

**Supplementary file 2 Secondary Outcomes and Measures**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Measure and items</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Reliability where available</b>	<b>Administration point, trial arms</b>
LBP patients risk of chronicity	StarT Back Screening Tool <sup>[1]</sup>  9-items	Patients rate agreement/ disagreement with a range (8) of modifiable prognostic indicators including bothersomeness, disability and mood over the past 2 weeks.	Internal consistency: 0.74 <sup>[1, 2]</sup>	Baseline only
Physiotherapists General Causality Orientations	General Causality Orientation Scale <sup>[3]</sup>  36-items	PTs rate their likely behaviour in a range of vignettes evaluating autonomous, controlling and impersonal responses on a 7-point scale ranging from very unlikely to very likely.	Internal consistency for 3 subscales range: 0.69-0.74 <sup>[3]</sup>	Pre-training
Physiotherapists autonomous and controlled motivation to participate in training	Motivation to Participate Questionnaire <sup>[4]</sup>  8-items	PTs rate their reasons for participating in training on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from not at all true to very true.	No reliability data available	Pre-training
Osteoarthritis specific-functional disability	WOMAC Function Daily Living Subscale Hip or Knee* <sup>[5]</sup>  17-items	Patients rate difficulty with hip and/or knee in performing various everyday activities.	Internal consistency for the subscales range: 0.83-0.96 <sup>[6]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Low back pain-specific functional disability	Roland-Morris Disability Questionnaire* <sup>[7]</sup>  24-items	Patients respond to statements which match their experience of low back pain on the day of completion on a dichotomous scale.	Internal consistency: 0.91 <sup>[7]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Physical component of functional disability	Short Form-12* <sup>[8]</sup>  12-items	Patients rate health and the limitations caused by physical problems on 5 point Likert scales ranging from all of the time to none of the time.	Internal consistency: 0.77 <sup>[9]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Pain intensity	Pain Rating	Patients rate their level	Inter-rater	Baseline,

	Scale* <sup>[10]</sup> 1-item	of pain in the past week on an 11-point numeric scale.	reliability: 0.56 <sup>[11]</sup>	2 months, 6 months
Pain bothersomeness	Single item on a numeric rating scale* <sup>[1, 12]</sup> 1-item	Patients rate how bothered they've been by their pain in the last week on a 5-point scale ranging from not at all to extremely.	Internal consistency: 0.79 <sup>[1, 12]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Quality of life [Health state]	EuroQol Weighted Health Index <sup>[13]</sup> 5-items	Patients describe their current health state under five domains: mobility, self-care, usual activities, pain/discomfort, anxiety/depression.	Test-retest reliability range for the subscales range: 0.70-0.85 <sup>[14]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Mood	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale <sup>[15]</sup> 14-items	Patients rate agreement with items related to anxiety or depression, such as "I feel tense or 'wound up'" on a 4-point scale.	Internal consistency for the subscales range: 0.78-0.86 <sup>[16]</sup>	Baseline, 2 months, 6 months
Global impression of change	Global Perceived Effect Scale* <sup>[17]</sup> 1-item	Patients rate on an 11-point scale the level of change (positive or negative) in their hip, knee and/or back pain between now and when the pain episode started ranging from vastly worse to vastly recovered.	Test-retest reliability excellent: intraclass correlation coefficient: 0.90-0.99 <sup>[18]</sup>	2 months, 6 months
Resource utilisation costs related to the patient	Client Services Receipt Inventory <sup>[19]</sup> 20-items	Patients recall costs related to their condition and its treatment: healthcare, labour productivity changes, costs borne by patients and their families and state benefits received.	Concordance correlation: 0.756 <sup>[20]</sup>	Baseline, 6 months
Resource utilisation costs related to providing treatment	Brief questionnaire developed for this trial 10-items  Purchase	Treating PTs record staff time, facilities, equipment used to provide treatment. Overheads will be estimated.  Actual costs of	No reliability data available	End of treatment

	invoices	producing, printing or purchasing intervention materials will be documented.		
--	----------	--	--	--

\*Minimum Data Set

1. Hill JC, Dunn KM, Lewis M, et al. A primary care back pain screening tool: identifying patient subgroups for initial treatment. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008;59:632-41. doi: 10.1002/art.23563.
2. Bruyère O, Demoulin M, Beaudart C, et al. Validity and reliability of the French version of the STarT Back Screening Tool for patients with low back pain. *Spine* 2014;39:E123-E28. doi: 10.1097/BRS.000000000000062
3. Williams GC, Grow VM, Freedman ZR, et al. Motivational predictors of weight loss and weight-loss maintenance. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1996;70:115-26.
4. Black AE, Deci EL. The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory perspective. *Sci Ed* 1989;84:740-56.
5. Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, et al. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to anti-rheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *J Rheumatol* 1988;15:1833-40.
6. Roos EM, Klassbo M, Lohmander LS. WOMAC osteoarthritis index. Reliability, validity, and responsiveness in patients with arthroscopically assessed osteoarthritis. Western Ontario and MacMaster Universities. *Scand J Rheumatol* 1999;28:210-5.
7. Roland M, Morris R. A study of the natural history of back pain. Part I: development of a reliable and sensitive measure of disability in low-back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 1983;8:141-4.
8. Ware Jr JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care* 1996;34:220-233.
9. Luo X, George ML, Kakouras I, et al. Reliability, validity, and responsiveness of the short form 12-item survey (SF-12) in patients with back pain. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 2003;28:1739-1745.
10. McCaffery M, & Beebe A. *Pain: Clinical Manual for Nursing Practice*. Baltimore: V.V. Mosby Company, 1989.
11. van Tubergen A, Debats I, Ryser L, et al. Use of a numerical rating scale as an answer modality in ankylosing spondylitis-specific questionnaires. *Arthritis Rheum* 2002;47:242-8.
12. Dunn KM, Croft PR. Classification of low back pain in primary care: using "bothersomeness" to identify the most severe cases. *Spine* 2005;30:1887-92.
13. Group TE. EuroQol-a new facility for the measurement of health-related quality of life. *Health Policy* 1990;16:199-208.
14. Hurst NP, Kind P, Ruta D, et al. Measuring health-related quality of life in rheumatoid arthritis: validity, responsiveness and reliability of EuroQol (EQ-5D). *Brit J Rheumatol* 1997;36:551-9.
15. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1983;67:361-70.
16. Montazeri A, Vahdaninia M, Ebrahimi M, et al. The hospital anxiety and depression scale (HADS): translation and validation study of the Iranian version. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2003;1:14.
17. Fischer D, Stewart AL, Bloch DA, et al. Capturing the patient's view of change as a clinical outcome measure. *Jama* 1999;282:1157-62.
18. Kamper SJ, Ostelo RW, Knol DL, et al. Global perceived effect scales provided reliable assessments of health transition in people with musculoskeletal disorders, but ratings are strongly influenced by current status. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;63:760-766.e1 doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.09.009 [published Online First: 8 January 2010].

19. Chisholm D, Knapp MR, Knudsen HC, et al. Client socio-demographic and service receipt inventory-European Version: development of an instrument for international research. EPSILON Study 5. European Psychiatric Services: Inputs Linked to Outcome Domains and Needs. *Brit J Psychiatry Suppl* 2000(39):s28-33.
20. Patel A, Rendu A, Moran P, et al. A comparison of two methods of collecting economic data in primary care. *Fam Pract* 2005;22:323-7.