Supplementary material has been published as submitted. It has not been copyedited, or typeset by Journal of Rehabilitation Medicine

Table SI. A checklist for the electronic patient record data.

ID				
Date of consent				
First contacting professional:				
1) physician; 2) first nurse and then physician;	3) physiotherap	ist; 4) nurse alone		
Number of LBP related appointments	3 months	12 months		
Physiotherapist				
Nurse				
Physician				
Physiatrist				
Ortopedic surgeon				
All primary care contacts				
Number of LBP-related sick leave days				
	1	<u>, </u>		
Radiograph (X-ray)	yes/no	yes/no		
Magnetic resonance imaging	yes/no	yes/no		
Computed tomography	yes/no	yes/no		
Evaluation of implementation according to patie	ent registry doc	umentation from		
baseline contact (=date of consent)				
Pain characteristics				
Presence of radicular pain	Yes / No /Unknown			
Presence of muscle weakness	Yes / No /Unknown			
Presence of cauda equina symptoms	Yes / No /Unknown			
Pain intensity (NRS)				
Physical functioning documented	Yes / No /Unknown			
STarT Back Tool (SBT) used	Yes / No			
SBT risk group	Low-risk / Medium-risk / High-risk			

Care plan according to risk group	Yes / No		
Lifestyle and psychosocial factors documented	Yes / No		
Mood	Documented /no documentation		
Social situation	Documented /no documentation		
Sleep	Documented /no documentation		
Physical activity	Documented /no documentation		
Smoking	Yes / No /Unknown		
Goal setting for care plan	Documented /no documentation		
Any physical activity care plan	Yes / No		
Referral to physiotherapy	Yes / No		
NRS: Numeral Rating Scale 0-10			

Table SII. STarT Back Tool (SBT) scores and risk groups.

Outcome	Time	Risk group	N	Interven-	Control	P-value
				tion		
*SBT total score ¹	Baseline			4.5 (2.2)	4.9 (2.3)	
SBT risk group ²						
	first study	low % (n);		22.9 (54);	not	
	contact	medium % (n);		47.0 (111);	available	
		high % (n)		30.1 (71)		
	Baseline	low % (n);	491	32.7 (73);	29.1 (78);	0.068
		medium % (n);		46.6 (104);	39.6 (106);	
		high% (n)		20.6 (46)	31.3 (84)	
	12 months	low % (n);	315	66.2 (96);	66.5 (113);	
		medium % (n);		20.7 (30);	18.8 (32);	
		high % (n)		13.1 (19)	14.7 (25)	

Presented as intervention group vs control group. ²Difference between intervention and control groups was analyzed with ordinal logistic regression using generalised estimating equations with exchangeable working correlation matrix.

P-value describes the statistical significance of the difference in change from baseline to 12 months between intervention and control groups (time*intervention).

* The maximum total score range will be 0–9, subscale will be derived from Questions 5–9 (range 0–5): 1) Low-risk (total score of 3 or less); 2) Medium-risk (total score of 4 or more and psychosocial subscale score of 3 or less); 3) High-risk (total score and psychosocial subscale score of 4 or more).