wording of Choosing Wisely recommendations**

170 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: unqualified statements are
171 inappropriate ($n=49$, 32.2%), wording would benefit from further refining ($n=34$, 22.4%),
172 clinical experience is more valuable than evidence ($n=19$, 12.5%), shift the framing from
173 negative to positive ($n=18$, 11.8%), threat to autonomy or the profession ($n=16$, 10.5%), and
174 new evidence might change recommendations ($n=4$, 2.6%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
175 example:

176 *“Wording needs to be guidance, not definitive in most situations as individual cases*
177 *may require alternative approaches”* (unqualified statements are inappropriate)

1
2
3 178 *“Provocative. Too black and white...Are we going to drive our patients to masseurs*
4
5 179 *and quacks”* (threat to autonomy or the profession)

6
7
8 180 *“Evidenced base treatment are those that are proven, but they shouldn't exclude time*
9
10 181 *worn treatments that are yet to be proven ineffective”* (new evidence might change
11
12 182 recommendations).

13
14
15
16 183 For responses that suggested agreement, codes included: unqualified statements (i.e. those
17
18 184 without reservation or limitation) are important (n=22, 14.5%), recommendations provoke
19
20 185 discussion (n=20, 13.2%) and recommendations will help change practice (n=12, 7.9%)
21
22 186 (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

23
24
25
26 187 *“The wording of these statements should be like a pebble in every physio's shoe*
27
28 188 *challenging our thinking and processes. I personally think the style of wording does that”*
29
30 189 (unqualified statements are important)

31
32
33 190 *“I like the wording because it makes the recommendations clear and may be an alarming*
34
35 191 *prompt for clinicians to change their practice”* (recommendations will help change
36
37 192 practice).

3.2.2. Section Two: validated decision rules for imaging

38
39
40
41 193
42
43 194 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate
44
45 195 (n=27, 25.5%), clinical experience is more valuable than validated decision rules (n=21,
46
47 196 19.8%), and threat to autonomy or the profession (n=5, 4.7%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
48
49 197 example:

50
51
52
53 198 *“There will always be situations where there is a need to contravene these rules, the*
54
55 199 *statement leaves no scope for this”* (blanket rules are inappropriate)

1
2
3 200 *“In over 40 years of disciplined Physio Practice, I have personally discovered a*
4
5 201 *number of spinal and pelvic tumours in patients, that would otherwise have been*
6
7
8 202 *missed, had X-rays not been taken”* (clinical experience is more valuable than
9
10 203 validated decision rules).

11
12
13 204 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=43, 40.6%);
14
15 205 a small percentage highlighted that educating patients and clinicians will support the adoption
16
17 206 of imaging recommendations (n=10, 9.4%). A small percentage of responses suggested that
18
19 207 the wording of the above-recommendation would benefit from further refining (n=16, 15.1%)
20
21 208 and unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=3, 2.8%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
22
23 209 example:

24
25
26
27 210 *“There will need to be a great deal of re-education of the public for this to be seen as*
28
29 211 *reasonable for certain clients”* (educating patients and clinicians will support the
30
31 212 adoption of imaging recommendations)

32
33
34
35 213 *“Physios generally don’t use imaging of course, whereas advocate for imaging could be*
36
37 214 *a better phrase”* (benefit from further refining).

40 215 **3.2.3. Section Three: use of incentive spirometry**

41
42 216 A large percentage of respondents commented that they did not have expertise to provide
43
44 217 feedback on this recommendation (n=70, 51.1%). For responses that suggested disagreement,
45
46 218 codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate (n=19, 13.9%), clinical experience is more
47
48 219 valuable than evidence (n=16, 11.7%), questioning the purpose of the recommendation (n=5,
49
50 220 3.6%) and threat to autonomy or the profession (n=3, 2.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
51
52 221 example:

53
54
55
56
57 222 *“You could still use it if it's the only thing a patient will do to encourage larger tidal*
58
59 223 *volumes”* (blanket rules are inappropriate)

224 *“I do not want my practice methods dictated by anybody, Australian Physiotherapy*
225 *Association or otherwise”* (threat to autonomy or the profession).

226 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n= 17,
227 12.4%); a small percentage highlighted that the recommendation would help promote
228 evidence-based care (n=11, 8.0%). A small percentage of responses suggested that the
229 recommendation would benefit from further refining (n=10, 7.3%) and should shift the
230 framing from negative to positive (n=8, 5.8%) and that unqualified statements are
231 inappropriate (n=4, 2.9%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

232 *“Movement and walking are cheaper, more functional alternatives to improving lung*
233 *function”* (help promote evidence-based care)

234 *“Can we suggest what should be done instead of incentive spirometry?”* (shift the
235 framing from negative to positive).

236 **3.2.4. Section Four: electrotherapy for low back pain**

237 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: electrotherapy is appropriate to
238 use as an adjunct to evidence-based care (n=54, 30.0%), clinical experience is more valuable
239 than evidence (n=51, 28.3%), blanket rules are inappropriate (n=51, 28.3%), threat to
240 autonomy or the profession (n=11, 6.1%) and new evidence might change recommendations
241 (n=6, 3.3%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

242 *“It can [be] appropriate to use electrotherapy for low back pain to support other*
243 *evidence-based practice interventions”* (appropriate to use as an adjunct to evidence-
244 based care)

245 *“My long experience (40 years) as a Musculoskeletal Physiotherapist shows me that*
246 *pain, inflammation and muscle spasm is relieved by Interferential and sonophoresis,*
247 *in most low back pain patients”* (clinical experience is more valuable than evidence)

1
2
3 248 *“If we tell all other professions that electrotherapy are no longer used in*
4
5 249 *physiotherapy treatment for low back pain, I can't see any difference between our*
6
7
8 250 *work as a masseur or exercise physiologist in the years to come”* (threat to autonomy
9
10 251 *or the profession).*

11
12
13 252 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=23, 12.8%);
14
15 253 a small percentage highlighted that the use of electrotherapy needs to be reduced (n=13,
16
17 254 7.2%) and other evidence-based treatments are available (n=11, 6.1%). Codes for feedback
18
19 255 on wording included: better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy
20
21 256 (n=17, 9.4%), unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=9, 5.0%) and shift the framing
22
23 257 from negative to positive (n=4, 2.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

24
25
26
27 258 *“Rarely used in last 10 years - always teach movement short of pain as a baseline”* (other
28
29 259 *evidence-based treatments are available)*

30
31
32
33 260 *“This recommendation needs to be re-worded to be more specific about the chronicity of*
34
35 261 *the condition”* (better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy)

36
37
38 262 *“Should the statement not be: ‘Don't use only electrotherapy modalities in the*
39
40 263 *management of patients with low back pain’”* (shift the framing from negative to
41
42 264 *positive).*

265 **3.2.5. Section Five: ongoing manual therapy for adhesive capsulitis**

266 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: blanket rules are inappropriate
267 (n=43, 30.1%), clinical experience is more valuable than evidence (n=28, 19.6%), threat to
268 autonomy or the profession (n=7, 4.9%), manual therapy is appropriate to use as an adjunct to
269 evidence-based care (n=7, 4.9%) and new evidence might change recommendations (n=6,
270 4.2%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

1
2
3 271 *“This is true most of the time...but there are exceptions”* (blanket rules are
4
5 272 inappropriate)
6
7
8 273 *“In the subacute to chronic setting I have effectively used manual therapy to improve*
9
10 274 *shoulder range. I am at a loss as to how this evidence was derived”* (clinical
11
12 275 experience is more valuable than evidence).

13
14
15
16 276 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=23, 16.1%);
17
18 277 a small percentage highlighted that other evidence-based treatments are available (n=14,
19
20 278 9.8%) and there is no evidence manual therapy alters natural history (n=4, 2.8%). Codes for
21
22 279 feedback on wording included: better define the disease presentation and type of manual
23
24 280 therapy provided (n=27, 18.9%) and unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=10, 7.0%)
25
26 281 (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

27
28
29
30 282 *“Problem is perpetuated by poor active movement, so retrain this”* (other evidence-based
31
32 283 treatments are available)
33
34
35 284 *“[The statement] is too broad and encompassing to say never”* (unqualified statements
36
37 285 are inappropriate).
38
39
40

41 286 **3.2.6. Section Six: ongoing physiotherapy without improvement in patient**
42
43 287 **outcomes**

44
45 288 For responses that suggested disagreement, codes included: physiotherapy could prevent or
46
47 289 reduce deterioration in patients’ symptoms (n=46, 29.9%), blanket rules are inappropriate
48
49 290 (n=39, 25.3%), concern over the use of outcome measures (n=18, 11.7%) and threat to
50
51 291 autonomy or the profession (n=17, 11.0%) (Supplementary Table 3). For example:

52
53
54
55 292 *“Need also to consider situation where without contact with physio, patient*
56
57 293 *demonstrates deterioration”* (physiotherapy could prevent or reduce deterioration in
58
59 294 patients’ symptoms)

1
2
3 295 *“Sometimes the patient may need to rely on the therapist's intervention as they may*
4
5 296 *not be able to independently exercise correctly”* (blanket rules are inappropriate)
6
7
8 297 *“In my clinic we have had a good example of why this is not a reasonable blanket*
9
10 298 *statement. We've had low back pain clients who have shown some activity of daily*
11
12 299 *living and subjective improvement, whilst their Oswestry outcome measure was*
13
14 300 *relatively insensitive to the improvement”* (concern over the use of outcome
15
16 301 *measures).*

17
18
19
20 302 Most responses that suggested agreement did not have any specific comments (n=38, 24.7%);
21
22 303 a small percentage highlighted that physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try to reduce
23
24 304 overtreatment (n=15, 9.7%). Codes for feedback on wording included: better define
25
26 305 ambiguous terms (n=27, 17.5%), unqualified statements are inappropriate (n=5, 3.2%) and
27
28 306 shift the framing from negative to positive (n=4, 2.6%) (Supplementary Table 3). For
29
30 307 example:

31
32
33
34
35 308 *“Physiotherapists have a role in being upfront to patients when no outcome has been*
36
37 309 *achieved from ongoing physiotherapy”* (physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try
38
39 310 *to reduce overtreatment)*

40
41
42 311 *“The reasons sweeping statements like these don't tend to work (with a few*
43
44 312 *exceptions), is that very few conditions are black and white, or can be covered by a*
45
46 313 *single statement”* (unqualified statements are inappropriate).
47
48
49

314 **4. Discussion**

315 **4.1. Statement of principal findings**

316 The majority (63.9%) of physiotherapists agreed with the style of wording for Choosing
317 Wisely recommendations and with draft recommendations (ranging from 52.3% to 76.6%),
318 although a number of areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement were

1
2
3 319 identified. Many physiotherapists believe blanket rules are inappropriate, clinical experience
4
5 320 is more valuable than evidence, and the recommendations threaten physiotherapists'
6
7 321 autonomy and the profession. Many also suggested that the recommendations need to better
8
9 322 define key terms and shift the framing from negative to positive. Since there are few
10
11 323 differences between the draft Choosing Wisely recommendations and current
12
13 324 recommendations (Supplementary Table 1), the findings from this study are an important step
14
15 325 towards developing and testing strategies to increase adoption of Choosing Wisely
16
17 326 recommendations and replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.

22 327 **4.2. Strengths and weaknesses of the study**

23
24 328 A strength of this study is that two researchers developed a reliable coding framework to
25
26 329 code written feedback from physiotherapists regarding Choosing Wisely recommendations.
27
28 330 Level of agreement between the two researchers coding responses ranged from 'substantial'
29
30 331 (section six) to 'almost perfect' (sections one to five). The main weakness is the low response
31
32 332 rate to the survey (5.6%). Our sample might therefore not be representative of all members of
33
34 333 the Australian Physiotherapy Association; this reduces our confidence in the quantitative
35
36 334 results of our study. Further, as we have no demographic data for the participants, this might
37
38 335 limit external validity. Nevertheless, our qualitative data highlights possible targets to
39
40 336 increase adoption of Choosing Wisely recommendations among physiotherapists.

45 337 **4.3. Meaning of the study**

46
47 338 We found that some physiotherapists believe blanket recommendations should not guide
48
49 339 treatment choices and that clinical experience is more valuable than evidence. This is largely
50
51 340 consistent with a qualitative study of 31 physicians in emergency medicine, internal
52
53 341 medicine, hospital medicine, and cardiology from the United States (17). Many physicians
54
55 342 felt that Choosing Wisely recommendations should act as guide and not be a strict set of rules
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 343 for clinicians, while others disagreed with certain recommendations (e.g. general health
4
5 344 checks) based on their clinical experience.

6
7
8 345 Disagreement with blanket recommendations and valuing clinical experience over evidence
9
10 346 could explain why some physiotherapists do not use guidelines to inform their treatment
11
12 347 choices (10, 13, 18-19). For example, previous research found only 46% of physiotherapists
13
14 348 believe guidelines should inform the management of low back pain (survey of n=274) (11),
15
16 349 66% apply guidelines to more than half of their patients with acute ankle sprains (survey of
17
18 350 n=214) (18), and 39% use guidelines to inform the management of whiplash more than three-
19
20 351 quarters of the time (survey of n=237) (19). Challenging these beliefs could be an important
21
22 352 first step towards replacing low-value care with evidence-based care in physiotherapy.

23
24
25 353 Barriers to following Choosing Wisely recommendations emerged from our study. Some
26
27 354 physiotherapists expressed that recommendations do not consider clinical reasoning or
28
29 355 clinical experience, and make treatment 'recipe-based'. Others expressed that there will
30
31 356 always be exceptions to practice recommendations, such as patient preference and fear of
32
33 357 missing an important diagnosis. Similar barriers were identified in a Choosing Wisely report;
34
35 358 73% of physiotherapists were willing to perform low-value testing if requested by a patient
36
37 359 and 61% when uncertain of a diagnosis (20). However, a qualitative study of 19 physicians in
38
39 360 Canada identified different barriers of time pressure, uncertainty about what constitutes
40
41 361 necessary care, and fear of litigation (21). This highlights the importance of exploring
42
43 362 barriers to adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations across professions.

44
45
46 363 Physiotherapists appear to view practice recommendations as a recipe that does not allow for
47
48 364 clinical reasoning nor considering patient preference; this belief could make increasing
49
50 365 adoption of Choosing Wisely recommendations challenging. We believe that providing
51
52 366 individualised care and adhering to guideline recommendations are not mutually exclusive.
53
54
55 367 For example, physiotherapists need to tailor guideline-recommended treatments for low back

1
2
3 368 pain, such as education and exercise, because of patient-level factors including health literacy
4
5 369 and exercise preference. Clinical reasoning is also extremely important when it comes to
6
7 370 deciding whether a patient with low back pain requires imaging. This is illustrated by the fact
8
9 371 that ‘clinical suspicion’ is one of the few red flags endorsed in guidelines that are useful for
10
11 372 identifying patients with a serious pathology (22).

12
13
14
15 373 Some physiotherapists expressed that research evidence is not consistent with the treatment
16
17 374 outcomes they observe in the clinic. This opens up an interesting debate about the value of
18
19 375 healthcare and potential issues with using clinical experience to justify treatment choices.
20
21 376 One argument is that it is reasonable to conclude a treatment is appropriate if the patient
22
23 377 improves and they are happy with the care provided. The counter argument is that many
24
25 378 factors could explain why clinicians observe improvement in patient outcomes despite
26
27 379 providing treatment not supported by strong evidence. These include the confounding effects
28
29 380 of natural history, regression to the mean, placebo effects and other non-specific treatment
30
31 381 effects. In other words, the same patient might have got similar results from no treatment or
32
33 382 better results from a treatment supported by evidence. Views about the value of clinical
34
35 383 experience versus evidence could be the most difficult barrier to replacing low-value
36
37 384 physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.

38
39
40
41
42
43 385 The high proportion of physiotherapists that agreed with the draft Choosing Wisely
44
45 386 recommendations might explain why only minor changes were made to the final list
46
47 387 published by the Australian Physiotherapy Association. Further, our content analysis
48
49 388 highlighted key areas of disagreement with the recommendations that might have been
50
51 389 difficult to incorporate into a brief ‘do not do’ message (e.g. feedback that recommendations
52
53 390 do not consider clinical reasoning or clinical experience, and make treatment ‘recipe-based’).
54
55 391 Nevertheless, the Australian Physiotherapy Association did not ignore this feedback and
56
57 392 introduced the Choosing Wisely recommendations with the following statement: “*The*

1
2
3 393 *recommendations are not prescriptive - instead, they should help to start a conversation*
4
5 394 *about what is appropriate and necessary in individual patient consultation”.*
6
7

8 395 **4.4. Unanswered questions and future research directions**

9
10 396 This study provides insight into how physiotherapists view their Association’s Choosing
11
12 397 Wisely recommendations, although a more in-depth understanding of the barriers and
13
14 398 facilitators to adopting Choosing Wisely recommendations is needed. We plan to conduct
15
16 399 qualitative research to address this knowledge gap and further explore the barriers and
17
18 400 facilitators to replacing low-value physiotherapy with evidence-based physiotherapy.
19
20 401 Future research should explore how different aspects of the language of Choosing Wisely
21
22 402 could either support or discourage adoption of recommendations. Some physiotherapists
23
24 403 expressed that unqualified recommendations were key to changing practice, while others
25
26 404 believed that recommendations should be qualified to allow for clinical reasoning. Further,
27
28 405 some suggested that recommendations should focus on a positive message; either by
29
30 406 providing an alternative to low-value care or stating when a typically low-value intervention
31
32 407 could be provided. Choice experiments, such as discrete choice experiments or best-worst-
33
34 408 scaling surveys, are a useful tool for eliciting preferences in healthcare (23) and could be used
35
36 409 to determine whether modifying the language of Choosing Wisely recommendations could
37
38 410 increase clinicians’ willingness to follow them. Understanding how language influences the
39
40 411 adoption of Choosing Wisely recommendations has implications for refining existing and
41
42 412 developing new recommendations for the Australian Physiotherapy Association; as well as
43
44 413 for the 230+ professional societies worldwide with Choosing Wisely lists.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 414 **5. Conclusion**

54
55 415 Physiotherapists’ views regarding Choosing Wisely recommendations highlight a number of
56
57 416 areas of disagreement and suggestions for improvement. These findings could prove valuable
58
59 417 for developing and testing strategies to increase physiotherapists’ willingness to follow
60

1
2
3 418 Choosing Wisely recommendations and so replace low-value physiotherapy with evidence-
4
5
6 419 based physiotherapy.
7

8 420
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3 421 **Authors' contributions**
4

5 422 All authors critically revised the manuscript for important intellectual content and approved
6
7 423 the final manuscript. Please find below a detailed description of the role of each author:

- 8
9
10 424 - Joshua R Zadro: conception and design, acquisition, analysis and interpretation of
11
12 425 data, drafting and revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be
13
14 426 published
15
16 427 - Aimie Peek: conception and design, acquisition and interpretation of data, drafting
17
18 428 and revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
19
20
21 429 - Rachael Dodd: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and revision of
22
23 430 the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
24
25
26 431 - Kirsten McCaffery: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and
27
28 432 revision of the manuscript, and final approval of the version to be published
29
30 433 - Christopher G Maher: conception and design, interpretation of data, drafting and
31
32 434 revision of the manuscript and final approval of the version to be published
33
34

35 435 The Corresponding Author (JZ) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that
36
37 436 no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

38
39 437 **Competing interests:** All authors declare: no support from any organisation for the
40
41 438 submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest
42
43 439 in the submitted work; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have
44
45 440 influenced the submitted work.

46
47 441 **Acknowledgements:** The authors would like to thank the Australian Physiotherapy
48
49 442 Association for the study data.

50
51 443 **Ethics approval:** The University of Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee approved all
52
53 444 study procedures [Project number: 2018/518].
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 445 **Funding source:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the
4
5
6 446 public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

7
8 447 **Data availability statement:** De-identified participant data is not publicly available but may
9
10 448 be obtained from the Australian Physiotherapy Association upon request.

11
12
13 449

14
15
16 450

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

1
2
3 451 **References**
4

- 5 452 1. Scott IA, Duckett SJ. In search of professional consensus in defining and reducing
6
7 453 low-value care. *Med J Aust.* 2015;203(4):179-81.
8
9 454 2. Choosing Wisely. An initiative of the ABIM foundation.
10
11
12 455 <http://www.choosingwisely.org/>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
13
14 456 3. Choosing Wisely Australia. An initiative of NPS Medicine Wise.
15
16 457 <http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/home>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
17
18 458 4. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2013. Allied health workforce 2012.
19
20 459 National health workforce series no. 5. Cat. no. HWL 51. Canberra: AIHW.
21
22 460 5. The Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency and the National Boards.
23
24 461 Annual Reports 2010/11 to 2016/17.
25
26 462 6. Physiotherapy Board of Australia Registrant data. Reporting period: 1 October 2017 –
27
28 463 31 December 2017. <http://www.physiotherapyboard.gov.au/About/Statistics.aspx>. Accessed
29
30 464 18th Mar 2019.
31
32 465 7. Medical Board of Australia Registrant data. Reporting period: 1 October 2017 – 31
33
34 466 December 2017. <http://www.medicalboard.gov.au/News/Statistics.aspx>. Accessed 18th Mar
35
36 467 2019.
37
38 468 8. American Physical Therapy Association (APTA). Accredited PT and PTA Programs
39
40 469 Directory.
41
42 470 [http://aptaapps.apta.org/accreditedschoolsdirectory/default.aspx?UniqueKey&UniqueKey=.](http://aptaapps.apta.org/accreditedschoolsdirectory/default.aspx?UniqueKey&UniqueKey=)
43
44 471 Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
45
46 472 9. Data USA: Physical Therapists. Growth Projections.
47
48 473 <https://datausa.io/profile/soc/291123/#growth>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
49
50 474 10. Madson TJ, Hollman JH. Lumbar Traction for Managing Low Back Pain: A Survey
51
52 475 of Physical Therapists in the United States. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2015;45(8):586-95.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 476 11. Li LC, Bombardier C. Physical therapy management of low back pain: an exploratory
4
5 477 survey of therapist approaches. *Phys Ther.* 2001;81(4):1018-28.
6
7
8 478 12. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Guidelines. Low back pain
9
10 479 and sciatica in over 16s: assessment and management. November 2016.
11
12 480 <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng59>. Accessed 18th Mar 2019.
13
14
15 481 13. Ladeira CE, Cheng MS, da Silva RA. Clinical Specialization and Adherence to
16
17 482 Evidence-Based Practice Guidelines for Low Back Pain Management: A Survey of US
18
19 483 Physical Therapists. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2017;47(5):347-58.
20
21 484 14. Vos T, Abajobir A, Abate K, et al. Global, regional, and national incidence,
22
23 485 prevalence, and years lived with disability for 328 diseases and injuries for 195 countries,
24
25 486 1990–2016: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *The Lancet.*
26
27 487 2017;390(10100):1211-59.
28
29
30 488 15. Weber RP. Content analysis. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, California:
31
32 489 Sage, 1990:117–24.
33
34
35 490 16. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data.
36
37 491 *Biometrics.* 1977;33(1):159-74.
38
39
40 492 17. Bishop TF, Cea M, Miranda Y, et al. Academic physicians' views on low-value
41
42 493 services and the choosing wisely campaign: A qualitative study. *Healthc (Amst).* 2017;5(1-
43
44 494 2):17-22.
45
46
47 495 18. Leemrijse CJ, Plas GM, Hofhuis H, et al. Compliance with the guidelines for acute
48
49 496 ankle sprain for physiotherapists is moderate in the Netherlands: an observational study. *Aust*
50
51 497 *J Physiother.* 2006;52(4):293-9.
52
53
54 498 19. Corkery MB, Edgar KL, Smith CE. A survey of physical therapists' clinical practice
55
56 499 patterns and adherence to clinical guidelines in the management of patients with whiplash
57
58 500 associated disorders (WAD). *J Man Manip Ther.* 2014;22(2):75-89.
59
60

- 1
2
3 501 20. Choosing Wisely Australia. An initiative of NPS MedicineWise. Join the
4
5 502 conversation: 2017 Report. p.27. [http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-](http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx)
6
7 503 [4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx](http://www.choosingwisely.org.au/getmedia/042fedfe-6bdd-4a76-ae20-682f051eb791/Choosing-Wisely-in-Australia-2017-Report.aspx)
8
9
10 504 21. Embrett M, Randall GE. Physician perspectives on Choosing Wisely Canada as an
11
12 505 approach to reduce unnecessary medical care: a qualitative study. Health Res Policy Syst.
13
14 506 2018;16(1):95.
15
16
17 507 22. Verhagen AP, Downie A, Maher CG, et al. Most red flags for malignancy in low back
18
19 508 pain guidelines lack empirical support: a systematic review. Pain. 2017;158(10):1860-8.
20
21
22 509 23. Flynn TN, Louviere JJ, Peters TJ, et al. Best–worst scaling: What it can do for health
23
24 510 care research and how to do it. J Health Econ. 2007;26(1):171-89.
25
26
27 511
28
29
30 512
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Comparison of draft and current Choosing Wisely recommendations from the Australian Physiotherapy Association

Draft recommendations	Current recommendations	Modification
Don't use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.	Don't request imaging for patients with non-specific low back pain and no indicators of a serious cause for low back pain.	Split into 3 recommendations each specifying a different clinical scenario
	Don't request imaging of the cervical spine in trauma patients, unless indicated by a validated decision rule.	
	Don't request imaging for acute ankle trauma unless indicated by the Ottawa Ankle Rules. (localized bone tenderness or inability to weight-bear as defined in the Rules)	
Don't use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.	Don't routinely use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.	'Don't' was replaced by 'Don't routinely'
Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.	Avoid using electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.	'Don't use' was replaced by 'Avoid using'
Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder	Don't provide ongoing manual therapy for patients with adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.	'Don't use' was replaced by 'Don't provide'. The population was broadened from patients 'following acute adhesive capsulitis' to all patients with adhesive capsulitis
Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.	No recommendation	This recommendation was not included in the current list

513

514

Table 2. Draft recommendations and survey questions

	Context	Example recommendation from the APTA	Question
Section 1	The Choosing Wisely format deliberately uses “don’t” or similar wording, and is expressly intended to incite discussion about interventions. One of the “5 Things Physical Therapists and Patients Should Question” by the American Physical Therapy Association in 2014 was:	Don’t employ passive physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program.	In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?
	Draft recommendation	Explanation	Question
Section 2	Don’t use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.	Imaging should only be requested when clinically appropriate. Physiotherapists should use appropriate clinical decision making tools such as Ottawa Ankle Rules, Canadian C-Spine Rule, Nexus, and should not be used in cases of non-specific low back pain with no signs of serious pathology.	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?
Section 3	Don’t use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.	Physiotherapists should not routinely use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery. Physiotherapists should instead consider adding other interventions to standard care. For example, there is high level evidence for the addition of	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

		preoperative inspiratory muscle training when added to usual care.	
Section 4	Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.	Clinical practice guidelines don't recommend electrotherapy modalities to manage low back pain. Physiotherapists should instead consider other interventions to manage low back pain, for example exercise prescription and education.	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?
Section 5	Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.	Physiotherapists should consider a range of other interventions to manage acute adhesive capsulitis, like exercise to optimize function, education and appropriate management of pain.	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?
Section 6	Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.	Physiotherapists should facilitate and empower the patient's independent management of chronic conditions.	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?

515 APTA: American Physical Therapy Association.

516

Table 3. Agreement and disagreement with survey questions

Section	Question	Agree, n (%)	Disagree, n (%)	Neither, n (%)
One	In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?	347 (63.9%)	134 (24.7%)	62 (11.4%)
Two	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?	416 (76.6%)	20 (3.7%)	107 (19.7%)
Three	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?	328 (60.4%)	43 (7.9%)	172 (31.7%)
Four	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?	284 (52.3%)	138 (25.4%)	121 (22.3%)
Five	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?	322 (59.3%)	87 (16.0%)	134 (24.7%)
Six	Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?	341 (62.8%)	74 (13.6%)	128 (23.6%)

Supplementary Tables

Supplementary Table 1. Coding Framework

Supplementary Table 2. Number of responses, codes, percent exact agreement and Kappa (95% Confidence Interval) for the level of agreement between reviews for coding a random sample of responses

N: number of responses coded; k: kappa coefficient; CI: confidence interval.

Supplementary Table 3. Frequency of codes in response to Section One to Six

N: number of respondents; *: percent of respondents that completed the free-text field for this question.

Supplementary Table 1. Coding framework

SECTION 1

CONTEXT: The Choosing Wisely format deliberately uses “don’t” or similar wording, and is expressly intended to incite discussion about interventions. One of the “5 Things Physical Therapists and Patients Should Question” by the American Physical Therapy Association in 2014 was:

RECOMMENDATION: Don’t employ passive physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program.

QUESTION: In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?

CODING FRAMEWORK:**Response suggests disagreement****1. Unqualified statements are inappropriate**

- Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language

2. Would benefit from further refining

- Any suggestion/comment for how the wording could be changed

3. Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence

- Any comment suggesting that the respondents experience is more trustworthy than research evidence

4. Shift framing from negative to positive

- Any comment suggesting that recommendations need to be more positive (e.g. providing a high-value alternative alongside a ‘don’t’ recommendation, instructing clinicians what to do)

5. Threat to autonomy or the profession

- Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
- Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations could negatively impacting the profession

6. New evidence might change recommendations

- Any comment that suggests new evidence might contradict current recommendations

Response suggests agreement**7. Using unqualified statements is important**

- Any positive comment regarding the use of strong language

8. Provokes discussion

- Any mention of discussion or debate prompted by the recommendations

9. Will help change practice

- Any mention of how the recommendations will change practice

10. No further comment

- Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement (e.g. “I agree with this statement”)

SECTION 2

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.

EXPLANATION: Imaging should only be requested when clinically appropriate.

Physiotherapists should use appropriate clinical decision making tools such as Ottawa Ankle Rules, Canadian C-Spine Rule, Nexus, and should not be used in cases of non-specific low back pain with no signs of serious pathology.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?

CODING FRAMEWORK:**Response suggests disagreement****1. Blanket rules are inappropriate**

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation is inappropriate because it does not apply to every patient

2. Clinical experience is more valuable than validated decision rules

- Any comment suggesting that the respondents experience is more trustworthy than validated decision rules

3. Threat to autonomy or the profession

- Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
- Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations could negatively impacting the profession

Response suggests agreement**4. No further comment**

- Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement

5. Educating patients and clinicians will support adoption

- Any comment suggesting that educating patients and clinicians will support uptake of this recommendation

Feedback on wording**6. Would benefit from further refining**

- Any suggestion/comment for how the wording could be improved

7. Unqualified statements are inappropriate

- Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language

Not area of expertise

- Any acknowledgement that this recommendation is outside the expertise of the respondent

SECTION 3

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should not routinely use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery. Physiotherapists should instead consider adding other interventions to standard care. For example, there is high level evidence for the addition of preoperative inspiratory muscle training when added to usual care.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?

CODING FRAMEWORK:**Not area of expertise**

- Any acknowledgement that this recommendation is outside the expertise of the respondent

Response suggests disagreement**1. Blanket rules are inappropriate**

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation is inappropriate because it does not apply to every patient

2. Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence

- Any comment suggesting that the respondents experience is more trustworthy than research evidence

3. Questions the purpose of the recommendation

- Any comment that questions why the recommendation made the Choosing Wisely 'Top Five' list

4. Threat to autonomy or the profession

- Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
- Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations negatively impacting the profession

Response suggests agreement**5. No further comment**

- Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement

6. Will help promote evidence-based care

- Any comment that suggests this recommendation will increase clinicians' use of evidence-based care

Feedback on wording**1. Would benefit from further refining**

- Any suggestion/comment for how the wording could be changed

2. Shift focus from negative to positive

- Any comment suggesting that recommendations need to be more positive

3. Unqualified statements are inappropriate

- Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language

SECTION 4

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.

EXPLANATION: Clinical practice guidelines don't recommend electrotherapy modalities to manage low back pain. Physiotherapists should instead consider other interventions to manage low back pain, for example exercise prescription and education.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?

CODING FRAMEWORK:

Response suggests disagreement

- 1. Appropriate to use as adjunct to high-value treatments**
 - Any comment highlighting the value of using electrotherapy alongside other treatments (e.g. exercise)
- 2. Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence**
 - Any comment suggesting that the respondents experience is more trustworthy than research evidence
- 3. Blanket rules are inappropriate**
 - Any comment that suggests the recommendation is inappropriate because it does not apply to every patient
- 4. Threat to autonomy and the profession**
 - Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
 - Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations negatively impacting the profession
- 5. New evidence might change recommendations**
 - Any comment that suggests new evidence might contradict the recommendation

Response suggests agreement

- 6. No further comment**
 - Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement
- 7. The use of electrotherapy must be reduced**
 - Any comment highlighting the need to reduce the use of electrotherapy
- 8. Other evidence-based treatments are available**
 - Any comment that highlights the availability of evidence-based treatments for low back pain

Feedback on wording

- 9. Absolute statements are inappropriate**
 - Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language
- 10. Better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy provided**
 - Any comment that suggests the recommendation should be clearer about the type of low back pain (or musculoskeletal condition) it's referring to (e.g. acute low back pain)
 - Any comment that suggests the recommendation should be clearer about the type of electrotherapy it's referring to (e.g. ultrasound)

1
2
3 **11. Shift framing from negative to positive**

- 4 ▪ Any comment suggesting that recommendations need to be more positive

5
6 **Not area of expertise**

- 7 ▪ Any acknowledgement that this recommendation is outside the expertise of the
8 respondent
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

SECTION 5

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should consider a range of other interventions to manage acute adhesive capsulitis, like exercise to optimize function, education and appropriate management of pain.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?

CODING FRAMEWORK:

Response suggests disagreement

1. Blanket rules are inappropriate

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation is inappropriate because it does not apply to every patient

2. Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence

- Any comment suggesting that the respondents experience is more trustworthy than research evidence

3. Threat to autonomy and the profession

- Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
- Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations negatively impacting the profession

4. Appropriate to use as adjunct to evidence-based care

- Any comment highlighting the value of using ongoing manual therapy alongside other treatments interventions (e.g. exercise)

5. New evidence might change recommendations

- Any comment that suggests new evidence might contradict the recommendation

Response suggests agreement

6. No further comment

- Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement

7. Other evidence-based treatments may be available

- Any comment that highlights the availability of evidence-based treatments for adhesive capsulitis

8. No evidence manual therapy alters natural history

- Any comment that highlights the lack of benefit of manual therapy for adhesive capsulitis or the favourable natural history of adhesive capsulitis

Feedback on wording

9. Better define the presentation and manual therapy provided

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation should be clearer about the stage of adhesive capsulitis it's referring to (e.g. early vs. late stage)
- Any comment that suggests the recommendation should be clearer about the type of manual therapy it's referring to (e.g. massage, manipulation, passive movements)

10. Unqualified statements are inappropriate

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language

Not area of expertise

- Any acknowledgement that this recommendation is outside the expertise of the respondent

For peer review only

SECTION 6

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.

EXPLANATION: Physiotherapists should facilitate and empower the patient's independent management of chronic conditions.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?

CODING FRAMEWORK:**1. Not area of expertise****Response suggests disagreement****1. Physiotherapy could prevent deterioration in symptoms**

- Any comment highlighting that the role of a physiotherapist can be to maintain a patient's function or prevent deterioration

2. Blanket rules are inappropriate

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation is inappropriate because it does not apply to every patient

3. Concerns over use of outcome measures

- Any comment highlighting potential issues with outcome measures (e.g. availability, suitability, sensitivity to detect change, relevance to patients)

4. Threat to autonomy and the profession

- Any comment expressing concern about clinicians not being able to apply clinical reasoning
- Any comment expressing concerns that the recommendations negatively impacting the profession

Response suggests agreement**5. No further comment**

- Any form of agreement that does not specify the reason for agreement

6. Physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try to reduce overtreatment

- Any comment highlighting the potential harms of overtreatment in physiotherapy (e.g. unnecessary spending, diminishes the value of physiotherapy services)

Feedback on wording**7. Better define ambiguous terms**

- Any comment that suggests the recommendation should be clearer about the meaning of 'ongoing' and the type of patient outcomes it's referring to

8. Unqualified statements are inappropriate

- Any negative comment regarding the use of strong language

9. Shift framing from negative to positive

- Any comment suggesting that the recommendation needs to be more positive

Unclear response

- Any response that could not be interpreted

Supplementary Table 2. Number of responses, codes, percent exact agreement and Kappa (95% Confidence Interval) for the level of agreement between reviews for coding a random sample of responses

Characteristic of recommendations	N (%)	Codes	Agreement	k	95% CI
All sections	114 (24.8)	165	86%	0.85	0.78-0.91
Section 1	16 (20.5)	24	91%	0.89	0.73-1.00
Section 2	15 (25.9)	18	94%	0.91	0.68-1.00
Section 3	21 (28.4)	24	91%	0.86	0.66-1.00
Section 4	29 (30.2)	46	86%	0.84	0.70-0.96
Section 5	14 (20.6)	23	94%	0.93	0.76-1.00
Section 6	19 (22.4)	28	80%	0.75	0.54-0.94

N: number of responses coded; k: kappa coefficient; CI: confidence interval.

Supplementary Table 3. Frequency of codes in response to Section One to Six

SECTION ONE				
RECOMMENDATION: Don't employ passive physical agents except when necessary to facilitate participation in an active treatment program.				
QUESTION: In the context of the intent of the Choosing Wisely campaign do you think style of wording is an acceptable method to engage the physiotherapy profession in a conversation about evidence based clinical practice?				
Code description	Example	N	%*	
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>				
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	I would prefer an alternative phrase such as 'don't routinely'. I think the absolute statement of 'don't' requires an exhaustive list of all of the possible, even if rare, exceptions.	49	32.2	
Would benefit from further refining	The statement is very broad which may need further refining in the actual discussion document.	34	22.4	
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	This is an entirely inappropriate blanket statement. For example, a 12 year old comes in with a first ever episode of an acute wry neck. This can be completely resolved in one passive treatment. It would be inappropriate to give them a home exercise program as there is no evidence that it would be useful and it could focus them on having a problem which could create hyper-vigilance.	19	12.5	
Shift framing from negative to positive	I would prefer a discussion point around the affirmative rather than the negative, e.g. only choose passive physical agents with demonstrable measurable outcomes.	18	11.8	
Threat to autonomy or the profession	Combative and deprecating approach to practitioners. Suggestive of disrespect of practitioner and lack of sincere care for our patients.	16	10.5	
New evidence might change recommendations	'Don't' is a strong word and if in the future an Australia Physiotherapy Association 'Don't' suggestion is found to be incorrect then the Australia Physiotherapy Association would have to provide an answer. More appropriate wording could be 'The current evidence suggests...'	4	2.6	
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>				
Using unqualified statements is important	Physiotherapy, like other health professions, is inherently conservative and resistant to change. Physiotherapists won't pay attention to vaguely worded advice. The DON'T format is the key to the effectiveness of the Choosing Wisely strategy.	22	14.5	
Provokes discussion	Especially where the explanation is provided as to why. I feel it is an emotive and engaging way to start a conversation/healthy debate.	20	13.2	
Will help change practice	Strong, directive language is appropriate to make clinicians realise that they are directions to follow not suggestions to consider.	12	7.9	

No further comment I would completely agree with this statement - can't think of a better way of wording this concept! 12 7.9

SECTION TWO

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use imaging where validated decision rules indicate imaging is not necessary.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use imaging when validated decision rules indicate it is not necessary?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Doesn't always correlate with patient's wishes - sometimes they just want peace of mind, despite our clinical judgement.	27	25.5
Clinical experience is more valuable than validated decision rules	X-rays can give important but subtle information about the presenting circumstances - DISH; functional instability. The rules were developed around a concept of sensitivity for specific diagnoses. What level of risk are you prepared to accept and are these the only pathologies where x-rays are useful to the clinically reasoned management? Consequently they are limited, if not conceptually flawed.	21	19.8
Threat to autonomy or the profession	The situations where I would recommend imaging is when the patient is over cautious and if I have had trouble establishing a professional rapport with them even after explaining decision making to them. It is important that the patient has a professional belief in us because often the doctor will say something that has not been based on clinical decision and the patient believes that. E.g. the doctor says...and with questioning they haven't even looked at the body part. The reason for this is they are likely to go back to their doctor who will recommend an X ray anyway. Some patients feel the need to have this investigated and if that gives them piece of mind and therefore aids/speeds up their recovery then I am not against it.	5	4.7
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	This is one area that there is clear evidence. The evidence supports that imaging can in fact do harm such as exposure to unnecessary radiation and in some cases impede progress and recovery. This is an important recommendation.	43	40.6
Educating patients and clinicians will support adoption	I think the APA should do a members value webinar promoting the Western Australia radiology imaging pathways website and mobile phone app. There is need for more education and easier access to the rules, as well as discussion on how to explain this to the modern client who wants images.	10	9.4
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Would benefit from further refining	Should we be a little more specific here and identify one area. It is still quite broad and worried that not ALL physios will understand validated decision rules or know of these.	16	15.1

Unqualified statements are inappropriate	Avoid using 'should not' - go for 'physiotherapists are urged to avoid imaging'... or 'Best practice indicates that physiotherapists follow validated decision rules regarding not imaging when contraindicated.'	3	2.8
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	This is not an area I have enough knowledge or experience to comment on.	3	2.8

SECTION THREE

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use incentive spirometry after upper abdominal and cardiac surgery?

Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I don't work in this area so prefer not to comment.	70	51.1
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Another ideal recommendation that doesn't take health economics & workload into account. There are still plenty of patients who would never be seen pre-op, regardless of the planned surgery.	19	13.9
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	Patients are individuals and in my experience sometimes it has been indicated and also helpful but mass use is not indicated.	16	11.7
Questions the purpose of the recommendation	Patients enjoy and are encouraged by post-op increases in vital capacity etc. Negligible cost blowing in a machine.	5	3.6
Threat to autonomy or the profession	It is one tool in the toolbox, there is no reason not to use it other than that there is no evidence for its routine use. I really dislike these blanket DONT statements. They go against clinical judgement and reasoning...	3	2.2
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	Love this!	17	12.4
Will help promote evidence-based care	Getting this out there with the medical professions' recommendations is exciting. Hopefully it will help us get the message to them to help influence a change in the hospital setting.	11	8.0
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Would benefit from further refining	The statement should mention evidence regarding early mobility rather than just inspiratory muscle training.	10	7.3

Shift framing from negative to positive	Statement doesn't address recommended therapy AFTER these surgeries at all - what about mobilization?	8	5.8
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	Don't infer it should never be used. This is not a safety issue that warrants a 'DONT'. Incentive spirometry may still be appropriate in some select patients who otherwise have difficulty taking/coordinating deep breaths, or who are post-operatively confused, or need motivation.	4	2.9

SECTION FOUR

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use use electrotherapy modalities in the management of patients with low back pain?

Code description	Example	N	%*
Response suggests disagreement			
Appropriate to use as adjunct to evidence-based care	Used in conjunction with appropriate education, active exercise etc. may provide enough short term relief to encourage full participation in the before mentioned strategies.	54	30.0
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	Very few physios just use electro of anything and they need to [be] educated. However, in the real world of quality musculoskeletal practice, many physios use electro +/- heat/cold therapy as an adjunct to manual, exercise and other therapies. It is patient specific may be short term analgesia or easing for the muscle spasm and this may improve movement quality and exercise compliance. Used well there is no down side clinically and costs the patient and system nothing.	51	28.3
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Lower back pain can present with lots of erector spinae spasm. Studies have shown that Interferential Therapy and Transcutaneous Electro-Nerve Stimulation are effective analgesics and do not have side effects. Unlike Codeine. How the heck do you expect to establish trust with a patient if we are not reducing their fear and pain before touching them when they are in strong pain?	51	28.3
Threat to autonomy or the profession	Why would the college/panel of experts see this as one of the top 5 thing going wrong in physio practice? Incredible really. I employ a dozen physios, am a titled MS and Sports physio and have not found a colleague who agrees with this one! The feeling is that the Australian Physiotherapy Association has lost touch for even starting down this track!	11	6.1
New evidence might change recommendations	Research published in the Lancet regarding the effectiveness of low level laser to treat cervical pain may indicate a place for this in low back pain but I am not aware of any research to show this is effective or not so I am not happy about a blanket ban of use of all modalities. Laser may well prove to be of use.	6	3.3

Response suggests agreement

No further comment	100% agree.	23	12.8
The use of electrotherapy must be reduced	Physiotherapists are intelligent people who should be able to use a multitude of more successful and evidence based treatments for low back pain patients. Anyone resorting to the passive electrophysical modalities is either trying to pump through as many patients as they can to make money or hasn't done a course recently enough to give them up to date treatment approaches.	13	7.2
Other evidence-based treatments are available	Physiotherapists have so many more manual and exercise skill sets to offer patients with low back pain.	11	6.1
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Better define the disease presentation and modality of electrotherapy provided	This is a very general statement about many types of applications. It would be better to see electrotherapy replaced with a specific modality for which there is Level 1 evidence.	17	9.4
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	This statement I think reflects academics who are not working in the clinical setting for most of their practice. Ask any clinician and they would comment that to put a blanket ban so to speak on electrotherapy is probably exceeding the actual value of the evidence we have. That said, there is no doubt that long-term management of backs should not be based upon electrotherapy of course, but clients will tell you that TENS and such actually do provide the ability to improve their activities of daily living. Hence my concern with 'Don't'. Rather something like 'it should not be the mainstay of therapy' or similar...	9	5.0
Shift framing from negative to positive	Is the statement: " <i>Clinical practice guidelines don't recommend electrotherapy modalities to manage low back pain. Physiotherapists should instead consider other interventions to manage low back pain, for example exercise prescription and education</i> " going to be included in our statement, if so I like this recommendation.	4	2.2
<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I don't know the latest evidence to comment here.	3	1.7

SECTION FIVE

RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.

QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing manual therapy for patients following acute adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder?

Code description	Example	N	%*
-------------------------	----------------	----------	-----------

<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>		
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Another concern with the wording is that limited manual therapy may be used to improve scapula position and control which is usually a problem in these cases.	43 30.1
Clinical experience is more valuable than evidence	In the subacute to chronic setting I have effectively used manual therapy to improve shoulder range. I am at a loss as to how this evidence was derived. In the acute setting I agree, but this statement appears to put a blanket ban on all manual therapy for all such shoulders.	28 19.6
Threat to autonomy or the profession	It does not matter what works in 2 or 3 studies, physiotherapists must be free to choose a variety of techniques and use more than one and education for each patient. Look at the way sports people are treated. I am thinking specific exercise type angles, timing and repetitions. Your committee could do well to stop 10 reps practice for all patients of all ages in hospital. More fruitful than this witch hunt against Private Practice practitioners.	7 4.9
Appropriate to use as adjunct to evidence-based care	This is never performed in isolation, but in conjunction with appropriate range of motion and strengthening exercises as range returns.	7 4.9
New evidence might change recommendations	As the recent Cochrane review concluded that " <i>No trial compared a combination of manual therapy and exercise versus placebo or no intervention</i> " I don't think we can dismiss the use of manual therapy so quickly in the management of this condition.	6 4.2
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>		
No further comment	Respect the process of physiology with this disorder	23 16.1
Other evidence-based treatments may be available	Hydrodilatation should be utilised by medical staff on a more regular basis.	14 9.8
No evidence manual therapy alters natural history	There is clear evidence that not only does manual therapy not facilitate recovery, but may actually impede recovery. Ongoing manual treatment reduces patients' self-efficacy and promotes dependency.	4 2.8
<u>Feedback on wording</u>		
Better define the disease presentation and manual therapy provided	Not sure here what is meant by ongoing how ongoing days. Months, years?	27 18.9
Unqualified statements are inappropriate	I don't think we know enough about this condition to be making clear and decisive statements. Maybe a statement saying " <i>Don't use ongoing manual therapy for patients (who do not respond) with adhesive capsulitis of the shoulder.</i> " Ideally, we shouldn't be doing anything ongoing if the patient does not respond.	10 7.0

<u>Not area of expertise</u>	I can't comment on this clinically as I'm not across the evidence for this	12	8.4
SECTION SIX			
RECOMMENDATION: Don't use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there isn't improvement in measurable patient outcomes.			
QUESTION: Do you agree that physiotherapists should not use ongoing physiotherapy in cases where there is no improvement in measurable patient outcomes?			
Code description	Example	N	%*
<u>Response suggests disagreement</u>			
Physiotherapy could prevent/reduce deterioration in symptoms	I work with a number of patients with palliative conditions. For them, the goal may be MAINTAINING as opposed to IMPROVING function. In these cases, it can be hard to anticipate the trajectory of the disease progression, but I think physiotherapy still plays a vital role in maintaining the patients' independence.	46	29.9
Blanket rules are inappropriate	Occasionally there are chronic patients with chronic conditions that still need our help/support/advice/symptomatic relief. Do we just turn our backs on them?	39	25.3
Concern over use of outcome measures	What you can objectively measure and the response or benefit the patient receives, are often quite divergent. What I mean is that if the patient doesn't believe they are getting anywhere and the physiotherapist is ethical, of course they would cease treatment. However, if the patient 'feels better' by getting physiotherapy intervention, who are you to say they can't access it. After all it is their money they are spending.	18	11.7
Threat to autonomy or the profession	I have seen it time and again where physio has been written off because of failed physio interventions - however the failure has not been because physio cannot work, but because ineffective, non-evidence-based strategies have been administered often by junior or burnt-out physios.	17	11.0
<u>Response suggests agreement</u>			
No further comment	Patient and therapist both have better things to do.	38	24.7
Physiotherapy should focus on outcomes and try to reduce overtreatment	Absolutely, it diminishes the value of our profession and gives the appearance we are revenue raising, when treatment is continued when there is no change in measureable outcomes (or in fact I suspect sometimes, no initial assessment of outcome measures to review).	15	9.7
<u>Feedback on wording</u>			
Better define ambiguous terms	I feel this is too vague and doesn't really mean anything. There is no time limit imposed and in some cases there won't be improvement, but rather a prevention of decline in outcomes. Also, what is meant by	27	17.5

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

physiotherapy - is this just the application of physical interventions, or a broader scope of practice like education, self-management support , cognitive behavioural therapy, etc.

Unqualified statements are inappropriate	To say 'Don't' worries me. Obviously we want to achieve positive client outcomes and these might include their own functional improvement, validated outcome scores, subjective and objective findings. My concern is that this statement needs qualification in that it appears that if outcome scores are not improving then physio should cease.	5	3.2
Shift framing from negative to positive	For a start the facilitation and empowerment is physiotherapy! Needs rewording to something like physiotherapy management should focus on.....	4	2.6
Unclear response	I am unsure and the details of a service that HCF audited and confirmed that 8 years of exercise therapy, twice weekly was appropriate for average back patients. Are there any normative statistics of the average length of back care programs in our industry?	1	0.6

N: number of respondents; *: percent of respondents that completed the free-text field for this question.

STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	Evidence
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	Pg1.
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	Pg2.
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	Pg5-6. Introduction
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	Pg 6.
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	Pg 6. Study design
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	Pg6-7
Participants	6	(a) <i>Cohort study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up	Pg 6. Participants and recruitment
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	
		(b) <i>Cohort study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	N/A
		<i>Case-control study</i> —For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	Pg6-7. Data collection
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	Pg6-7. Data collection
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	Pg 7-8. Data analysis
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	Pg 6. Participants and recruitment
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	Pg 7-8. Data analysis
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	Pg 7-8. Data analysis

		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	N/A
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	N/A
		(d) <i>Cohort study</i> —If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	N/A
		<i>Case-control study</i> —If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	N/A
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	Pg 8. Results
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	N/A
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	N/A
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	N/A
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	N/A
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	N/A
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	N/A
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	N/A
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	Pg 8-14. Results
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	N/A
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	N/A
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	N/A
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	N/A
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	Pg 15-16. Discussion.
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	Pg 16.
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	Pg16-18
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	Pg16-18

Other information

Funding 22 Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based Pg21.

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

For peer review only