medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# Step-downs reduce workers' compensation payments to encourage return to work. Are they effective?

Tyler J Lane, Luke R Sheehan, Shannon E Gray, Dianne Beck, Alex Collie

Insurance Work and Health Group, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .


# Abstract

## Objective

To determine whether step-downs, which cut the rate of compensation paid to injured workers after they have been on benefits for several months, incentivise return to work.

## Methods

We aggregated administrative claims data from nine Australian workers' compensation systems to calculate weekly scheme exit rates, a proxy for return to work. Jurisdictions were further subdivided into four injury subgroups: fractures, musculoskeletal, mental health, and other trauma. The effect of step-downs on scheme exit was tested using a regression discontinuity design. Results were pooled into meta-analyses to calculate combined effects and the proportion of variance attributable to heterogeneity.

## Results

The combined effect of step-downs was a 0.61 percentage point (95% CI -1.16 to -0.05) reduction in the exit rate, with significant heterogeneity between jurisdictions ($I^2$ = 73%, $p$ = .001). Most significant effects were observed within earliest step-downs, implemented at 13 weeks of benefit payment. Within injury subgroups, only fractures had a significant combined effect (-0.84, 95% CI -1.61 to -0.07), and sensitivity analysis suggested a potentially meaningful effect among mental health claims as well.

## Conclusions

The results suggest step-downs prompt an anticipatory effect, meaning some claimants leave compensation ahead of the step-down to avoid the reduction in benefits. However, the effects were small and, given their anticipatory nature, probably short-lived. Our findings were statistically significant, but questions remain about practical significance. We find limited evidence that step-downs are an effective incentive for return to work.


Preprint available at: xxx

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# Key messages

1. What is already known about this subject?

A number of workers' compensation systems around the world reduce payments to injured workers after they have been in the system for several months, though there is little evidence on their efficacy as a return to work incentive. In Australia, each of the nine major workers' compensation systems implements step-downs, offering a unique opportunity to test the effect on scheme exit rate, a proxy for return to work.

2. What are the new findings?

Exit rates increased in advance of step-downs, suggesting an anticipatory effect. However, the effect was small, increasing by less than two-thirds of a percentage point on average, and was mainly observed where step-downs occurred earlier.

3. How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

The effect of step-downs on scheme exit is small and probably short-lived, suggesting they provide little incentive to return to work. Workers' compensation systems may need to reconsider step-downs as a component of scheme design, or justify them as a cost-saving measure rather than an effective incentive return to work.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# Introduction

A number of workers' compensation systems around the world "step-down" income replacement payments to injured workers after they have been on benefits for several months. These include several in Europe (Andorra, Croatia, Slovakia, Sweden), Africa (Ethiopia, Republic of Congo, São Tomé and Príncipe, Zimbabwe), Asia (Indonesia, Laos, Singapore, Taiwan), Central America (Belize, Panama), the Middle East (Kuwait, Oman, Qatar), South America (Ecuador),[1] one American state (Ohio),[2] and each of Australia's nine major workers' compensation systems.[3]

Step-downs are promoted as an incentive for claimants to return to work.[4,5] However, there is little empirical evidence to support this claim,[6,7] and that which exists is generally inconclusive.[8,9] This also contrasts with original objective of step-downs when introduced across Australia in the 1980s and 90s, which was to reign in the rising costs of employers' insurance premiums.[6] Nevertheless, evidence that more generous benefits increase time off work indicates that step-downs could plausibly incentivise return to work.[4]

In this study we test whether step-downs increase the rate at which injured workers exit workers' compensation, and examine effects by type of injury.

# Methods

Study questions and analyses were pre-registered with the Open Science Framework.[10] We reproduce the analytical approach here and note any deviations.

## Step-downs in Australia

Each of Australia's six states, two territories, and the Commonwealth government have their own benefits system for injured workers that cover 94% of the workforce.[11] Each scheme is cause-based, meaning benefits are contingent on attribution of the injury to employment. However, the specific policies vary considerably, including whether the scheme allows common law claims, whether it is publicly or privately underwritten, and generosity of benefits.[3] All have step-downs, which also vary in both timing and magnitude, as illustrated in Table 1.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

*Table 1 Wage replacement rate by jurisdiction and time on workers' compensation benefits, up to 104 weeks; rate changes and values indicated with heatmap. Data derived from the Comparison of Workers' Compensation Arrangements in Australia and New Zealand reports.*[3]

| | | | Rate of pre-injury earnings compensated based on weeks in the system† | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jurisdiction | Included date range | Nominal caps* | 1-13 | 14-26 | 27-45 | 46-78 | 79-104 |
| New South Wales | Oct 2012 to Jun 2015 | Maximum | 95% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% |
| Victoria | Apr 2010 to Jun 2015 | Maximum | 95% | 80% | 80% | 80% | 80% |
| Queensland (NWE) | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum | 85% | 85% | 75% | 75% | 75% |
| Queensland (QOTE) | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum | 80% | 80% | 70% | 70% | 70% |
| Western Australia | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum | 100% | 85% | 85% | 85% | 85% |
| South Australia | Jul 2009 to Jun 2014 | Maximum | 100% | 90% | 80% | 80% | 80% |
| Tasmania | Jul 2010 to Jun 2015 | Minimum | 100% | 100% | 90% | 90% | 80% |
| Northern Territory | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum (step-down only) | 100% | 100% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| Australian Capital Territory | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum & minimum | 100% | 100% | 65% | 65% | 65% |
| Comcare | Jul 2009 to Jun 2015 | Maximum & minimum | 100% | 100% | 100% | 75% | 75% |

* Nominal caps are indexed to state average earnings and change annually or in some cases more frequently. We have chosen to denote only whether such caps exist in the relevant time frames. † Step-down timing is the same for all claims, though step-down rates can vary based on a number of characteristics including pre-injury earnings amount, industrial awards, enterprise agreements, and number of dependents.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

In addition to income replacement rates, most schemes have wage replacement caps that set a nominal maximum on what an injured worker may earn, while a few have minimums. Industrial agreements and number of dependents may also influence the magnitude of step-downs. In Queensland, claimants with an industrial agreement are initially compensated at the greater of 85% their Normal Weekly Earnings (NWE, based on the injured workers' earnings) or the industrial instrument. At 26 weeks, they step-down to the greater of 75% NWE or 70% Queensland Ordinary Time Earnings (QOTE, based on state mean earnings). Claimants not under an industrial instrument are initially compensated at the greater of 85% NWE or 80% QOTE, and step-down to the greater of 75% NWE or 70% QOTE. In the Northern Territory, step-downs are the greater of 1) 75% of weekly earnings up to a maximum nominal cap, or 2) the lesser of a flat rate plus additional income for each dependent or 90% of NWE. Step-down rates in Tasmania and Comcare are higher if the claimant is back at work in some form of partial capacity.[12] In these cases, the magnitude of initial and step-down compensation rates varied, though timings remained the same.

There are a number of other variations[3] we are unable to account for. In Western Australia, claimants with an industrial agreement are not subject to step-downs and are compensated at 100% throughout the life of the claim.[12] In Victoria and to a lesser extent New South Wales, claimants from unionised industries often have industrial awards and enterprise agreements that top up payments and can make up any gaps between pre-injury earnings compensation.[6,7]

## Data

Data were derived from the *National Data Set for Compensation-based Statistics*, an amalgamation of case-level administrative claims data compiled by Safe Work Australia from each Australian scheme.[13] The pre-registered inclusion criterion restricted eligibility to claims lodged since either July 2009 or the most recent change to step-down arrangements, whichever latest, up to June 2015. For instance, in July 2011 Tasmania altered step-down arrangements via legislative amendment. Only claims lodged afterwards were included in analyses. *Post hoc*, we added several other exclusions:

- Claims affected by minimum and maximum caps for weekly payments
- Claims lodged after June 2014 in South Australia to allow a one-year buffer with the change in step-downs arrangements implemented in July 2015
- Claims exempted from New South Wales' 2012 legislative amendments, including several occupations (police, paramedics, firefighters, and coalmine workers) and dust diseases[3]

Our outcome – weekly scheme exit rate – was determined using cumulative compensated time off work, which was calculated by dividing hours compensated by weekly pre-injury working hours. However, a number of jurisdictions including Victoria[14] count weeks as any calendar week in which

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

there was compensated time loss, while in the relevant time period, South Australia used calendar calculations.[5] For some cases, this would mean step-downs applied earlier than specified in our analyses.

## Analysis

We calculated scheme exit rate, a proxy for return to work, by dividing the number of claims exiting the system each week by the number of claims in the system at the start of that week. Injury subgroups included fractures, mental health, musculoskeletal, and other trauma. Our pre-registered categorisation separated back and neck from other musculoskeletal conditions, though we have since decided to keep them together as a better conceptual fit. Neurological conditions and all other conditions were excluded due to low numbers.

Data were left-censored at four weeks to exclude residual effects of employer excess, which are the post-injury periods for which employers pay compensation. Anecdotal reports suggest claims are less likely to persist only a day or two beyond the employer excess period, tending either to resolve before the employer excess period ends, or to persist for a few days beyond that. In Australia, the longest employer excess periods are 10 working days/two weeks in Victoria/South Australia.[3] We determined *a priori* that four weeks, while arbitrary, would be sufficient to remove any confounding due to this effect. Exit rates were calculated up to two years, or 104 weeks.

Effects were evaluated with a regression discontinuity design, a powerful quasi-experimental approach that compares outcomes on either side of an arbitrary cut-off.[15,16] We used a parametric polynomial estimator to account for non-linear patterns in exit rates, testing up to 10 polynomial terms with separate or same slopes, erring on the side of overfitting,[16] and selected best-fit models based on the Akaike Information Criterion.[15] Initially, we tested only separate slopes, but in several cases fitted lines noticeably diverged from data points near the step-down cut-off. Testing same-slope models as well addressed these issues.

Results are reported as the percentage point change to the exit rate. Coefficients and standard errors were combined into random effects meta-analyses to determine combined effects and the proportion of variance attributable to heterogeneity.

Exit rates in small groups became unstable as the number of claims in the system diminished over time. We excluded data points where the number of remaining injured workers for the week was <500, and did not conduct analyses where there were <20 aggregated data points after the step-down. These exclusions were an *ad hoc* approach to an analytical problem that only became

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

apparent as we examined the full dataset. To illustrate the issue, data points in regression discontinuity plots are coloured black to denote included and grey to denote excluded.

Analyses were conducted in R with RStudio using the following packages: *ggpubr*, *lubridate*, *metafor*, *metaviz*, *rdd*, *rddtools*, *scales*, *see*, *tidyverse*, and *zoo*. Aggregated data and R code are available on a FigShare repository.[17] The findings were first presented at the Actuaries Institute Injury and Disability Schemes Seminar in Canberra on 11 November 2019.

# Results

Data counts are summarised in Table 2, describing the number of claims included for each jurisdiction and by injury type. In total there were *N* = 303,232 claim records in this study, the majority of which were musculoskeletal (*N* = 182,852, 60%).

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

*Table 2 Numbers and row percent of included claims by jurisdiction and injury type*

| Jurisdiction | All | Fractures | Mental health | Musculoskeletal | Other trauma | Injuries excluded due to low numbers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Neurological | Other conditions |
| New South Wales | 49 391 | 5693 (11.5%) | 4296 (8.7%) | 29 380 (59.5%) | 7456 (15.1%) | 717 (1.5%) | 1849 (3.7%) |
| Victoria | 75 702 | 8604 (11.4%) | 8256 (10.9%) | 43 729 (57.8%) | 9869 (13.0%) | 1868 (2.5%) | 3376 (4.5%) |
| Queensland | 82 973 | 11 303 (13.6% | 3584 (4.3%) | 50 722 (61.1%) | 11 533 (13.9%) | 2289 (2.8%) | 3542 (4.3%) |
| Western Australia | 41 967 | 5941 (14.2%) | 1789 (4.3%) | 26 798 (63.9%) | 6008 (14.3%) | 538 (1.3%) | 893 (2.1%) |
| South Australia | 27 055 | 2686 (9.9%) | 3968 (14.7%) | 16 827 (62.2%) | 1694 (6.3%) | 846 (3.1%) | 1034 (3.8%) |
| Tasmania | 7252 | 737 (10.2%) | 1254 (17.3%) | 4100 (56.5%) | 815 (11.2%) | 143 (2.0%) | 203 (2.8%) |
| Northern Territory | 5803 | 939 (16.2%) | 647 (11.1%) | 3158 (54.4%) | 729 (12.6%) | 99 (1.7%) | 231 (4.0%) |
| Australian Capital Territory | 3767 | 429 (11.4%) | 343 (9.1%) | 2358 (62.6%) | 500 (13.3%) | 36 (1.0%) | 101 (2.7%) |
| Comcare | 9322 | 719 (7.7%) | 1793 (19.2%) | 5780 (62.0%) | 400 (4.3%) | 289 (3.1%) | 341 (3.7%) |
| Total | 303 232 | 37 051 (12.2%) | 25 930 (8.6%) | 182 852 (60.3%) | 39 004 (12.9%) | 6825 (2.3%) | 11 570 (3.8%) |

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

*Table 3 Count and row percent of included claims in analysis, by jurisdiction and injury type*

| Jurisdiction | All | Fractures | Mental health | Musculoskeletal | Other trauma | Conditions excluded due to low numbers | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Neurological | Other conditions |
| New South Wales | 49 391 | 5693 (11.5%) | 4296 (8.7%) | 29 380 (59.5%) | 7456 (15.1%) | 717 (1.5%) | 1849 (3.7%) |
| Victoria | 75 702 | 8604 (11.4%) | 8256 (10.9%) | 43 729 (57.8%) | 9869 (13.0%) | 1868 (2.5%) | 3376 (4.5%) |
| Queensland | 82 973 | 11 303 (13.6% | 3584 (4.3%) | 50 722 (61.1%) | 11 533 (13.9%) | 2289 (2.8%) | 3542 (4.3%) |
| Western Australia | 41 967 | 5941 (14.2%) | 1789 (4.3%) | 26 798 (63.9%) | 6008 (14.3%) | 538 (1.3%) | 893 (2.1%) |
| South Australia | 27 055 | 2686 (9.9%) | 3968 (14.7%) | 16 827 (62.2%) | 1694 (6.3%) | 846 (3.1%) | 1034 (3.8%) |
| Tasmania | 7252 | 737 (10.2%) | 1254 (17.3%) | 4100 (56.5%) | 815 (11.2%) | 143 (2.0%) | 203 (2.8%) |
| Northern Territory | 5803 | 939 (16.2%) | 647 (11.1%) | 3158 (54.4%) | 729 (12.6%) | 99 (1.7%) | 231 (4.0%) |
| Australian Capital Territory | 3767 | 429 (11.4%) | 343 (9.1%) | 2358 (62.6%) | 500 (13.3%) | 36 (1.0%) | 101 (2.7%) |
| Comcare | 9322 | 719 (7.7%) | 1793 (19.2%) | 5780 (62.0%) | 400 (4.3%) | 289 (3.1%) | 341 (3.7%) |
| Total | 303 232 | 37 051 (12.2%) | 25 930 (8.6%) | 182 852 (60.3%) | 39 004 (12.9%) | 6825 (2.3%) | 11 570 (3.8%) |

## Step-down impact on scheme exit rates

Across jurisdictions, the combined effect of step-downs on exit rates was a reduction of 0.61-percentage points (95% CI: -1.16 to -0.05). A significant and moderate proportion of the variance in effects was attributable to heterogeneity between jurisdictions ($I^2$ = 73%, $p$ = .001).

Within individual schemes, all significant effects were negative. Three of four significant effects were observed in jurisdictions with the earliest step-downs, occurring at 13 weeks: New South Wales (-1.65, -3.25 to -0.06), Western Australia (-1.65, -3.07 to -0.23), and South Australia (-2.24, -3.38 to -1.10). Victoria also had a 13-week step-down, though the effect was non-significant (0.03, -0.88 to 0.95). The only significant effect outside of 13 weeks was in Comcare, where step-downs occur at 45 weeks (-1.24, -2.20 to -0.28). Results are summarised in Figure 1, and regression discontinuities are plotted in Figure 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

FIGURES 1 & 2 ABOUT HERE



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

*Figure 1 Meta-analysis forest plot of step-down effects. Band thickness reflects the meta-analytic weight of each group.*




*Figure 2 Regression discontinuity plots illustrating impact of step-downs on exit rates by jurisdiction regression discontinuity plots. Grey data points indicate exclude data (<500 denominator cases).*

## Step-down impact by injury type

Combined effects were significant only among fracture claims (-0.84, -1.61 to -0.07). Heterogeneity between sites was non-significant ($I^2$ = 25%, $p$ = .087). Meta-analyses by injury are summarised in Figure 3, and regression discontinuity plots are presented in Supplementary Figures 1-4.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

## Step-down impact by injury type – sensitivity analysis

While combined effects were non-significant in mental health, musculoskeletal, and other trauma claims, magnitudes were similar to fractures claims. There were also indications that a single jurisdiction was responsible for attenuation to non-significance in some injuries, such as the unique positive effect among musculoskeletal conditions in the Northern Territory (1.00, 0.04 to 1.96). We conducted "leave one out" sensitivity analyses,[18] which tested the effect of dropping each jurisdiction from combined results. Excluding Comcare from the mental health claims meta-analysis resulted in a significant effect (-1.70, -3.40 to 0.00), though musculoskeletal and other trauma claims remained non-significant. The results are presented in Supplementary Figure 5.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Figure 3 Impact of step-downs on weekly exit rates by type of injury; see Summary Figures 1-4 for detailed regression discontinuity plots. Band thickness reflects the meta-analytic weight of each group.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# Discussion

## Interpretations of step-down effects on scheme exit rates

The local effect of step-downs on scheme exit rates was negative. The first potential explanation is that step-downs reduce the likelihood of return to work. This seems implausible given its lack of theoretical coherence and evidence that greater benefit generosity is positively associated with claim duration.[19,20] The second interpretation is that there is an anticipatory effect, where claimants leave compensation system early avoid reductions in income. For illustration, regression discontinuity plots indicate that where effects are significant, scheme exits increase in just the week prior to step-down.

A third explanation posits that scheme exit actually increases after step-downs take effect, but we mis-specified step-downs as occurring later in the process due to discrepancies in step-down determinations between our data and the various systems. In most cases, divergent estimates would be attributable to failed return to work attempts and graduated/partial working arrangements. We think this third explanation is unlikely for several reasons. First, such claimants have demonstrated positive action to return to work and financial incentives may not provide a sufficient motivation to achieve sustained return to work. Second, claimants with graduated/partial working arrangements are less affected by step-downs since only the compensated portion of their wages are reduced. Tasmania and Comcare even pay higher step-down rates for claimants with partial working arrangements. Third, we would expect such exits to be more evenly distributed in the pre-injury period. Instead, plotted results indicate an increase in scheme exits in the week prior to step-downs that deviates from the secular trend, which suggests these claimants are maximising payments under the higher initial compensation rate.

Our analytical approach – the regression discontinuity design – only tests on local effects, i.e., at the cut-off. Evidence that greater benefit generosity increases time off work[19,20] suggests step-downs may still have longer-term effects, even where there are no local effects. Plotted exit rate patterns generally indicate continuing logarithmic decay, particularly where local effects were non-significant. While this does not rule out longer-term effects, it suggests that at most they are small.

## Heterogeneity of effects and potential causes

A moderate proportion of the variance in effects across jurisdictions was attributable to heterogeneity. While we lacked sufficient data to conduct a meta-regression to identify significant moderators, there was a noticeable association between timing of step-downs and their impact. In jurisdiction-level analysis, most significant effects were among step-downs occurring at 13 weeks,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the earliest timing. This aligns with employer and policymaker opinion that delaying step-downs diminishes their effectiveness.[4,5] However, the 45-week Comcare step-down, the latest tested in this study, had a significant effect. This suggests unmeasured factors such as the presence of organised unions, who may advise claimants on changes to their compensation payments, modify step-down effects, regardless of timing.

## Potential confounders

One challenge to the anticipatory effect explanation is potential confounders that coincide with step-downs, like incentives that encourage employers and insurers to keep claim durations below a set threshold. In New South Wales, employers can get a 10% discount on insurance premiums if they return claimants to work within 13 weeks.[21] In Victoria, claims agents receive bonuses for keeping the rate of claims reaching 13 weeks low.[22] In both cases, the timing coincided with step-downs, and there were significant effects: New South Wales overall and for other trauma conditions, Victoria only for fracture and mental health conditions. We were unable to identify similar incentives in other jurisdictions.

In presenting these findings, return to work professionals have offered addition explanations that involve anticipatory effects but do not result in return to work. Rather, at the end of the pre step-down period, some claimants lodge a new claim with the intention of avoiding the reduction in payments. Unfortunately, our data to not allow us to link claims across individual claimants and we are unable to test this explanation.

## Effects by type of injury

There were significant combined effects in fractures claims, and more tenuous evidence for an effect in mental health claims. Fractures are generally considered less responsive to benefit generosity since they are more visible, easier to diagnose,[20] and have less variability in recovery time.[23] In other words, there is less discretionary time off work that may be influenced by benefits. Though contrary to expectations, the findings were not unprecedented. We previously found time off work among fracture claims sharply increased after Victoria increased maximum wage replacement cap from 150% to 200% of average state earnings.[19] This may be explained by the subset of fracture claims exposed to step-downs. Regression discontinuity plots (Supplementary Figure 1) illustrate that unlike other injuries, exit rates for fracture claims peak around two months post-claim, possibly reflecting the natural course of recovery.[23] Claims exceeding this peak will be more complex on average, and may be more sensitive to benefit generosity.[24]

Mental health conditions are less visible and harder-to-diagnose, characteristics thought to increase sensitivity to benefit generosity. To our knowledge, our previous work is the only empirical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

investigation of how such claims respond to an increase in compensation, in which we found no evidence of an effect.[19] However, the previous study examined the effect of initial rates of compensation, while we measure the effect of a change in those rates. The psychological vulnerability of mental health claimants may mean the act of cutting benefits has a greater effect than variations in what they are paid from the start.

We were surprised to find the combined effect of step-downs on musculoskeletal conditions was non-significant, as it contrasts with previous research on these less visible, harder to diagnose conditions.[20] However, this does not mean there was no effect, only that we were unable to detect one.

## Statistical versus practical significance of findings

While the findings were statistically significant, practical significance is less clear. For one, effects were fairly small. At the state level, the largest effect was -2.24 in South Australia. At injury level, the biggest effect was -5.28 among mental health claims in South Australia, though this and the other larger injury effect estimates had wide confidence intervals and were gathered from 25 subgroup analyses, making point estimates unreliable. Nevertheless, if these are reflective of the maximum potential impact of step-downs, they remain marginal. And if they are indeed anticipatory, the effects may be short-lived, with scheme exit rates returning to normal shortly after step-downs apply.

Step-downs may negative side effects. They have been linked to financial strain,[25] which could worsen outcomes or even delay scheme exit, particularly later in the process.[24] Economically-motivated return to work, such as that driven by compensation benefits, can increase the likelihood of reinjury.[26]

Scheme exit does not necessarily entail return to work and may result in cost-shifting to other income replacement systems.[7,27] However, it seems unlikely that those who leave workers' compensation in response to step-downs would go elsewhere if the causal mechanism is financial pressure. Other government-provided incapacity benefits are less generous than workers' compensation.[3,28] Some claimants may have retired as this option generally entails less financial stress than other options.[29] However, these inferences assume an informed, calculated, and rational economic response to financial incentives. The cut in benefits may induce a negative psychological reaction in some claimants and lead to a scheme exit that is neither return to work nor an alternative that improves financial well-being.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Meta-analyses suggested there was a moderate amount of heterogeneity between jurisdictions, which makes it difficult to assess generalisability of results. However, the effects varied from small to approximately null. The findings may be applicable to similarly cause-based, devolved workers' compensation systems in developed economies like Canada and the United States. They may also apply to other disability-based systems in developed countries, though it is unclear what the effects may be in underdeveloped settings.

### Strengths and limitations

This study has several limitations, some we have already mentioned: confounding incentives for employers and insurers to shorten time off work, discrepancies in determination of step-downs, and inconsistent application of step-downs for some claimants. Regression discontinuity designs assume populations around the cut-off are unable to manipulate what condition they are exposed to.[15] Our study inverted this assumption, since claimants were reacting to the step-down cut-off rather than being allocated by it to separate conditions. The theoretical implications are unclear, though there may have been some crossover bias, or mixture of both anticipatory and reactive responses that biased the results towards null.

Nevertheless, this study had several strengths. We applied a robust quasi-experimental approach, the regression discontinuity design, to national workers' compensation data with population-level coverage. There were sufficient data to investigate impact by jurisdiction and most injury subgroups, and meta-analysis increased precision of estimates and provided evidence that effects varied by jurisdiction.

## Conclusions

Claimants leave workers' compensation in anticipation of step-downs, though the effects are small and probably short-lived. Step-downs may still reduce costs to the workers' compensation, which is a legitimate policy goal, though our findings suggest step-downs have a limited effect on return to work.

## Ethics

This study received ethics approval from the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (CF14/2995 – 2014001663).

## Funding

This study was funded by an Australian Research Council Discovery Project Grant (DP190102473), as part of the Compensation and Return to Work Effectiveness (COMPARE) Project, and by Safe

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Work Australia, a government statutory agency that develops national work health and safety and workers' compensation policy.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the COMPARE Project's Advisory Group who provided valuable insight when interpreting the results.

## Conflicts of interest

The authors previously received salary support from funding provided by the workers' compensation systems investigated in this study.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# References

1. Social Security Administration. Social Security Programs Throughout the World. Social Security Programs Throughout the World. https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdesc/ssptw/. Accessed August 16, 2019.

2. Texas Department of Insurance Workers' Compensation Research Group. *Comparison of State Workers' Compensation Systems*. Austin, TX https://senate.texas.gov/cmtes/78/c780/comprswcompn0325.pdf.

3. Safe Work Australia. Comparison of workers' compensation arrangements in Australia and New Zealand. https://www.safeworkaustralia.gov.au/collection/comparison-workers-compensation-arrangements-australia-and-new-zealand. Published 2019. Accessed August 16, 2019.

4. Department of Employment. *Inquiry into the Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation Amendment (Improving the Comcare Scheme) Bill 2015*. Canberra, AU; 2015.

5. Australian Industry Group. *Independent Review of the Administration and Operation of the South Australian Return to Work Act 2014*.; 2018. https://www.agd.sa.gov.au/sites/default/files/submission_review_of_the_return_to_work_act_13.3.18_final.pdf?v=1521521970.

6. Purse K. Australian workers' compensation policy: conflict, step-downs and weekly payments. *Int Employ Relations Rev*. 2003;9(1):23-44.

7. Purse K, Meredith F, Guthrie R. Neoliberalism, workers' compensation and the productivity commission. *J Aust Polit Econ*. 2003;54:45-66.

8. Gray SE, Lane TJ, Hassani-Mahmooei B, Collie A. Evaluating the success of legislative amendments designed to reduce work disability. *Policy Des Pract*. 2019;2(3):291-304. doi:10.1080/25741292.2019.1610147

9. Cossey B, Latham C. *Review of the Impact of the Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation (Scheme Review) Amendment Act 2008*.; 2011.

10. Lane TJ. Step-downs in wage replacement rates across workers' compensation jurisdictions in Australia: impact on scheme exit rate - public pre-registration of research questions and analytical approach. Open Science Framework. https://osf.io/pt876/. Published 2019. Accessed November 6, 2019.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

11. Lane TJ, Collie A, Hassani-Mahmooei B. *Work-Related Injury and Illness in Australia, 2004 to 2014*. Melbourne, AU; 2016.

12. WorkCover Tasmania. *A Guide to Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation in Tasmania*. Hobart, AU; 2017.

13. Safe Work Australia. *National Data Set for Compensation-Based Statistics Third Edition*. Canberra, AU; 2004.

14. WorkSafe Victoria. Claims Manual. http://www1.worksafe.vic.gov.au/vwa/claimsmanual/Home.htm. Published 2019. Accessed August 21, 2019.

15. Lee DS, Lemieux T. Regression discontinuity designs in economics. *J Econ Lit*. 2010;48(2):281-355. doi:10.1257/jel.48.2.281

16. Shadish WR, Cook TD, Campbell DT. *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Generalized Causal Inference*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin; 2002.

17. Lane TJ, Sheehan LR, Gray SE, Beck D, Collie A. Step-downs analysis: aggregated data and analytical code. FigShare. doi:10.26180/5dba1e5b4277a

18. Kossmeier M, Tran US, Voracek M. metaviz: Forest Plots, Funnel Plots, and Visual Funnel Plot Inference for Meta-Analysis. 2019. https://cran.r-project.org/package=metaviz.

19. Lane TJ, Gray SE, Sheehan LR, Collie A. Increased benefit generosity and the impact on workers' compensation claiming behavior. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2019;61(3):e82-e90. doi:10.1097/jom.0000000000001531

20. Butler RJ, Gardner HH, Kleinman NL. Workers' Compensation: Occupational Injury Insurance's Influence on the Workplace. In: Dionne G, ed. *Handbook of Insurance: Second Edition*. Second. New York, NY: Springer; 2013:449-469. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-0155-1

21. Markey R, Holley S, O'Neill S, Thornthwaite L. *The Impact on Injured Workers of Changes To NSW Workers' Compensation: June 2012 Legislative Amendments*.; 2013. https://www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0011/76637/1_Dec_The_Impact_on_Injured_Workers_of_Changes_to_NSW_Workers_.pdf.

22. Glass D. *Investigation into the Management of Complex Workers Compensation Claims and WorkSafe Oversight*. Melbourne, AU; 2016.

23. National Clinical Guideline Centre. *Fractures (Non-Complex): Assessment and Management*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

London; 2016. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng38/evidence/full-guideline-2358460765.

24. Krause N, Dasinger LK, Deegan LJ, Rudolph L, Brand RJ. Psychosocial job factors and return-to-work after compensated low back injury: a disability phase-specific analysis. *Am J Ind Med*. 2001;40(4):374-392. doi:10.1002/ajim.1112

25. Ezzy D, Walter M, Welch A. *Quantitative Report for Phase 1 for the WorkCover Tasmania Board*.; 2008.

26. Jinks L. Why Pay More? The Effects of Increased Wage Replacement Benefits in Workers' Compensation. *J Econ Lit*. 2019:1-60. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d7544e446b1cb2e0218215e/t/5d909916e9279434ee4a27a6/1569757463955/JMP+Paper_Jinks.pdf.

27. Collie A, Di Donato M, Iles RA. Work disability in Australia: an overview of prevalence, expenditure, support systems and services. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2018;0(0):0. doi:10.1007/s10926-018-9816-4

28. Department of Human Services. *A Guide to Australian Government Payments*.; 2018. https://www.humanservices.gov.au/sites/default/files/2018/09/co029-1809-rates.pdf.

29. Sheehan LR, Lane TJ, Collie A. The impact of income sources on financial stress in workers' compensation claimants.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Supplementary Figure 1 Fracture regression discontinuity plots*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Supplementary Figure 2 Mental health regression discontinuity plots*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Supplementary Figure 3 Musculoskeletal regression discontinuity plots*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Supplementary Figure 4 Musculoskeletal regression discontinuity plots*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/19012286; this version posted November 19, 2019. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .




*Supplementary Figure 5 Sensitivity "leave one out" meta-analysis by injury type*