

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objective:** To explore why patients with simple mechanical back pain seek urgent care.

3 **Design:** Grounded Theory

4 **Setting:** Urgent Care

5 **Methods:** Data collection by semi-structured interview.

6 **Results:** The study identified eight key motivators of patients with mechanical back pain
7 seeking urgent care: 1) GP access, 2) Pain, 3) Function, 4) Something being different, 5)
8 Something being wrong, 6) Desire for investigation, 7) Third Party Influence and 8) Repeat
9 visits.

10 **Conclusion:** This study provides some evidence to support the notion that patients are
11 willing to use primary care services for the treatment of Simple Mechanical Back Pain but
12 that access is frequently limited and untimely. The study concludes that inappropriate
13 attendances at urgent care facilities are frequently a human response to perception of pain
14 severity which is reinforced by functional loss, uncertainty, the need to provide care for
15 others and the encouragement of others. While it is asserted that there is a clear need for mass
16 education in this area, it is also speculated that attendance at urgent care may occur to overtly
17 escalate the need for assistance and illustrate to sceptical significant others the severity of the
18 condition.

19

20 **Key words:** back pain, care-seeking, urgent-care, qualitative design, primary care.

21

22

23 **Introduction**

24 A recent systematic review of the global prevalence of low back pain (LBP) revealed the
25 point prevalence to be 11.9% [1]. With a lifetime prevalence of 84% most individuals will
26 experience LBP;. It has been identified as the most common musculoskeletal problem within
27 primary care costing the NHS £1000 million per annum [2]. NICE (National Institute for
28 Health and Care Excellence) guidance outlines the use of: exercise programmes, manual
29 therapy and acupuncture for patients with Simple Mechanical Back Pain (SMBP) all of which
30 can be provided effectively in primary care [3]. Despite this, patients with SMBP frequently
31 use urgent care facilities which are neither able to provide these modalities nor well placed to
32 deal with this condition.

33

34 A literature search of EMBASE, MEDLINE, BNI, CINAHL, Embase, PsychINFO, the
35 Cochrane Library and ASSIA up to 2013 using the terms; “health-seeking”, “care-seeking”,
36 “urgent care”, “emergency services”, “emergency department”, “accident and emergency”
37 and “back pain” was undertaken. While seemingly counter to a grounded theory approach,
38 this was a requirement of ethics application and any preconceptions were deemed minimal
39 due to the lack of existing research & time lapsed from application to analysis.

40 The literature review revealed a paucity of knowledge which was conflicting, varied and
41 dependent on the healthcare setting. Studies were predominantly based in Australia and the
42 USA. [4][5]. Review of the individual studies identified limitations such as low statistical
43 power [4][6] a lack of specificity to back pain [7][8]. For example Martin *et al.* [8] report the
44 rate of inappropriate urgent care attendance in the UK as 16.8% but this figure encompasses
45 all conditions. When considering back pain specifically, the majority of those presenting
46 (95%) will have SMBP [9]. Urgent care providers routinely discharge these patients with

47 analgesia and advice only, as recommended, yet urgent care attendance rates for SMBP
48 continue to rise (unpublished audit data) with the cause of this remaining unclear. In a local
49 urgent care audit, it was observed that between January and March 2010, an average (mean)
50 of 108 patients per month sought urgent care for back pain, of which 102 had SMBP. Whilst
51 there has been an increased prevalence in chronic disabling back pain in many countries [10]
52 this does not explain the increase in urgent-care seeking as the overall incidence of back pain
53 has not risen [9].

54

55 Despite this identified increase of urgent care seeking by patients with SMBP there is a gap in
56 the literature. There are no existing studies which have considered why patients with SMBP
57 seek urgent care in the UK. It is this gap the study aims to address. This may have benefits
58 for the target population in the form of more appropriate and timely care and the healthcare
59 economy through reducing cost and burden on urgent care services.

60

61 **Method**

62 **Design**

63 A grounded theory approach was considered most suitable as the aim was to investigate
64 underlying reasons for behaviour [11].

65 **Recruitment**

66 Patients presenting to urgent care (Accident and emergency (A&E), Walk-in Centre (WIC)
67 Out of hours service (OOH)) with back pain were assessed. Those diagnosed with SMBP by
68 their urgent care clinician, who met the inclusion criteria were advised of the study and
69 invited to join.

70 **Inclusion Criteria:**

- 71 • Aged 18 years or over.
- 72 • Diagnosis by healthcare professional of SMBP; requiring only advice and analgesia
- 73 [3][9].

74 **Exclusion Criteria:**

- 75 • Diagnosis of systemic or neurological disease.
- 76 • Inability to provide informed consent.
- 77 • Non-English speaking.

78

79 **Data Collection**

80 Primary data collection was via face-to-face interview using a semi-structured guide, by the

81 principal investigator (VS). Initial sampling was purposive then theoretical once data was

82 gathered. Interviews were conducted in a private clinic room and audio-recorded. Interview

83 duration lasted from 10-75minutes.

84

85 **Ethics**

86 The study and subsequent amendments were given a favourable opinion by the Central

87 Manchester Research Ethics Committee, number 10/H1014/81.

88

89 **Data Analysis**

90 Anonymised interviews were transcribed within 24 hours (VS). This not only increased

91 familiarity with the data and enabled preliminary analysis, but minimised the possibility of

92 transcript inaccuracies. As an iterative process, on-going data collection was concurrent with

93 analysis, informing further data collection. Transcripts were analysed as soon as possible,

94 prior to the next interview where this was possible. This process continued until saturation.

95

96 Data was analysed with a grounded theory approach. Initial coding was line by line, with the
97 second phase identifying commonly used codes which were developed into salient and
98 complete categories then themes. Coding and theming was undertaken independently by VS
99 and SG, both reported saturation at nine participants. Findings were consistent and all
100 transcript information was coded, with no discrepancy or deviant cases. Memo writing was
101 undertaken to assist analysis and enable reflection. Reflexivity is an important process in GT
102 allowing the researcher to regularly review their preconceptions and their possible impact on
103 the analysis [11].

104

105 **Results**

106 **Participant Summary**

107 Recruitment commenced on the 21st January 2011 and continued until the 14th July 2011
108 when saturation was reached. All participants had sought urgent care from: A&E, WIC or
109 OOH's.

110

111 **Themes**

112 Eight themes were identified through independent review: GP access; Pain & Analgesia;
113 Function; Different; Something Wrong; Investigation; Third Party; Repeat Visits

114 **Theme 1) GP access**

115 Participants reported an attempt to access GP care in the first instance but went on to seek
116 urgent care when unsuccessful. Some were reportedly directed to the urgent care if unable or
117 unwilling to wait:

118 INSERT BOX 1 HERE

119 GP access was also dependent on day and time: Participant 4 contacted his GP initially but it
120 was a Wednesday afternoon when most GP practices in the study location are closed.

121 Participants 5 and 10 sought urgent care late at night and Participant 6 at the weekend when
122 her GP surgery was closed:

123 INSERT BOX 1b HERE

124

125 This theme highlighted the consequence of an inability to access the GP in a timely manner
126 which led patients to seeking urgent care, seemingly redirected by GP practices.

127

128 **Theme 2) Pain and Analgesia**

129 Pain intensity, and associated with this, a desire for quick relief of pain, was a key driver for
130 seeking urgent care (cited by ten of eleven participants).

131 INSERT BOX 2 HERE

132

133 **Theme 3) Function**

134 A level of impaired function was referred to by all participants with nine of eleven
135 specifically referring to impaired walking. The inability to perform activities of daily living
136 (ADL) appeared to be distressing to participants and was a motivator in their decision to seek
137 urgent care.

138 INSERT BOX 3a HERE

139 Caring for children while in a state of dysfunction was a compelling driver to seek urgent
140 help:

141 INSERT BOX 3B HERE

142 This participant went on to associate regained function and ability to care for her son with her
143 recovery:

144 INSERT BOX 3C HERE

145 **Theme 4) Different**

146 Most participants had experienced back pain previously, only one reported no prior episodes.
147 When seeking urgent care, those with previous back pain history described this episode as
148 “different”

149 INSERT BOX 4A HERE

150 The sense of something “different” appears to have provoked fear in patients, both
151 immediate and anticipatory fear: fear of future consequences. Along with fear, three other
152 negative emotions were identified: frustration, anger and pessimism. Patients were frustrated
153 when unable to access GP care and angry when faced with triage systems which determined
154 symptoms they considered to be different as non-urgent.

155 INSERT BOX 4B HERE

156

157 **Theme 5) Something Wrong**

158 Several participants reported a concern that there was something wrong:

159 INSERT BOX 5a HERE

160 For participant 10, it was concern of something potentially sinister, specifically: paralysis:

161 INSERT BOX 5b HERE

162

163 **Theme 6) Investigation**

164 Potentially linked with this feeling of something wrong was the theme of investigation, yet
165 such was its prominence it was given individual consideration. Of eleven participants, eight
166 referred to an investigation:

167 INSERT BOX 6a HERE

168 Two participants recounted previous investigations which had revealed nothing significant
169 yet they wanted further examination.

170 INSERT BOX 6b HERE

171 Other participants sought investigation to enable understanding.

172 INSERT BOX 6c HERE

173

174 **Theme 7) Third party**

175 The advice or action of others, principally a family member, contributed to the decision to
176 seek urgent care for over half of participants.

177 INSERT BOX 7a HERE

178 One participant was advised at attend A&E by GP reception staff:

179 INSERT BOX 7b HERE

180 Two participants reported a previous encounter where the GP directed them to urgent care:

181 INSERT BOX 7c HERE

182 Participant 8 had previously been guided to A&E and felt she would be again, as her husband
183 reported:

184 INSERT BOX 7d HERE

185 Once participants had sought urgent care for their back pain, over half did so again.

186 Participant 9, prompted by family on the first occasion, sought urgent care directly for the
187 second episode:

188 INSERT BOX 7e HERE

189

190 **Theme 8) Repeat visits**

191 Identifying that patients with SMBP were returning to urgent care raised the question of why,
192 particularly as some acknowledged dissatisfaction with the care received, or recognised that
193 little could be done in the urgent care setting:

194 INSERT BOX 8a HERE

195 In subsequent data collection, participants were questioned about what they would do in the
196 event of future episodes. Despite the acknowledged limited intervention or poor experience
197 three participants reported they would return to urgent care:

198 INSERT BOX 8b HERE

199 Of the four participants questioned about future action, only one reported that he would not
200 seek urgent care again. He left A&E when the triage nurse advised of a long wait and
201 unlikelihood to receive treatment:

202 INSERT BOX 8c HERE

203 When questioned about what he would do in the future he replied:

204 INSERT BOX 8d HERE

205

206 Pain and altered function were the most prominent themes, referred to by all participants.

207 Desire for investigation, inability to secure GP access and third party influence were also
208 substantial motivators in seeking urgent care, expressed by over half of participants.

209

210 **Discussion**

211 The themes of: access, pain, function, investigation, something wrong, third party influence
212 and repeat visits are present in some context within the literature [4][5][6][7], however they
213 have not previously been identified within the context of care-seeking behaviour in an urgent
214 care setting for back pain.

215

216 One striking finding was that most participants correctly attempted to access care through
217 their GP in the first instance. Other powerful drivers in seeking urgent care related to
218 dysfunction [12] and associated high pain levels. This incapacitating pain sparked fear
219 something was wrong, or “different”, which was perceived as indicating something sinister.

220 This escalation of symptoms appeared to precipitate a need for ‘answers’ which were sought
221 through investigation. The refusal to investigate by urgent care clinicians resulted in
222 frustration and anger as patients felt they were not being taken seriously.

223

224 The data reflects a very human response to uncertainty and incapacitating pain which in turn
225 makes receptiveness to 3rd party suggestion to seek urgent care more likely. The need for
226 assurance and pain relief becomes particularly acute when patients are carers. Most the 3rd
227 parties were family members, but surprisingly advice to attend urgent care was also received
228 from GPs and their reception staff. This inappropriate advice appears to have stifled the
229 appropriate response and instead facilitated urgent care-seeking behaviour, potentially
230 resulting in possible harm as appropriate and timely care was not delivered.

231

232 Patients believed investigations would identify the cause of their symptoms. This is a
233 common misconception faced by clinicians dealing with patients with SMBP. Numerous
234 structures can contribute to symptoms and there is no definitive disease to diagnose [3] and
235 investigations do not change the evidence-based management of SMBP.

236

237 The second misconception identified related to analgesia. Participants sought immediate pain
238 relief yet when prescribed analgesia they described it as ineffective. Further questioning
239 revealed that fear of addiction resulted in ineffective use and avoidance. This appears at odds
240 with the reported desire to abolish the pain at the earliest possible opportunity.

241

242 Although most of the themes in this study have been identified in other contexts, a new
243 finding, not previously reported was the theme of something ‘different’. It is interesting that
244 this sense of something “different” is listed as one of 163 red flags, indicators of possible

245 serious pathology [13]. The prognostic value of individual red flags is not known as they are
246 not considered in isolation but within the context of the individual clinical presentation [13]
247 and this, to some extent, legitimised the patients' desire for urgent attendance.

248

249 The sense of "something different" may be an important motivator in seeking urgent care. If
250 "different" this time, patients could be concerned a pre-existing condition had developed into
251 something sinister. This concern could provoke anxiety, fear and pessimism about their
252 current and future state. Something "different" may also facilitate the desire for investigation.
253 Perhaps patients sought reassurance that all was well rather than cause. Patients reported
254 frustration and anger when unable to access investigations even though this was not clinically
255 indicated. Resolution of this juxtaposition would prove difficult.

256

257 It is well established that pain is not purely organic but also an emotional response [14].
258 Perceived pain is known to increase when there is anxiety or fear about the cause particularly
259 if it seems "different". Back pain is particularly fear-provoking as it comes from behind,
260 instilling a feeling of vulnerability [9]. Waddell [9] also reports heightened fear and anxiety
261 due to awareness of incapacity as a possible consequence of spinal injury. Functional
262 limitations may therefore not be entirely due to dysfunction but fear that it may exacerbate
263 injury.

264

265 The sense of "different" is linked to the theme of something "wrong". Two participants
266 reportedly sought urgent care because of fear of serious pathology. For one,
267 the sense was so compelling, she described a fear of dying.

268

269 While attendance at urgent care is understandable from a human suffering point of view, it is
270 also a means by which the degree of discomfort can be conveyed to those who doubt the
271 legitimacy of the observed dysfunction. To some extent, this doubt is reinforced by the notion
272 that back pain is subjective with no definitive disease to diagnose.

273 While this was not detected as a theme, there is some evidence from the data to suggest that
274 an element of social construction could be at play as Participant 9 openly reported that co-
275 workers including one manager were sceptical of his back pain:

276

277 INSERT TEXT BOX 9 HERE

278

279

280 For those previously seen by their GP, attendance at urgent care was an escalation of action
281 reflecting perceived symptom severity. Patients may have felt the appropriate GP
282 management received (analgesic and advice to maintain function) was not sufficiently
283 reassuring and the gravity of their symptoms not recognised. If symptom legitimisation was a
284 motivating factor, it should have been identified by the Grounded Theory methodology. That
285 saturation was reached and no deviant cases occurred suggests this is speculative however,
286 this train of thought is worthy of further investigation. Although, it is possible that symptom
287 legitimisation was an additional motivator undisclosed by participants. The unpreparedness
288 of patients to disclose this could either be because they were not fully aware of it themselves,
289 but also it may reflect their vulnerability to socially constructed pressures to ‘prove’ their
290 incapacity.

291

292 The desire for investigation may have been a further attempt to legitimise symptoms As
293 might theme 8, repeat visits. Although this is speculative, McPhillips-Tangum *et al.* [5]

294 reported chronic back pain patients continue to seek care because fundamental questions
295 about the cause and diagnostic role remain unanswered. It is suggested this may be because
296 patients do not receive the answers they desire, in that their symptoms are not legitimised.

297

298 The results identify a need for education. Information provided to this patient population
299 needs to be evidence-based, standardised and accessible. Content should be in line with
300 current evidence and given a lifetime prevalence of 84%, delivery of such information should
301 be directed towards a “mass” approach. Recent public education films on “FAST” for stroke
302 and “Hard and Fast to Staying Alive” for heart attack have shown that ‘mass’ education is
303 effective in bringing about desired change. The hard and fast campaign has recorded over 1.7
304 million YouTube views and the World Heart Federation report 11 lives to date have been
305 saved by campaign bystanders. Further research is needed to assess the likely effect of such a
306 SMBP specific campaign within England.

307

308 **Study Limitations**

309 This was a small, exploratory study undertaken in one NHS trust with the aim of increasing
310 understanding of care-seeking behaviour. The study was part of a taught NIHR Masters in
311 Research. The lack of resource resulted in the exclusion of Non-English speakers, as
312 language is imperative in ensuring nuances and meanings are understood. If lost in
313 translation the quality of data may have been poor and erroneous conclusions drawn.

314

315 **Recommendations for future research**

316 Further studies of this sort should be repeated in other health districts in order to validate the
317 findings through a process of triangulation. Additionally, mixed-methods studies

318 incorporating a functional or health-related quality of life outcome measure would facilitate
319 understanding of the care-seeking behaviours of patients with SMBP.

320

321 **Conclusion**

322 To our knowledge, this study was the first of its kind to attempt to increase understanding of
323 why patients with SMBP seek urgent care. It has identified eight contributing factors and
324 discusses the possibility of a ninth which takes the form of legitimising incapacity.

325

326 The decision of patients to seek urgent care is complex and involves perception of both need
327 and of the services available. This study has highlighted the need for education of this patient
328 population.

329

330 Until a more certain understanding is gained about the motives and characteristic of this
331 patient population and community-wide education is achieved, urgent care facilities will
332 continue to be used inappropriately placing continued demands on a pressured and vital
333 resource. The Health Select Committee has warned this week that the growing demand on
334 A&E is unsustainable. When considering alternatives to urgent care it has recognised that
335 primary care should be restructured. How this will occur has not yet been illustrated but
336 suggestions include: direct access for GP's to same-day specialist opinions and the use of
337 same-day telephone, web or e-mail access to a primary care team integrated within patients'
338 own GP practices [15]. Physiotherapists could play a key part in both these scenarios as they
339 are ideally placed to provide cost effective care which would not only serve the patient better
340 but would also decrease demand on strained urgent care resources. Support for
341 physiotherapist roles appears to be growing with a call for physiotherapists to be the
342 gatekeepers for musculoskeletal conditions voted the most popular "dangerous idea" by

343 delegates at a recent primary care conference [16]. The recently published Royal college of
344 General practitioners 2022 report: “A vision of General Practice in the future” [17] also
345 envisages increased self-referral and highlights self referral to physiotherapy specifically.

Box 1a Quotations for Theme 1

“Because I couldn’t get in to see my own Dr..... it’s getting more of a struggle getting into your own GP at the minute” (Participant 1)

“I tried my GP but the receptionists...said there was nothing, but I said to them well I’d like to have a Dr out then and she said if you’re able to come to the surgery which, because I’d asked for an appointment, she said I feel you’re able to get to the surgery then you’re gonna have to go to the out of hours or the walk in centre” (Participant 3)

Box 1b Quotation for Theme 1

“I went but the Dr’s was shut on Saturday....so my husband said we’ll just go to the walk in centre and see what they say....” (Participant 6)

Box 2 Quotations relating to theme 2

“The pain, it was just, I’ve never felt pain like that before” (Participant 10)

“I was in so much pain...it was so intense... it was just too much...I was so desperate for some relief.....I have a child and labour’s meant to be painful but (not) compared to that.” (Participant 10)

Box 3a Quotations from theme 3

“The pain were that acute and I were limping and I went like that and I just had to see a Dr”

(Participant 5)

“I just needed to be able to function really because I couldn’t do anything over the weekend with it.....I couldn’t move, my kids had to help me up off the couch, everything....I couldn’t do anything, the whole lot. I was stuck in pyjamas all weekend” (Participant 1)

Box 3b Quotation from Theme 3

“When I’ve got a 2 year old little boy I can’t lie down all day, as much as I’d like to....I haven’t been able to cuddle him and it’s killed me not being able to bath him, not being able to put his pyjama’s on... it’s awful and he doesn’t understand, he’s only 2.....I’ve had to have someone with me every day since I did it” Participant 3

Box 3c Quotation from Theme 3

“I can manage now, I managed to read him his bedtime story and put his pyjama’s on last night so I was happy” Participant 3

Box 4A Quotations from Theme 4

“It just went and it felt...different” (Participant 8)

“It’s happened a few times but not as bad....for some reason this time it was different” (Participant 9)

Box 4B Quotations form theme 4

“they just said there’s nowt we can do , you can see someone but we won’t be able to do owt and it’ll be three hours so I just went” (Participant 11)

Box 5a Quotations from Theme 5

“I just wanted to know what was wrong with me” (Participant 3)

“Just reassurance that it was okay, it was something that I’d just pulled and not in the process of dying” (Participant 5)

Box 5b Quotation from Theme 5

“I thought oh my God, what is happening to me, am I ever going to walk again?” (Participant 10)

Box 6a Quotations relating to theme 6

“I said is there any chance of a scan.....I thought there’s more to this” (Participant 9)

“you need a scan just to make sure because I, err, we’re not medical professions to the extent

of a Dr but you know that's not right" (Participant 3)

Box 6b Quotation from Theme 6

"[I asked].. for an x-ray so I could have proof that it's got worse because I know it's got worse. So there must be something on an x-ray to say yeah that it's got worse" (Participant 7)

Box 6c Quotation from Theme 6

"actually investigate further as to what was wrong with me...I was so confused, no-one told me what was wrong with my back" (Participant 10)

Box 7a Quotations from Theme 7

"my dad just said forget it. We'll just take you to the out of hours" (Participant 3)

"Me son, before we had chance to do anything, he phoned for an ambulance" (Participant 8)

Box 7b Quotation from Theme 7

"I rang my GP in the morning and I explained what happened and she (receptionist) said to be quite honest all we're gonna do is send you to the hospital so to save yourself time waiting for our appointment you might as well just go straight there"(Participant 3)

Box 7c Quotation from Theme 7

“Every time I go to my Dr’s, my Dr’s telling me to go to A&E and then A&E are telling me to go to my Dr’s” (Participant 7)

Box 7d Quotation from Theme 7

“The GP would probably have just sent you to the hospital anyway....At our place they do it with [everything], if they don’t know enough they just send you straight to the hospital” (Participant 8’s husband)

Box 7e Quotation from Theme 7

“(The second time) I just drove to the hospital, I thought I’m not even messing about going there [to the GP]...I’ll just go straight to the hospital”

Box 8a Quotations from Theme 8

“I thought, I can’t go back to A&E because they’re not going to do anything for me” (Participant 10)

“They gave her painkillers and kept an eye on her until the pain went...but there was nothing else they could do” (Participant 8’s husband)

Box 8b Quotations Relating to Theme 8

“Straight to hospital, no hesitation, straight there” (Participant 9)

“That’s the only place, where else can I go?”(Participant 10)

Box 8c Quotations Related to Theme 8

“they just said there’s nowt we can do , you can see someone but we won’t be able to do owt and it’ll be three hours so I just went”(Participant 11)

Box 8d Quotation Relating to Theme 8

“not got a clue to be honest because it took me ages to get anywhere didn’t it so I don’t know”(Participant 11)

Text box 9 - Discussion section

“...he kept on tutting and pulling his face and stuff like that.....they were all there giving me dirty looks”(Participant 9)

Ethical Approval: The study was given a favourable opinion by the Central Manchester Research Ethics Committee, number 10/H1014/81.

Funding: any sources of funding should be stated: NONE

Conflict of Interest: NONE

References (in order of appearance)

[1]Hoy D, Bain C, Williams G, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, Woolf A, Vos T, Buchbinder R.

A systematic review of the global prevalence of low back pain. *Arthritis & Rheumatism*.

2012;64(6):2028-37.

[2] Savigny P, Kuntze S, Watson P, Underwood W, Ritchie G, Cotterell M, Hill H, Browne

N, Buchanan E, Coffey P, Dixon P, Drummond C, Flanagan M, Greenough C, Griffiths M,

Halliday-Bell J, Hettinga D, Vogel S, Walsh D. *Low Back Pain; early management of*

persistent non-specific low back pain. London: National Collaborating Centre for Primary

Care and Royal College of General Practitioners; 2009.

[3] NICE *Low Back Pain: Early Management of Persistent Non-Specific Low Back pain*

CG88. London: National Institute for Health and Clinical excellence; 2009.

[4] Walker BF, Muller R, Grant WD. *Low back pain in Australian adults: healthcare provider*

utilisation and care seeking. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics*

2004;27:327-35.

[5] McPhillips-Tangum CA, Cherkin DC, Rhodes LA, Markham C. *Reasons for repeated*

medical visits among patients with chronic back pain. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*

1998;13:289-95.

[6] O’Cathain A, Coleman P, Nicholl J. *Characteristics of the emergency and urgent care*

system important to patients: a qualitative study. *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy*

2008;13(2):19-25.

- [7] Nelson J. (2011). Why patients visit emergency units rather than use primary care services. *Emergency Nurse* 2011;19(1):32-6.
- [8] Martin A, Martin C, Martin PB, Martin PAP, Green G. ‘Inappropriate’ attendance at an accident and emergency department by adults registered in local general practices: how is it related to their use of primary care? *Journal of Health Services Research & Policy* 2002;7(3): 160-5.
- [9] Waddell G. *The Back Pain Revolution*. 2nd ed. London: Churchill Livingstone; 2004.
- [10] Hartvigsen J, Foster NE, Croft RP. We need to rethink front line care for back pain. *BMJ* 2011; 342:d3260 [website] <<http://journals.bmj.com> [accessed 17 July 2011].
- [11] Parahoo K. *Nursing Research: Principles, Process and Issues*. 2nd ed. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan; 2006.
- [12] Ferreira ML, Machado G, Latimer J, Maher C, Ferreira PH, Smeets RJ. Factors defining care-seeking in low back pain: a meta-analysis of population based surveys. *European Journal of Pain* 2010;14:1-7.
- [13] Greenhalgh S, Selfe J. *Red Flags II: A guide to solving serious pathology of the spine*. London: Churchill Livingstone; 2010.
- [14] Butler DS, Moseley GL. *Explain Pain*. Adelaide: Noigroup Publications; 2003.
- [15] Health Committee 171: Urgent and emergency services. London: House of Commons; 2013.
- [16] McMillan I. Making physios the gatekeepers for MSK problems branded a “dangerous idea”. *Frontline* 2013;19(13):13.

[17] The 2022 GP: A Vision for General Practice in the future NHS. London: Royal College of General Practitioners; 2013.