



Determining Key Features of Effective Depression Interventions

March 2009

Prepared for:

Department of Veterans Affairs
Veterans Health Administration
Health Services Research
& Development Service
Washington, DC 20420

Prepared by:

Greater Los Angeles Veterans Affairs Healthcare
System/Southern California/RAND
Evidence-based Practice Center
Los Angeles, CA

Investigators

Lisa V. Rubenstein, MD, MSPH

Professor of Medicine, VA Greater Los Angeles and UCLA
PI, HSR&D Center of Excellence for the Study of Healthcare Provider
Senior Scientist, RAND Corporation
Los Angeles and Santa Monica, CA

John W. Williams Jr., MD, MHS

Professor of Medicine and Psychiatry, Durham VA Medical Center and
Duke University
Director, Duke Evidence-Based Practice Center
Durham, NC

Marjorie Danz, MD

Associate Scientist
RAND Corporation and VA Greater Los Angeles
HSR&D Center of Excellence for the Study of Healthcare Provider
Behavior

Paul Shekelle, MD, PhD

Professor of Medicine, VA Greater Los Angeles and UCLA
Director, Evidence-Based Practice Center RAND Corporation
Los Angeles and Santa Monica, CA

Statistician

Marika Suttorp, MS

RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA

Research Assistant

Breanne Johnsen, BA

RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA



This report is based on research conducted by the Greater Los Angeles Veterans Affairs Healthcare System and Southern California Evidence-based Practice Center (EPC) under contract to the Department of Veterans Affairs. The findings and conclusions in this document are those of the author(s) who are responsible for its contents; the findings and conclusions do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs. Therefore, no statement in this article should be construed as an official position of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

This report is intended as a reference and not as a substitute for clinical judgment.

This report may be used, in whole or in part, as the basis for development of clinical practice guidelines and other quality enhancement tools, or as a basis for reimbursement and coverage policies. The Department of Veterans Affairs endorsement of such derivative products may not be stated or implied.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**..... 1
 - Background..... 1
 - Methods 2
 - Results..... 3
 - Conclusions..... 4
- EVIDENCE REPORT**..... 5
 - Introduction..... 6
 - Background 7
 - Methods 11
 - Methodological Overview 12
 - Search Strategy 12
 - Study Selection 13
 - Data Abstraction 13
 - Example Table for how impact ratings were carried out 16
 - Study Quality assessment 17
 - Data Synthesis and Analysis..... 17
 - Qualitative Analysis..... 18
 - Peer Review 19
- RESULTS**..... 20
 - Literature Flow 20
 - Studies Included in Effect Size or Relative Risk Analyses..... 20
 - Correlations between Features..... 20
 - Overall Effectiveness..... 21
 - Study Evaluation Design Features vs. Effectiveness..... 21
 - Associations between Intervention Featuresand Outcome Effect Sizes 22
 - Impact Measure..... 22
 - Qualitative Analysis of Intervention Features Versus Outcome Impacts..... 22
 - Qualitative Analysis of Evaluation Design Features, Including Patient Comorbidity, Versus Outcome Impacts 24
 - Limitations 24
 - Conclusions..... 26
- TABLES AND FIGURES** 27
- APPENDIX A**..... 55
- APPENDIX B**..... 58
- REFERENCES**..... 62

INTRODUCTION

Practice improvement to assure appropriate depression care is urgently needed. According to projections from the World Health Organization, depression will be the second leading cause of disability in the developed world by 2020 (Ormel J 1994; Murray and Lopez 1997). Primary care clinicians (PCCs) care for approximately two thirds of depressed individuals. Rates of optimal quality of care for depression, however, are low (Simon and VonKorff 1995; Hepner, Rowe et al. 2007).

Collaborative care models show promise as guides for achieving appropriate depression care in ordinary primary care practices. These models are organizational interventions that target the structure of primary care practice through changes in elements such as those identified in the Chronic Illness Care Model (Wagner, Austin et al. 2001). A previous rigorously conducted meta-analysis of thirty-seven randomized trials (Gilbody, Bower et al. 2006; Gilbody, Bower et al. 2006) showed the effectiveness of multifaceted interventions based on the collaborative care model (Katon 1995) for improving depression care and outcomes for primary care patients. These studies followed several other literature syntheses on improving care for depression in primary care that drew similar conclusions on the effectiveness of multi-component models (Gilbody, Whitty et al. 2003; Craven and Bland 2006). The success of multi-faceted collaborative care interventions contrasted with prior and subsequent targeted guideline implementation strategies such as screening alone (Goldberg, Steele et al. 1980; Rubenstein, Calkins et al. 1989), screening plus reminders or management suggestions (Rubenstein, McCoy et al. 1995; Rollman, Hanusa et al. 2002) or education alone (Thompson, Kinmonth et al. 2000).

Not only did collaborative care prove to be effective, it also proved to be cost-effective. A meta-analysis of 11 cost-effectiveness studies on collaborative care showed that the multi-component collaborative care models are within usually accepted ranges of cost-effectiveness, while educational interventions alone are not cost-effective (Gilbody, Bower et al. 2006).

It is important in considering the impact of collaborative care interventions in primary care to recognize that depression of lesser symptom severity or complexity has severe impacts over time if not corrected (Hays, 1995). The effects of depression on job loss (Zhang, Rost et al. 1999; Schoenbaum, Unutzer et al. 2002; Schoenbaum, Sherbourne et al. 2005; Lo Sasso, Rost et al. 2006), social and family relationships, financial decision-making, and other aspects of functioning mean that early in its course, depression can initiate a potentially preventable downward spiral. Thus, effective treatment of the less dramatic presentations of major depression is critical to disability prevention. Yet low complexity patients are less likely to receive appropriate attention under usual care circumstances. Patients with severe depression symptoms and/or psychiatric comorbidities are more likely to be recognized in primary care settings than those with fewer symptoms (Borowsky 2000; Pfaff 2005; Barkow 2004). These complex patients are more likely to be referred to mental health specialists and to comply with the referral as part of usual care (Bartels 2004; Borowsky 2000).

The wealth of evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of collaborative care, however, is not matched by a clear understanding of what collaborative care features practices must


implement to achieve results similar to the studies. Collaborative care intervention descriptions vary both in terms of what was done and in how intervention features are described. Two meta-analyses of specific intervention features relevant to collaborative care had negative results—i.e., the identified feature was not associated with greater effect sizes. These studies did not directly address collaborative care, but focused on organizational interventions for depression care improvement in primary care. The first was a Cochrane review of the effect of collocation of mental health specialists in primary care (Bower and Sibbald 2000; Mitchell, Del Mar et al. 2002). The second was a study of integration of mental health or substance abuse treatment in primary care (Butler 2008). Thus, to date, there have been no quantitative analyses of features of collaborative care that have been able to clearly identify intervention features associated with effectiveness.

The purpose of this study is to support enhanced implementation of effective collaborative care for depression by identifying key intervention features that are consistently associated with greater impacts on outcomes across the many studies of this model. This will enable the development of practice guidelines, or best practices, that incorporate the best current evidence on the specific organizational features necessary for providing effective care to depressed primary care patients. It will also foster the development of measures of model adherence for use in determining the extent to which collaborative care as implemented matches the key features identified from the literature.

BACKGROUND

Conceptual Approach: Our basic conceptual approach to depression collaborative care was shaped by the chronic illness care model (Fig 1) first described by Wagner et al (Wagner, Austin et al. 2001). We viewed the collaborative care model for depression as a specific case of the chronic illness care model, and identified variables describing study interventions accordingly.


Fig. 1: Chronic Illness Care Model



The Chronic Illness Care model postulates types of organizational changes that can support guideline-concordant clinical care. In the case of depression, several specific aspects of depression care highlighted in clinical practice guidelines (Agency for Health Care Policy and Research 1993) are targeted by studies using a Chronic Illness Care type collaborative care approach. These include depression detection (i.e., screening or case finding), assessment (i.e., diagnosis of depression, comorbidities, and contributing factors), proactive follow-up (i.e., contacting patients to support self-management), and mental health specialty input or care for complex patients.

Collaborative Care for Depression: The early studies showing that improved depression outcomes can be achieved by multi-component organizational interventions that support primary care for depression were developed empirically, rather than theoretically. Intervention developers referred to these interventions as depression collaborative care based on their emphasis on linking clinicians and patients in a joint management effort (Katon, Von Korff et al. 1995; Von Korff, Gruman et al. 1997) (Fig. 2). Later developers also emphasized collaboration in terms of the enhancement of links between mental health, primary care, and patients through care management. However, as implemented across a variety of similarly constructed interventions, the term collaborative care has come to incorporate additional features and functions.

Fig. 2: Depression Collaborative Care



In general, collaborative care models aim to support primary care to prevent commonly identified deficits in how depression care is provided using organizational changes, tools, and materials (MacArthur 2003, RAND 2000, IMPACT Implementation Center 2008, Hepner, Rowe et al. 2007). Care deficits addressed by collaborative care occur in fulfilling the **set of functions** necessary for achieving appropriate depression treatment. These functions are:

- 1) *detecting* depressed patients;
- 2) *assessing* patients with depression symptoms for depression diagnosis, symptom severity, history, and comorbidities;
- 3) *triaging* sicker patients to be seen by or followed by mental health specialists;
- 4) *initiating treatment* that accounts for patient preferences and characteristics;
- 5) *promoting treatment adherence* through early, active follow-

up; 6) *adjusting treatment* based on patient depression symptom response; and 7) *re-assessing* patient symptoms after treatment to determine need for treatment continuation. All of these activities can be thought of as promoting 8) *patient self-management support*. These functions are difficult to deliver as part of routine primary care. Common barriers are that most patients do not wish to and/or are not able to access mental health specialists; resources for intensive individual mental health specialist care for mildly depressed patients are not available; patient and provider resources for attending primary care as frequently as needed during early treatment are not available; and time and training for primary care clinicians to perform needed symptom and history assessments are not available. Collaborative care models identify organizational resources, as indicated in the chronic illness care model, to overcome these barriers.

Consistent with the chronic illness care model, a major emphasis of collaborative care interventions is *delivery system design*. Typically, these models identify personnel, such as nurses or pharmacists, to fill gaps in usual care for the depression care functions that are most difficult for primary care clinicians to fulfill. These personnel follow designated procedures, usually with identified *decision support*, including provider education. In some cases, *clinical information systems* are engaged to facilitate key functions. *Patient self-management support* is considered important for all patients with chronic illnesses. Depressed patients, however, by virtue of their depressive illness, feel hopeless, helpless, and apathetic—characteristics that promote the low treatment adherence seen in many studies (Katon, von Korff et al. 1992; Lin, Katon et al. 2000). Collaborative care interventions provide patient self management support by promoting pro-active follow-up (i.e., follow-up that is initiated by the provider, rather than the patient); by educating patients; and/or by activating patients through behaviorally-oriented interventions such as problem-solving therapy or cognitive behavioral therapy.

Multifaceted organizational interventions carried out in routine care settings are challenging to synthesize through literature review. These interventions include features adapted to individual organizational settings and resources, preventing uniformity of types of interventions across settings. Echoing findings on collaborative care for depression, we found that multi-faceted organizational interventions targeting Chronic Illness Care Model primary care organizational features such as staffing and delivery system design were more likely to be effective in improving prevention quality than were other types of interventions (Stone, Morton et al. 2002). However, also similarly to prior reviews, we were unable to achieve a high level of specificity about the characteristics of these organizational interventions. Thus, while a strong signal can be detected across broad types of multifaceted interventions, it has been challenging to translate the broad signal into specific guidance for spreading these interventions.

The first set of literature syntheses looked for a signal identifying a general type of depression care improvement intervention with positive effects. These studies identified multi-faceted collaborative care or chronic illness care type interventions as the only general type of intervention to date that had robustly impacted depression outcomes for populations of patients identified as depressed in primary care (Craven and Bland 2002; Gilbody, Whitty et al. 2003). Following this signal, the 2006 Gilbody meta-analysis selected studies based on designation of one or more staff members to support management of depressed patients (care management), and showed overall effectiveness of the 37 selected randomized trials (Gilbody, Bower et al. 2006). A cost effectiveness meta-analysis of a similar set of interventions studies (Gilbody, Bower et al. 2006) showed that these models are

relatively inexpensive, may save costs in the long run, and are more cost-effective in terms of benefits to patients than many other commonly-used clinical interventions. All of these literature analyses found that studies varied substantially in the exact configurations of intervention components and features used, as well as in what and how they report on intervention features and outcomes.

In addition to variations in intervention design, studies vary in terms of the patient populations they enroll and in other aspects of their evaluations. For example, some studies include patients screened in as depressed from a primary care population, and referred to collaborative care. Other studies identify patients by asking primary care clinicians or by searching pharmacy data bases for patients recently started on antidepressants. The range of depression symptoms required for inclusion varies from subsyndromal to very severe. Some studies exclude patients with psychiatric comorbidities, while others include them. Most studies exclude the most complex patients. Some studies involve multiple practices, while others focus on only one or two. Some studies involve large practices, often within managed care organizations, while others address small network or private practices. Few studies report in detail on the dynamics of mental health specialty referral or communication (Butler 2008). Overall, little is known about how the variety of possible features affect the chances of impacting patient outcomes.

In this study, we aimed to build on previous reviews using both quantitative and qualitative techniques, combined with extensive queries to authors to obtain unpublished intervention details. We aimed to identify articles that represented organizational change approaches to improving depression care for patients in primary care as emphasized in the chronic illness care model. Based on these, we aimed to describe the set of features that characterize high impact collaborative care interventions as a group. We also aimed to identify a short list of features that, when present, are associated with greater intervention impact. We additionally identified a set of “optional” features that varied across studies but were not associated with differential outcome effects. A short list of such features can assist those implementing collaborative care as a depression quality improvement strategy to choose intervention designs (or change strategies, in quality improvement terminology) with the greatest probability of reproducing the effects of high impact depression care interventions from the literature. Finally, we aimed to add to our current understanding of how to use literature analysis to understand multi-component interventions by using innovative qualitative approaches to overcome some of the methodological limitations of meta-regression for understanding how to implement successful depression collaborative care interventions.

The rationale behind supporting these aspects of depression care delivery is strong, in that depression quality of care is known to be suboptimal in each of these areas, and better performance relative to them is associated with improved outcomes (Hepner, Rowe et al. 2007). To date, collaborative care approaches remain the only identified method for enhancing guideline concordance, and improving outcomes, in primary care. It is thus essential for primary care and mental health specialist managers to know which features of collaborative care research interventions are necessary for achieving effects.

Our study builds directly on a prior literature synthesis recently published by Williams et al. This study aimed at identifying features of collaborative care, but did not carry out quantitative or rigorous qualitative analyses to determine relationships between features and study outcomes.

The data set assembled by this study, however, provides a rigorously identified set of high quality collaborative care articles that follow a chronic illness care model. The authors assembled, in addition, a rich set of over 60 rigorously defined variables, of which 22 related to specific broad intervention or evaluation features. By using this set as a starting point, we aimed to focus this study intensively on understanding the links between features and outcomes.

While previous meta-analyses were aimed primarily at determining whether collaborative care models, loosely defined, were effective, Williams aimed specifically to understand collaborative care features. He and colleagues therefore selected a group of articles that were more homogeneous in design (all randomized trials) and that focused on an organizational intervention aimed at patients (eliminating studies limited to staff level interventions only, such as education or reminders). Selected studies (a) involved primary care patients receiving acute-phase treatment; (b) tested a multicomponent intervention involving at least one patient-directed component; and (c) reported effects on depression severity. Reviewers analyzed the 28 multifaceted organizational interventions meeting these criteria according to intervention features mapped to the Chronic Illness Care Model (Wagner, Austin et al. 2001). Reviewers sought further unpublished details from study authors as needed.

The review found that all selected studies involved care management and required additional resources or staff reassignment to implement. The other most commonly used features among the studies included: patient education and self-management, monitoring of depressive symptoms and treatment adherence, decision support for medication management, a patient registry and mental health supervision of care managers. Additional intervention features were highly variable. Overall, the set of studies selected confirmed prior meta-analysis results, showing significant short-term effects of collaborative care up to 12 months and with three studies showing longer-term effects (up to 57 months). No quantitative analyses relating features to outcomes were performed, however. The study concluded that there was strong evidence supporting the benefits of care management for depression, but only “emerging” evidence on what constituted a successful care management model.

METHODS

Topic Development

The Veterans Health Administration (VHA), along with many other health care organizations and primary care practices, aims to improve care for depression among primary care patients. VHA participated in the President’s New Freedom Commission, and developed mental health strategic priorities related to improving mental health care in primary care in 2004 based in part on the Commission’s report. Following the strategic plan goals, beginning in 2006, VHA began a series of initiatives focusing on primary care/mental health integration, funded at high levels and culminating in a mandatory Uniform Mental Health Services Package for mental health conditions (VHA Handbook 1160.01). In beginning the improvement process, VHA researchers and policy makers identified the need to understand in more depth which of the features of previously tested multifaceted depression care interventions might be considered optional, and which should be considered required based on their impacts on outcomes. Required features could be incorporated into guidelines or best practices for improvement, and could be targeted for particular attention, tools, and other resources during the implementation of the

improvements in new organizations and practices.

Our main research question was whether, based on the literature, there are specific features of rigorously evaluated depression care improvement interventions that characterize effective interventions or are associated with greater intervention impacts. As a secondary research question, we asked whether there were specific design features of the practice settings or of the evaluation designs in these studies that might be associated with consistently greater or smaller effects. We also assessed effects of patient complexity on intervention effectiveness.

METHODOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

In this study, we used the Williams review (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007) as the basis for further investigation of relationships between intervention features, study designs, and outcomes. We used the 28 selected studies, and the 22 specific variables already abstracted to describe intervention or evaluation features, as the basis for quantitative evaluation. We developed hypotheses about features most likely to affect outcomes, and used existing variables, derived variables based on them, or new variables created for this review to address these hypotheses. We re-abstracted articles and queried authors to complete new variables. All new variables represented independent review and consensus among three investigators (JW, LR, MS). After reviewing quantitative results, we used qualitative cross-case impact analysis (Miles and Huberman 1994) iteratively with quantitative regression analysis to refine our results and develop a short list of key intervention features.

SEARCH STRATEGY

The search strategy used in the Williams review (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007) is listed below:

DATABASE SEARCHED & TIME PERIOD COVERED:

We searched Medline, HealthSTAR, CINAHL, PsycINFO and a specialized registry of depression trials for English-language medical literature published from 1966 to February 2006

LIMITERS:

SEARCH STRATEGY: Search terms included: (a) the MESH terms “depressive disorder” and “depression”; (b) a series of terms validated to identify clinical trials; and (c) a series of MESH terms and text words designed to identify studies using one or more elements of care management (Appendix A). Other sources were references identified from pertinent articles and contacts with experts in the field of depression and health services interventions. Exact search terms are reported in (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007).

In addition to our PubMed search, we performed reference mining of retrieved articles, references of prior reviews, and solicited articles from experts.

NUMBER OF ITEMS RETRIEVED: 1464

STUDY SELECTION

Of 1464 articles identified, reviewers from the Williams study (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007) identified 138 as potentially relevant. These were reviewed to identify randomized controlled trials meeting the following selection criteria: (a) samples comprising adult patients with a depressive disorder who were cared for in a primary care setting; (b) interventions needed to augment usual care by incorporating at least one patient-directed element from the CCM (e.g., patient self-management, active follow-up); and (c) studies had to report clinically meaningful outcomes, such as change in depressive symptoms. Interventions directed solely at the clinician (e.g., clinician education or performance feedback) or health care system (e.g., automated clinical reminders) were not included. Twenty-eight of the 136 articles met these criteria.

DATA ABSTRACTION

Our final set of key intervention variables, and their definitions, is listed in Table 1. Some variables are from the original Williams study (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007). Others are based on either re-derivation or re-abstraction as a part of this study. Table 1 provides the variable labels, names and definitions for the major analytic variables. It also indicates whether the distribution of each variable was adequate for regression analysis (at least 3 studies per variable value) at each time period (short-term, medium-term or long-term). Variables measuring non-white status and comorbidity are listed in Table 7 only.

Variable Definition and Abstraction in the Williams Study: In the Williams study (Williams, Gerrity et al. 2007) pairs of independent reviewers (SKD, AJD, JWW, JD, TH, BNG) abstracted the 28 articles to identify features of the chronic illness care model (Wagner, Austin et al. 2001; Bodenheimer, Wagner et al. 2002; Bodenheimer, Wagner et al. 2002); study clinician and patient characteristics; 3) components of the intervention (decision support, self-management support, delivery system redesign including care management and enhanced mental health involvement, and clinical information systems), and support for implementing the intervention; 4) care management functions and process, and 5) outcomes. When key information was missing or unclear, investigators contacted the primary author for clarification; 22 of 24 authors contacted responded to our request. Two investigators (MSG, JWW) reviewed areas of disagreement. Final classification was based on the consensus of all investigators.

Data abstraction included study design features, including inclusion and exclusion criteria, and proportion of minorities in the study. The study also focused substantially on care management, defined as any systematic or structured management of patient care by a designated provider, and on patient outcomes. Specific abstracted features on care management included coordination and communication among treating health care providers, patient education, monitoring symptoms and adherence to treatment plans, self-management support, or psychological treatments (Katon, Von Korff et al. 2001; Oxman, Dietrich et al. 2002). Outcomes abstracted included the proportion of subjects who had a least a 50% decrease in depressive symptomatology or remission in symptoms based on a validated questionnaire, the mean change in depressive symptoms, and antidepressant adherence. Extensive variable tables are included in the Williams publication.

Study Intervention and Evaluation Variable Definition and Abstraction (Current Study): We reviewed, re-abstracted or re-defined variables from the Williams study related to four categories relevant to our research questions. The first category focused on study intervention features and patient characteristics. The second category focused on intervention features. The third category focused on measures of study impact, including depression symptoms, patient adherence to treatment, satisfaction, and global improvement or functioning. The fourth category focused on study design characteristics, including proportion of patients who were non-white, and inclusion and exclusion criteria.

We then derived ten new variables. Five of the new variables required re-abstraction of the article set, while the other five were new combinations of previous variable values. Variables we re-derived and/or re-reviewed included those related to 1) care management (defined as any systematic or structured management of patient care that included coordination and communication among treating health care providers); 2) patient education; 3) self-management support or psychological treatments; 4) monitoring of symptoms; 5) monitoring of adherence to treatment plans, and 6) impact.

We contacted authors for additional information as needed. Overall, between the original data collection and our final data collection effort, we attempted to contact all but two of the authors, and succeeded in getting a responses from all but one of those we attempted (26/28). We got information from each of these authors between one and four times (mean 2.1). Only one of the authors contacted was unable to supply the information we needed. In both the original and final data collection efforts, two investigators independently abstracted the articles and reviewed any area of disagreement. Final variable values in the original data set were based on the consensus of all investigators on that article, and in our additional data collection were based on consensus of two authors (Williams and Rubenstein). For final analyses, a third author (MS) reviewed variables we identified as significant.

Study Outcome Variable Definitions and Abstraction: We used effect sizes for depression symptom change and relative risk of depression resolution as our main outcome measures. Our statistician for this study (MS) independently abstracted the data needed to calculate both effect sizes for the continuous outcomes and risk ratios for the dichotomous outcomes.

Our symptom outcome variables identified all reported *effect sizes* in *short* (six weeks to four months), *medium* (five to eight months), and *long* (nine to twelve months) time strata after baseline. We developed one set of outcome variables with values at these time periods based on continuous symptom measures, and another set based on dichotomous outcomes. Examples of continuous outcomes include results based on depression scales such as the Beck Depression Inventory, Hamilton Depression Rating Scale, or Hopkins Symptoms Checklist-20). Examples of dichotomous outcomes include assessments of the percent of patients recovered or below a specified symptom threshold by the end of the study.

After initial hypothesis testing, we developed and validated a newly-developed *impact scale* for subsequent qualitative and quantitative analyses. Because studies used different symptom measures and different follow-up time periods, each outcome variable based on effect size

included only a portion of the articles in the set. To create an outcome measure applicable to all articles in the set, we developed an impact rating for each article.

To derive the impact measure, we randomly ordered the 28 studies on an Excel spreadsheet and listed only each study's set of outcomes, without any other identifiers. We listed all of the measured outcomes for each study that fell into one of four conceptual domains. These were depression symptom outcomes, process of care outcomes (usually adherence to antidepressants), patient satisfaction, and quality of life or functioning (see table below). For each outcome we listed whatever statistics the authors reported. Two authors (LR and JW) then independently reviewed and rated the outcomes on the scrambled Excel spreadsheet, independently of any article identifiers. One investigator (JW) rechecked using outcomes from Table 4, Williams (Williams 2007). Considerations for assigning impact level included consistency of results across domains, size and significance of the effects, and persistence of results over time. The rating process graded impacts on a four-point scale as robust (high), medium, low, and none or negative. Interrater reliability for impact judgments was high, with agreement on 86% (24/28) of ratings. Final impact ratings reflected consensus on the four studies rated differently. The example table below shows four actual example studies with their impact ratings.

EXAMPLE TABLE FOR HOW IMPACT RATINGS WERE CARRIED OUT

Example Studies	Treatment Adherence (short-term)	Treatment Adherence (medium term)	Depression Symptoms (short term)	Depression Symptoms (medium or long term)	Satisfaction	Global or Functional impact	Impact Rating By LR, JW
Information recorded for each study, as available. Usual care group noted first vs. intervention group	E.g., odds ratios, significance, what was measured, time measured	E.g., odds ratios, significance, what was measured, time measured	E.g., odds ratios, change scores, significance, patients with 50% symptom decrease, type of measure,	E.g., odds ratios, change scores, significance; patients with 50% symptom decrease; type of measure	E.g., odds ratios, percent satisfied, significance, time measured	E.g., odds ratios, significance, what was measured	Robust, Moderate, Weak, Little or No Impact
#1	---	----	-3.9 vs -5.6, p= .02, Ham-D change, 3 mos.	-4.0, vs -7.3 p<.001, Ham-D change, 6 mos. 33% vs, 53% p<.001, Ham-D 50% improvement, at 12 mos.	----	P < .05 on the SF 20 at 12 mos., exact score not given	Robust
#2	957 vs 867, NS, Mean milligrams antidepressant dispensed at 6 wks	2267i vs. 2111, NS, Mean milligrams antidepressant dispensed at 6 mos	33% vs 38%, p=.01, Ham-D 50% improvement, at 6 weeks 33% vs 38%, NS, Beck 50% improvement, at 6 wks.	38% vs. 57%, p=.003, Ham-D 50% improvement at 6 mos. 37% vs. 48%, p = .05, Beck 50% improvement at 6 wks.	3.94 vs. 4.20, p=.001, 11 item unpublished scale, at 6 mos.	44.6 vs. 47.3, p = .10, SF-12 MCS score at 6 mos.	Moderate
#3	--	42% vs 64%., p<.001, prescribed ≥90 days AD	1.5 vs. 1.58, NS, SCL-20, at six months	1.63 vs. 1.62 NS, SCL-20, at six months	---	31.7 vs. 31.1, NS, PCS from SF36V	Weak
#4	No significant difference at 3 mos. (no numeric data provided)	30% versus 49% adherent to anti-depressants, p ≤.05, at six months excluding 3 dropouts, NS for intent to treat	21% vs. 21% 50% improvement, NS, BDI, 3 mos.	---	---	----	Weak

STUDY QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Determination of study quality was based on the Williams study. The quality measure took account of the process of randomization and allocation concealment, fidelity to the planned intervention without significant co-intervention, follow-up rates and analytic methods, using an intent-to-treat approach and blinded outcome assessments. Based on these criteria, risk of bias was rated as a low (all elements met), moderate (≥ 1 element partially met), or high (≥ 1 element not met) (Higgins and Green). There were no disagreements about quality assessments.

DATA SYNTHESIS AND ANALYSIS

Correlations: Prior to carrying out regression analysis, we evaluated correlations between intervention and evaluation design features. Since intervention and evaluation features were categorical, we evaluated the correlations between variables using cross tabulations and the chi-square statistic.

Effect Size Calculations for Continuous Outcomes: In order to compare estimates across studies that report different depression scales, the effect size was selected as the unit of analysis. An effect size was calculated if the follow-up mean, standard deviation, and sample size for both the intervention group and usual care group were reported or could be calculated. For trials that reported a mean outcome but no standard deviation, the standard deviation was estimated by taking the mean standard deviation weighted by the sample size across all other trials that reported standard deviations for that outcome (Furukawa, 2006).

Only one comparison per study within each time strata was calculated. For studies that included more than one intervention group, the group that was most similar to the complete collaborative care model was included. In addition, only one outcome per study was used. If a study reported more than one depression scale, then the measure that was clinically homogeneous to the scales reported in the other included studies was selected. Effect sizes were calculated by dividing the difference of follow-up means of the intervention and control group by the pooled follow-up standard deviations of the two groups (Sutton AJ, 2000). Ninety-five percent confidence intervals were calculated for each effect size. A negative effect size indicates that the intervention group did better at follow-up than the control group. Negative effect sizes indicate benefit because when the intervention group is doing better than the control group, depression symptoms are reduced. Thus, for example, for each independent variable, the largest negative effect size shows the group with the greatest effect.

Risk Ratio Calculations for Dichotomous Outcomes: We estimated a risk ratio to assess effect for dichotomous variables. For the risk ratio analysis, we used the longest follow-up interval reported. Risk ratios and their ninety-five percent confidence intervals were estimated for studies that reported the percent of people who improved since baseline in each study. A risk ratio greater than one indicates that the intervention group had a higher rate of improvement than the usual care group did. For example, a risk ratio of 1.50 signifies that 50% more people improved in the intervention group than in the usual care group. All analyses were conducted in Stata version 10.0.

Quantitative analysis focused on assessing key independent variables related to evaluation or implementation design against depression symptom outcomes as the dependent variable. Correlations between the independent variables were assessed. A stratified meta-regression was conducted separately for each independent variable with the effect size as the outcome (Sutton AJ, 2000). Stratification was based on follow-up time. A study could contribute to more than one stratum. Bivariate meta-regressions using the same independent variables as above were also conducted using the risk ratio as the outcome. Estimates were obtained from the meta-regressions for each level of the independent variable. In most cases, the independent variables had two levels (e.g. did the study have the component or not). A z-test was used from the meta-regression to test if the difference in effect sizes or risk ratios was significant between component groups. Differences with p-values less than 0.05 were denoted (Stata, 2006).

In this study, we found variations in which outcomes were used, ranging from a variety of depression symptom indices, health-related quality of life, patient satisfaction, and process of care for depression. We also found variations in when outcomes were measured. We used a conservative analytic approach such that we focused on depression symptom outcomes only. We also focused on time frames separately, rather than combining results across time frames.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

We carried out qualitative cross-case analysis using methods based on Miles and Huberman (Miles and Huberman 1994). We used this approach to overcome limitations to meta-regression in our article sample—primarily the inability to include all 28 selected articles in a single meta-regression analysis. In traditional meta-analysis, the study intervention is treated as the same across all studies. The major challenges posed during this kind of analysis derive from variations in how outcomes are reported (e.g. by time period, or specific measure); these variations may limit the number of studies included in a given analysis. However, since each study is included as a whole, power for detecting overall effects with an article sample size like ours is generally adequate. Meta-regression, however, makes comparisons within the overall group of studies and is thus more analytically demanding. In addition, valid meta-regression using multiple features or control variables simultaneously would require more studies than were available to us. Since no single quantitative outcome analysis in this study included all reviewed studies, we wanted to confirm qualitatively that our quantitative results were insensitive to inclusion of all studies in the same outcome analysis. We also wanted to be able to assess intervention features that characterized too many studies in the sample to be tested quantitatively (see Table 1). Cross-case analysis afforded us the ability to achieve these goals.

To carry out the analyses, we ranked studies by impact level based on our overall impact measure (see above). We focused primarily on the intervention features that had inadequate distributions either at all time periods or at medium-term and long-term due to being present in too many studies in the sample (see Table 1). These intervention characteristics could not be adequately tested quantitatively. We also developed four main scenarios based on our hypotheses for types of interventions or design features and their relationships to impact. We then created a series of tables around these scenarios as antecedent matrices related to our conceptual model of collaborative care and our hypotheses about effects of study design features. We looked for

patterns, and verified scenarios for similar and contrasting outcomes.

PEER REVIEW

This report was reviewed by our technical experts. Their comments were taken into consideration in our revision. Service as a technical expert does not imply endorsement of the report's findings. A table of peer review comments received and the changes we made to the report is presented in Appendix B.

RESULTS

LITERATURE FLOW

Of 138 studies reviewed, 29 met all inclusion criteria (Fig. 1). One of these was excluded because the intervention targeted relapse prevention for patients in remission from a depressive episode. Twenty-eight studies were reviewed for further analysis. Reviewers also consulted fifty-six articles that were companion papers for included studies and described methods, long-term outcomes, subgroup analyses, cost data and other outcomes.

Among the 28 selected studies, overall study quality was high (Table 2 and Appendix A). Risk of bias was low in 18/28 studies (64%); moderate in 6/28(22%); and high in 4/28 (14%). Outcomes were assessed blind to treatment assignment in 23 studies, and intent-to-treat analyses were used in 21 studies. Fifteen of the 28 studies (54%) involved managed care practices, including five in Veterans Affairs facilities. Most were carried out in the United States.

STUDIES INCLUDED IN EFFECT SIZE OR RELATIVE RISK ANALYSES

Twenty-five of the 28 studies included usable continuous depression symptom measures for analysis, while three studies did not. Two of the excluded studies did not report a follow-up mean, and one did not report the sample size by group. Among the 25 studies in the continuous measure analysis, 21 included effect sizes based on short-term follow-up. Eighteen studies contributed intermediate-term effect sizes. Ten studies contributed long-term effect sizes. Eighteen studies reported a dichotomous improvement outcome and were included in the risk ratio analysis.

Four studies had two intervention arms and reported results for each arm separately. For Katon (1995) and Katon (1996) the major depression groups were used while the minor depression groups were excluded. Simon (2004) reported two intervention groups. Both had telephone care management. One group had the addition of telephone psychotherapy which was the intervention group we selected to compare against the usual care group. Simon (2000) had feedback only and care management – we selected the care management group to compare to the usual care group. For Wells (2000), the enhanced medication arm was used.

We found that not all studies could provide suitable information for each effectiveness analysis. We found that studies were too heterogeneous in their assessments of comorbidities and demographics to evaluate any of these variables quantitatively. We were, however, able to evaluate studies with a higher proportion (over 25%) minorities. 6 studies did not report minority status.

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FEATURES

When we evaluated correlations between the intervention and evaluation features used in our final analyses, we found that enrolling patients through primary care clinician referral of patients or by identification of patients on antidepressants (versus by screening) is significantly correlated

with use of patient level randomization ($p = .03$). Enrolling patients referred by primary care clinicians on antidepressants or willing to take them is correlated with study inclusion of fewer practice groups ($p = .01$). Having mental health specialists involved in patient management was also correlated with inclusion of fewer practice groups ($p = .03$).

Looking just at collaborative care model intervention features, we found that studies in which medications were adjusted by primary care clinicians with expert guidance were significantly more likely to include care managers who were nurses, versus other types of professionals; were more likely to include at least 16 weeks of follow-up ($p = .04$); used more intensive (robust) interventions ($p = .001$); and followed an overall classic collaborative care intervention model ($p = .04$). Classic collaborative care interventions were correlated with having a dedicated care manager who used standardized depression symptom scales for follow-up ($p = .03$). Including active self-management was correlated with having a dedicated depression care manager who assessed depression symptoms with a structured instrument at baseline and at one or more follow-up visits, and who also assessed treatment adherence ($p = .02$).

No other correlations (associations) between study variables shown in Table 1 were significant at $p < .05$.

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Overall, the experimental groups in selected studies showed improvement. The overall effect size by follow-up time was: short-term, -0.28 ($-0.38, -0.19$); intermediate term, -0.25 ($-0.37, -0.14$); and long-term, -0.19 ($-0.36, -0.02$). Twenty of 28 interventions improved depression outcomes over 3–12 months (an 18.4% median absolute increase in the proportion of patients with 50% improvement in symptoms; range, 8.3–46%).

STUDY EVALUATION DESIGN FEATURES VS. EFFECTIVENESS

Study designs varied on several major features. Subjects were recruited using four strategies: screening ($n = 11$), clinician referral ($n = 9$), administrative or pharmacy databases ($n = 3$), a combination of these strategies ($n = 3$) or direct contact by a pharmacist when an antidepressant prescription was filled ($n = 2$). The unit of randomization varied across studies: 18 randomized patients, 3 randomized providers and 7 randomized practices.

Table 3 shows the relationship between four evaluation design features and depression symptoms and resolution, using univariate regression. In the table, the group with the higher negative effect size shows greater reduction in depression symptoms, and the group with the higher relative risk shows a better chance of depression resolution. Because nearly all studies had some effect, effect sizes both with and without the target feature are negative (showing an effect on depression symptoms), and nearly all relative risks are greater than one (showing greater resolution of depression). We report results on short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes. Our results show that studies in which patients were referred to care management through screening, rather than by primary care clinicians or administrative medication records, had a significantly higher relative risk of depression resolution. No other among the four design features we investigated was significantly linked to outcomes.

Table 3 also shows that studies with greater than 25% minorities tended to show greater effects, although this difference did not reach statistical significance. Six studies did not record minority status.

ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN INTERVENTION FEATURES AND OUTCOME EFFECT SIZES

Table 4a shows the relationship between nine variables reflecting collaborative care model intervention features and depression symptoms and resolution. In the table, the group with the higher negative effect size shows greater reduction in depression symptoms, and the group with the higher relative risk shows a better chance of depression resolution. We report results on short-term, medium-term, and long-term outcomes. Initial univariate regression results evaluating the first five individual features listed in the table (structured care manager assessment, active self-management support, care manager triage to mental health, adjustment of antidepressants by primary care clinicians, and care managers who were predominantly nurses) showed active patient self-management support as the single statistically significant intervention characteristic associated with improved depression symptoms and depression resolution.

We then derived additional variables shown in Table 4b. This table shows that studies with nurse or PhD pharmacist care management, patient education, and at least sixteen weeks of care manager follow-up (classic collaborative care model with long-term follow-up, see variables Table 1) are associated with significantly improved long-term effects on depression symptoms. Having at least 16 weeks of care manager follow-up alone was not well-distributed as a variable, but appeared to be associated with a significantly greater reduction in depression symptoms at short-term and medium-term time points.

IMPACT MEASURE

We designed our study impact measure to distinguish between high, medium or low impact by the study intervention by qualitatively taking into account all key outcome variables comparing intervention to usual care and all measurement time periods. We therefore expected it to be associated with, but not identical to, our quantitative study effect size measures of depression symptom reductions. Though the impact measure was based on expert rating, it was significantly associated with quantitative depression symptom effect size results at each time point (Table 5). Based on quantitative depression symptom reduction effects, the impact measure statistically distinguished studies designated as showing high, medium, or low impact from those designated as showing little or no impact. The impact measure was also associated with significantly greater relative risk of depression resolution. However, unlike the effect size measures we used for our primary study outcome tests, and as discussed in the Methods section above, the impact measure could be applied to all 28 studies. This afforded us additional opportunities to evaluate our results, and test their sensitivity to inclusion of all studies together.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERVENTION FEATURES VERSUS OUTCOME IMPACTS

To understand our initial regression results, we carried out extensive cross-case analyses looking at combinations of characteristics versus our impact measure, based on a priori study questions

as indicated in Methods above. Table 6 shows cross-case analysis of our key collaborative care model intervention features. The cross-case analyses enabled us to look closely at features that occurred together in large proportions of higher impact studies (the 20 studies with high, medium or low impact versus the 8 with little or no impact). We considered features present in 80% or more of the higher impact studies to be core features of effective collaborative care models. Our analyses identified six collaborative care model intervention core features. These were:

- Primary care clinicians actively involved in patient management
- Mental health specialists actively involved in patient management
- Care managers assessed patient symptoms at baseline with a standardized scale
- Care managers assessed patient symptoms at follow-up with a standardized scale
- Care managers assessed treatment adherence at follow-up
- Collaborative care intervention included at least 16 weeks of active patient follow-up

As shown in Table 6 and, in greater detail, in Table 9, active patient self-management support strongly characterized the high and medium impact studies, and became less prevalent in the low and little or no impact groups. Only one high impact study and only two medium impact studies did not undertake active self-management support. The one high impact study without active patient self-management (Katzelnick, Simon et al. 2000) used a previously tested and validated educational tool.

As indicated in Table 6, there were five VA studies in the sample, and one additional study with a VA site. Among the studies conducted in Veterans Affairs facilities, those that supported active patient self-management (Oslin, Sayers, Ross, et al., 2003; Fortney, Pyne, Edlund, et al., 2006) had the higher impact scores. One study (Swindle) that had low impact used mental health clinical nurse specialists as care managers and did not include structured assessment. A second low impact VA study (Dobscha) did not include at least twelve weeks of follow-up.

Table 9 shows the details of the self-management support interventions used in these studies. While all included studies incorporated at least one chronic illness care element directed toward patients, this element might be, for example, care manager assessment without patient education and behavioral activation. We looked for self-management support approaches that featured behavioral activation or interactive problem-solving approaches, usually in addition to standard patient education using written material or videotapes. We counted CBT provided by mental health specialists as therapy rather than self-management support.

In addition to core features, we used qualitative analyses to identify features that varied across high impact studies, and could thus be considered options. The main feature that emerged as an option was telephone versus in person care management.

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVALUATION DESIGN FEATURES, INCLUDING PATIENT COMORBIDITY, VERSUS OUTCOME IMPACTS

Table 8 shows qualitative results for evaluation design features. We found no evaluation design features other than those related to comorbidities that characterized more than 80% of high impact studies. In general, studies conducted in Veterans Affairs facilities were medium-sized, randomized at the provider or practice level, and eligible patients were referred through screening.

Table 7 shows results for comorbidities and demographics versus impact. More than 80% of studies excluded patients with bipolar disorder and psychosis. No study excluded anxiety. Six studies (21%) did not mention PTSD, and only 14% of the remaining 22 studies excluded patients based on it. Most studies (18 of the 28) excluded patients with substance abuse. Six studies (21%) did not report on the proportion of minorities enrolled.

In evaluating the relationship between evaluation design features and outcomes, we found no consistent effects qualitatively for the following design variables: number of practices in the study, patients per practice, whether patients were screened by the study and referred or were referred by their clinicians, or whether randomization was at the patient or cluster level.

LIMITATIONS

The results of this review are limited by several important factors. First, the analyses conducted in this paper were not designed to address causality. Even the quantitative analyses must be considered descriptive, and the qualitative analyses are hypothesis-generating. The number of categories of analytic variables tested and the possibility of misclassification of variables across reviewers have the potential to bias our results. With only 28 articles, quantitative analyses are of necessity limited. Nevertheless, within the framework of a set of complex interventions that we already know have robust effects on depression outcomes, but that vary in basic components, our analyses have substantial strengths. Strengths of our analyses include our extensive querying of authors regarding intervention and evaluation features; our systematic approach to analysis; our rigorous variable definitions and validation through independent review and consensus; and our triangulation, or sensitivity testing, of conclusions across methodologies.

Our qualitative approach is hypothesis generating. Our impact score is subjective, although rigorously derived and associated with effect sizes at each time frame. However, the only quantitative approach to defining an outcome across all 28 studies would have been to combine effects across heterogeneous time frames and measurement methods, an approach that may have resulted in greater bias than the method we chose. Future studies could assess the tradeoffs between these approaches. Our analysis is based on iterative review of data by investigators, and thus subject to bias. Our use of rigorous cross-case methods mitigates, but does not eliminate this possibility. The transparent presentation of our analyses to readers in tabular form, however, should assist readers in making independent assessments of our conclusions.

The studies upon which we based our analyses also have limitations. The studies themselves have selection biases. Even studies that use screening to identify patients exclude some categories of patients and recruit only a portion of those eligible due to refusal. We therefore cannot be certain how well these studies generalize to use of the collaborative care model in usual practice settings. Most interventions in these studies were implemented through large health care organizations, limiting the generalizability of the results to organizations with sufficient structure, commitment and resources to implement interventions requiring changes in systems of care. Moreover, practices in fee-for-service environments that do not reimburse for care management services have fewer incentives for implementing these interventions. In addition, there may be contextual variables not measured in the studies that influence outcomes. For example, even within managed care organizations, Rubenstein et al. (Rubenstein, Parker et al. 2002; Rubenstein, Meredith et al. 2006) found that expert leadership and support from local practice management and mental health specialists influenced the development of successful programs. In addition, study comparisons were to usual care. Usual care, however, is heterogeneous across settings and providers, For example, some usual care settings may have ample mental health specialty access, while some have little.

In terms of the interventions studied, we could not test the independence of many of the features in association with outcomes because the features were not distributed evenly among studies. Some features also tended to occur with other features. We extensively tested combinations of features both in quantitative analysis (e.g., the classic collaborative care model) and in qualitative analysis, where features could be viewed as present or absent across studies.

Our study is limited in terms of shedding light on the chronic illness care model as applied to conditions other than depression. Depression has unique features that might make it more necessary to expend resources on, for example, care management. Depressed patients tend to be apathetic, poor consumers who benefit from proactive care. They are often not detected without screening. Screening requires psychological testing, rather than a blood test, and follow-up of positive screens requires either a full mental health specialist interview or psychological assessments using standardized tests that take in the neighborhood of 40 minutes to complete. Assessment is difficult to complete in an average 20 minute primary care visit. Assessment can additionally uncover serious urgent or emergent conditions such as suicidal threats, requiring additional time to handle appropriately. Furthermore, adherence to treatment is likely to be a more prevalent problem among depressed patients than among other chronically ill patients. Follow-up care requires frequent contact, but not full in-person visits—the interview, not the physical examination or laboratory testing, provides most of the necessary information. Finally, mental health specialists may be more organizationally or geographically separate from primary care than are other specialists. The unique characteristics of depression may thus help explain why there is substantially more evidence for cost-effectiveness of depression collaborative care than for other care management-based interventions. Future research will clarify the transportability of conclusions on depression collaborative care to other chronic conditions.

The studies on collaborative care for depression were also severely limited in terms of addressing medical or psychiatric comorbidities. No evidence is available from these studies on collaborative care for bipolar disorder or psychosis, because these patients were nearly

universally excluded. Patients with subthreshold depression were also usually excluded, although one of the studies later found evidence of positive effects among these patients (Wells 2005). Only a few studies included patients with substance abuse. Among the studies that included a broader group of patients, intervention protocols most likely specified referring patients with severe psychiatric comorbidities for mental health specialty care (e.g., RAND 2000). Thus, no conclusions can be drawn from this review on collaborative care for primary care patients with medical or psychiatric comorbidities.

This study identified only 28 studies out of 1464 that met full inclusion criteria, and less than half of these were published in the last five years. Previous collaborative care literature syntheses have netted 30 to 40 includes, but have included more heterogeneous groups of interventions and evaluations. New methods for achieving the necessary improvements in depression care may well be identified in future reviews.

CONCLUSIONS

While collaborative care models for depression vary, careful analysis of model features shows that a core set of characteristics is linked to better results. This set is robust across qualitative and quantitative analyses, and does not seem to be biased by links to particular evaluation design features (e.g., the design feature of randomization at the patient level is distributed across all levels of care model impact). In addition to the core variables, active patient self management support appears to characterize the set of very high impact studies. These findings are sufficiently strong to support recommendations to sites intending to implement collaborative care for depression.

Guidelines for sites intending to implement collaborative care for depression should identify primary care and mental health specialty clinician involvement; care manager assessment of symptoms at baseline and follow-up using a structured instrument; care manager follow-up assessment of treatment adherence; and active follow-up for at least 16 weeks as core features of current evidence-based models. Guidelines should further recommend inclusion of active self-management support, such as elements of patient activation, cognitive behavioral or problem-solving therapy, or motivational techniques, for additional improvement in outcomes.

Figure 1. Article Flow




Fig. 1. Flow diagram of the search and selection processes for trials included in the systematic review.

Table 1: Variables Characterizing the Study Intervention and Design

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION†
Number of Practices in the Study <i>(practice group = small, medium, or large)</i>	Number of practices in the study. There are three levels: Small (1-2); Medium = (3-10); Large = (>10). (categorical) Distribution adequate for short-term and intermediate-term. Inadequate for long-term based on too few “small” category studies.
Referred to the Study by Primary Care Clinicians or on Antidepressant Medications <i>(type_ref1=yes)</i>	Patients enrolled in the study were referred by primary care clinicians and/or were on antidepressant medications. All other studies screened patients for depression, and included those who screened in as probably depressed. (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.
Referred to the Study by Primary Care Clinicians and on Antidepressant Medications or Willing to Take Them. <i>(type_ref2=yes)</i>	Patients enrolled in the study were referred by primary care clinicians and were on antidepressant medications or indicated a willingness to start them. Distribution adequate for short-term and intermediate-term; inadequate for long-term based on too few “yes” category studies.
Study Set in Primary Care Clinician Offices <i>(type_set=yes)</i>	Study set in primary care clinician offices rather than in a community-based setting. (dichotomous) Distribution not adequate for short-term, intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.
Patient Level Randomization <i>(rand1=yes)</i>	Subjects were randomized at the patient level rather than at the provider or practice level (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION†
Structured Care Manager Assessment of Depression Symptoms (Baseline and Follow-up) and Treatment Adherence <i>(CMAssess=yes)*</i>	Depression Care Manager (DCM) assesses depression symptoms with a structured instrument at baseline and at one or more follow-up visits; and also assesses treatment adherence (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term and intermediate-term but not for long-term, based on too few “no” category studies.
Active Self-Management Support <i>(self_manage = yes))</i>	Facilitates active self-management (goal-setting and/or patient activation), provides patient education, and encourages adherence to plan and tracking of progress (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.
Care Manager Triage to Mental Health <i>(MH_spec=yes)</i>	DCM guided patients to mental health specialty instead of primary care based on preferences, symptoms, co-morbidities, or other clinical judgment (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.
Primary Care Clinician Adjusts Antidepressants <i>(MedAdjR=yes)</i>	Primary care clinician adjusted antidepressant medications with review and input as needed from a mental health specialist or other depression medication expert (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term and intermediate-term, but not for long-term, based on too few “no” category studies.
Care Managers are Medical Nurses <i>(CMMedNurse=yes)</i>	Care managers were predominantly medical nurses rather than psychiatric nurses, other mental health professionals, pharmacists, or health educators (dichotomous) Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION†
<p>Intensity of Intervention Assessment and Follow-Up (<i>robustness=high, medium, or low</i>)</p>	<p>Intensity is defined by three features: (1) DCM structured assessment of depression symptoms (baseline and follow-up) and treatment adherence, (2) adequate number (mean of >3) of DCM contacts, and (3) antidepressant adjustment by the primary care clinician with expert guidance. The three levels of intensity are based on having one, two, or three features (categorical)</p> <p>Distribution adequate for short-term, but not for intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “medium” category studies.</p>
<p>Classic Collaborative Care Intervention With Long Follow-up (<i>type_int1= yes</i>)</p>	<p>Has care management by an RN or doctoral level pharmacist, primary care clinician collaboration with mental health specialty, patient education, and follow-up for at least 16 weeks (either by telephone or in person) (dichotomous)</p> <p>Distribution adequate for short-term, intermediate-term and long-term.</p>
<p>Active Patient Follow-up for At Least 16 Weeks (<i>_16_weeks = yes</i>)</p>	<p>Intervention included at least 16 weeks of active patient follow-up (dichotomous)</p> <p>Distribution adequate for short-term, but not for intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.</p>
<p>Overall Intervention Impact (<i>impact = high (1), medium (2), low (3), little or no (4)</i>)</p>	<p>Independent judgment regarding how certain and how large the impact of the intervention was by two reviewers blinded to study methods or results (viewing extracted study outcomes only).</p> <p>Raters identified four levels of impact (high, medium, low, and little or no impact). Judgments were based on effect size/significance of intervention impact on depression symptoms, process of care, patient satisfaction, and overall quality of life, considering all time points. (categorical)</p> <p>Distribution adequate for short-term, but not for intermediate-term or long-term. This is based on too few “3” category studies for medium-term and too few “ 2” & “3” categories for long-term.</p>

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION†
Type of Self-Management Support <i>[A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques), P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact), N = No evidence of self-management support]</i>	Intervention included self-management support or there was no evidence of self-management support. Support was either active or passive. Used only for qualitative analysis (categorical).
Primary Care Clinicians Are Involved <i>(PCP_Involve = yes)</i>	The intervention specified that primary care clinicians be actively involved in decision-making on depression management, rather than delegating decision-making to others after initial referral to collaborative care (dichotomous). Distribution not adequate for short-term, intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.
Mental Health Specialists are Involved <i>(MH_Specialty = yes)</i>	The intervention specified that one or more mental health specialists be actively involved in monitoring patients, either directly or through communication with the primary care clinician or care manager, after initial referral to collaborative care. (dichotomous). Distribution not adequate for short-term, intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.
Standardized Care Manager Baseline Symptom Assessment <i>(CM_Staff_Base_Sx = yes)**</i>	Dedicated care manager staff conducted assessment of patient symptoms at baseline using a standardized scale. By dedicated, we mean an individual who carried out this function as a defined, discrete job, rather than e.g. a primary care clinician or pharmacist engaged in usual practice. Usually studies also indicated specific training (dichotomous). Distribution not adequate for short-term, intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.

VARIABLE NAME	VARIABLE DEFINITION AND DISTRIBUTION†
Standardized Care Manager Follow-up Symptom Assessment (CM_Staff_F_U_SX = yes)***	Dedicated care manager staff conducted followed up assessments of patient symptoms using a standardized scale. By dedicated, we mean an individual carried out this function as a defined, discrete job. Usually studies also indicated specific training (dichotomous). Distribution adequate for short-term, but not medium-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.
Care Manager Follow-up of Treatment Adherence (CM_Staff_F_U_Adh = yes)****	Dedicated care manager staff F\followed patients proactively for treatment adherence. By dedicated, we mean an individual who carried out this function as a defined, discrete job. Usually studies also indicated specific training (dichotomous). Distribution not adequate for short-term, intermediate-term or long-term based on too few “no” category studies.

**CMAssess2* same as *CMAssess* except that the Dietrick article is coded as “yes” rather than “9” for base symptoms

**Same coding as *BaseSx* except that the Dietrick article is coded as “yes” rather than “9”

***Same coding as *DepScale*

****Same coding as *TxAdhere*

†Adequacy of variable distribution is based on having at least three studies with each variable value, see analysis methods. Short-term, medium-term, and long-term refer to time of measurement of effects, see outcome variable definitions. Intervention characteristics that were too prevalent in the sample to be investigated quantitatively and were therefore subjected to qualitative impact analysis are listed in bold.

Table 2: Summary of study design characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n
Study quality	Low risk of bias	18
	Moderate risk of bias	6
	High risk of bias	4
Comparator	Usual care	15
	Usual care: all patients starting antidepressant	12
	Consult-liaison mental health	1
Location	Latin America	1
	United States	23
	Western Europe	4
Setting	Community	8
	Academic	2
	HMO or Veterans Affairs	15
	Mixed	3
Patient recruitment	Systematic screening	11
	Administrative database or pharmacist	6
	Clinician referral	9
	Mixed	2
Major depression	< 75% of patients had MDD	14
	>= 75% of patients had MDD	9
	Unknown	5
Patient population	< 25% ethnic minorities	15
	>= 25% ethnic minorities	7
	Unknown	6
Psychiatric comorbidity	Not excluded systematically	13
	Bipolar disorder, psychosis and substance abuse excluded or triaged to mental health specialist	15

Table 3: Evaluation Design Features Versus Study Effects on Depression Symptoms or Depression Resolution*

		Depression Symptom Effects						Depression Resolution	
Intervention Feature	Response Category	n	Short-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Medium-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Long-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Relative Risk (95% CI)
Number of Practices in the Study (<i>practice_group</i>)	Few	5	-0.18 (-0.43, 0.06)	5	-0.08 (-0.38, 0.22)	2	-0.02 (-0.40, 0.35)	5	1.19 (0.90, 1.55)
	Medium	8	-0.33 (-0.50, -0.17)	8	-0.32 (-0.52, -0.12)	4	-0.12 (-0.34, 0.11)	8	1.49 (1.20, 1.84)
	Many	8	-0.28 (-0.46, -0.11)	5	-0.26 (-0.50, -0.01)	4	-0.33 (-0.54, -0.12)	5	1.47 (1.15, 1.88)
Referred to the Study after Screening Only (<i>type_ref1</i>)	Yes	7	-0.37 (-0.53, -0.20)	8	-0.33 (-0.52, -0.13)	7	-0.24 (-0.41, -0.07)	6	1.76 (1.44, 2.14)
	No	14	-0.23 (-0.36, -0.10)	10	-0.18 (-0.37, 0.01)	3	-0.07 (-0.36, 0.22)	12	1.24 (1.08, 1.43)*
Referred to the Study by Primary Care Clinicians and on Antidepressant Medications or Willing to Take Them (<i>type_ref2</i>)	Yes	7	-0.23 (-0.42, -0.03)	8	-0.14 (-0.35, 0.08)	2	-0.08 (-0.46, 0.30)	8	1.24 (1.02, 1.52)
	No	14	-0.31 (-0.44, -0.19)	10	-0.32 (-0.49, -0.15)	8	-0.22 (-0.38, -0.05)	10	1.53 (1.28, 1.82)
Patient Level Randomization (<i>rand1</i>)	Yes	13	-0.30 (-0.44, -0.16)	12	-0.27 (-0.44, -0.09)	3	-0.10 (-0.40, 0.19)	11	1.32 (1.11, 1.58)
	No	8	-0.27 (-0.43, -0.10)	6	-0.22 (-0.45, 0.00)	7	-0.23 (-0.41, -0.06)	7	1.53 (1.22, 1.90)
More than 25% of Patients Were Non-White (<i>minority_grp</i>)	Yes	6	-0.35 (-0.55, -0.14)	7	-0.29 (-0.51, -0.06)	4	-0.16 (-0.39, 0.07)	6	1.50 (1.17, 1.93)
	No	10	-0.24 (-0.41, -0.08)	8	-0.24 (-0.46, -0.02)	6	-0.23 (-0.42, -0.03)	12	1.35 (1.14, 1.61)

* See Table 1 for full variable descriptions.

Table 4a: Collaborative Care Intervention Model Feature Effects on Depression Symptoms or Depression Resolution (Initial Variables)*

Collaborative Care Model Intervention Features		Depression Symptom Effects						Depression Resolution	
Features	Response Category	n	Short-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Medium-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Long-term: Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Relative Risk (95% CI)
Structured DCM Assessment of Depression Symptoms (Baseline and Followup) and Treatment Adherence (<i>CMAssess</i>)	Yes	15	-0.23 (-0.34, -0.12)	15	-0.20 (-0.33, -0.06)	10	NE	14	1.38 (1.17, 1.62)
	No	6	-0.44 (-0.63, -0.25)	3	-0.53 (-0.83, -0.22)	0	NE	4	1.47 (1.09, 1.98)
Active Self-Management Support (<i>self_manage</i>)	Yes	7	-0.37 (-0.54, -0.20)	8	-0.33 (-0.53, -0.13)	4	-0.30 (-0.51, -0.08)	8	1.64 (1.36, 1.99)*
	No	14	-0.24 (-0.37, -0.11)	10	-0.18 (-0.37, 0.00)	6	-0.12 (-0.31, 0.07)	10	1.24 (1.04, 1.46)
Care Manager Triage to Mental Health (<i>MH_spec</i>)	Yes	7	-0.20 (-0.38, -0.02)	6	-0.14 (-0.38, 0.10)	4	-0.02 (-0.25, 0.20)	5	1.29 (0.98, 1.69)
	No	14	-0.33 (-0.45, -0.20)	12	-0.30 (-0.46, -0.14)	6	-0.29 (-0.45, -0.14)	13	1.44 (1.22, 1.70)
Primary Care Clinician Adjusts Antidepressants	Yes	17	-0.25 (-0.36, -0.13)	14	-0.19 (-0.34, -0.04)	8	-0.18 (-0.35, -0.01)	15	1.34 (1.15, 1.56)
	No	4	-0.44 (-0.66, -0.21)	4	-0.45 (-0.72, -0.19)	2	-0.25 (-0.59, 0.09)	3	1.69 (1.23, 2.33)
Care Managers were predominately medical nurses (<i>CMMed Nurse</i>)	Yes	8	-0.31 (-0.48, -0.15)	9	-0.31 (-0.50, -0.13)	6	-0.28 (-0.45, -0.11)	7	1.60 (1.32, 1.94)
	No	13	-0.26 (-0.40, -0.12)	9	-0.17 (-0.37, 0.03)	4	-0.05 (-0.28, 0.18)	11	1.26 (1.07, 1.49)

Table 4b: Collaborative Care Intervention Model Feature Effects on Depression Symptoms or Depression Resolution (Additional Variables)*

		Depression Symptom Effects						Depression Resolution	
Intervention Feature	Response Category	n	Short-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Medium-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Long-term Effect Size (95% CI)	n	Relative Risk (95% CI)
Intensity of Intervention Assessment and Follow-Up (<i>robustness</i>)	High	11	-0.21 (-0.36, -0.07)	11	-0.19 (-0.36, -0.01)	6	-0.20 (-0.41, 0.01)	11	1.37 (1.13, 1.65)
	Med	4	-0.28 (-0.52, -0.05)	2	-0.17 (-0.55, 0.21)	1	-0.08 (-0.58, 0.41)	2	1.33 (0.89, 1.98)
	Low	6	-0.40 (-0.59, -0.22)	5	-0.42 (-0.67, -0.16)	3	-0.23 (-0.52, 0.07)	5	1.50 (1.14, 1.96)
Classic Collaborative Care Intervention With Long Follow-up (<i>type_intl</i>)	Yes	14	-0.29 (-0.42, -0.16)	13	-0.24 (-0.40, -0.07)	5	-0.34 (-0.50, -0.17)*	13	1.44 (1.22, 1.70)
	No	7	-0.27 (-0.46, -0.08)	5	-0.28 (-0.55, -0.02)	5	-0.05 (-0.23, 0.13)	5	1.28 (0.98, 1.68)
Active Patient Follow-up for At Least 16 Weeks (<i>_16_weeks</i>)	Yes	17	-0.24 (-0.34, -0.13)*	16	-0.20 (-0.33, -0.07)*	8	-0.22 (-0.39, -0.06)	16	1.38 (1.19, 1.60)
	No	4	-0.52 (-0.75, -0.28)	2	-0.63 (-1.00, -0.26)	2	-0.08 (-0.42, 0.26)	2	1.59 (1.04, 2.43)

* See Table 1 for full variable descriptions.

Table 5: Relationship between Qualitative Impact Variable and Effects on Depression Symptoms and Resolution*

		Depression Symptoms						Depression Resolution	
Intervention Feature	Response Category	Short-term: Effect Size (95% CI)		Intermediate: Effect Size (95% CI)		Long-term: Effect Size (95% CI)		Relative Risk (95% CI)	
		n		n		n		n	
Overall Intervention Impact (<i>impact</i>)	High Impact (1)	8	-0.40 (-0.56, -0.24)	9	-0.42 (-0.59, -0.25)	4	-0.37 (-0.56, -0.18)	8	1.71 (1.47, 1.99)
	Medium (2)	6	-0.26 (-0.44, -0.08)	4	-0.15 (-0.39, 0.08)	1	-0.08 (-0.47, 0.31)	5	1.35 (1.12, 1.63)
	Low (3)	3	-0.30 (-0.59, -0.01)	1	-0.11 (-0.58, 0.36)	2	-0.10 (-0.39, 0.18)	2	1.24 (0.88, 1.76)
	Little or no impact (4)	4	-0.07 (-0.30, 0.16)*	4	0.02 (-0.25, 0.29)*	3	-0.01 (-0.28, 0.25)*	3	0.91 (0.70, 1.18)*

*See Methods section for full description of the impact variable.

Table 6: Qualitative Impact Analysis Table of Intervention Features*

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Primary Care Clinicians Actively Involved in Patient Management (PCP_Involve)	Mental Health Specialists Actively Involved in Patient Management (MH_Specialty)	CM Baseline Assessment of Patient Symptoms with Standardized Scale (CM_Staff_Base_Sx)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Symptoms with Standardized Scale (CM_Staff_F_U_Sx)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Treatment Adherence (CM_Staff_F_U_Adh)	Intervention included at least 16 weeks of active patient follow-up (_16_weeks)	Overall Impact (impact)
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	1= High 2 = Medium 3 = Low 4 = Little or None
Araya, 2003	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1
Katon, 1995	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Katon, 1996	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Katon, 1999	A	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	1
Katon, 2004	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Katzelnick, 2000	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Simon, 2004	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Unutzer, 2002***	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	1
Wells, 2000	A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	1
Bruce, 2004	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
Dietrich, 2004	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
Hunkeler, 2000	A	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	2

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Primary Care Clinicians Actively Involved in Patient Management (PCP_Involve)	Mental Health Specialists Actively Involved in Patient Management (MH_Specialty)	CM Baseline Assessment of Patient Symptoms with Standardized Scale (CM_Staff_Base_Sx)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Symptoms with Standardized Scale (CM_Staff_F_U_Sx)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Treatment Adherence (CM_Staff_F_U_Adh)	Intervention included at least 16 weeks of active patient follow-up (_16_weeks)	Overall Impact (impact)
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	1= High 2 = Medium 3 = Low 4 = Little or None
Oslin, 2003**	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
Peveler, 1999	P	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	2
Rost, 2001	A	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
Simon, 2000	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	2
Datto, 2003	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3
Fortney, 2006**	A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3
Hedrick, 2003**	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	3
Waterreus, 2004	A	N	?	Y	Y	Y	N	3
20								
90% = 18								
80% = 16	A = 15	Y = 19	Y = ?18	Y = 18	Y = 17	Y = 19	Y = 17	
70% = 14								
Adler, 2004	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Primary Care Clinicians Actively Involved in Patient Management (<i>PCP_Involve</i>)	Mental Health Specialists Actively Involved in Patient Management (<i>MH_Specialty</i>)	CM Baseline Assessment of Patient Symptoms with Standardized Scale (<i>CM_Staff_Base_Sx</i>)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Symptoms with Standardized Scale (<i>CM_Staff_F_U_Sx</i>)	CM Follow-up Assessment of Treatment Adherence (<i>CM_Staff_F_U_Adh</i>)	Intervention included at least 16 weeks of active patient follow-up (<i>_16_weeks</i>)	Overall Impact (<i>impact</i>)
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	Y= Yes N= No	1= High 2 = Medium 3 = Low 4 = Little or None
Brook, 2005	P	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	4
Cappocia, 2004	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
Dobscha, 2006**	P	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	4
Finley, 2003	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	4
Mann, 1998	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	4
Rickles, 2005	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	4
Swindle, 2003**	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	4
8 90% = 7.2								
80% = 6.4	A = 0	Y = 6	Y = 5	Y = 6	Y = 6	Y = 8	Y = 4	
70% = 5.6								

* See Methods section for full description of the impact variable. See Table 1 for full descriptions of the remaining variables. **VA studies. ***Had a VA site.

Table 7. Qualitative Comorbidity Ranked by Overall Impact*

Study	Proportion with Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)	Proportion Non-White (Minority)	Exclude Substance Abuse? (E_SA)	Exclude Dementia? (E_Dementia)	Exclude PTSD? (E_PTSD)	Exclude Anxiety? (E_Anxiety)	Exclude Psychosis? (E_Psychosis)	Exclude Bipolar Disorder? (E_BD)	Overall Impact
			1= yes 0= No	1= yes 0= No	1= yes 0= No	1= yes 0= No	1= yes 0= No	1= yes 0= No	1= High 2 = Medium 3 = Low 4 = Little or None
Araya	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
Katon 1995	0.419	No Data	1	1	9	0	1	1	1
Katon 1996	0.424	0.13	1	1	9	0	1	1	1
Katon 1999	0.798	0.17	1	9	9	0	1	1	1
Katon 2004	0.62	0.25	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
Katzelnick	1	0.17	1	9	0	0	1	1	1
Simon 2004	0.59	0.2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Wells	0.563	0.43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Unutzer	0.69	0.245	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
Bruce	0.662	0.33	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Dietrich	0.79	0.167	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
Hunkeler	.	0.37	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Oslin	0.688	0.55	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
Peveler	0.49	No Data	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Rost	0.774	0.157	1	9	9	9	0	1	2
Simon	.	No Data	1	1	0	0	1	1	2
Datto	0.847	0.2	1	9	9	9	1	1	3
Fortney	0.82	0.253	1	1	0	0	1	1	3
Hedrick	0.944	0.2	1	1	1	0	1	1	3
Waterreus	0.24	No Data	No Data	0	0	0	0	No Data	3
Adler	0.76	0.276	1	1	0	0	1	1	4
Brook	.	0.01	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Cappocia	0.41	0.22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
Dobscha	0.49	0.05	0	1	0	0	1	1	4
Finley	.	No Data	1	0	0	0	1	1	4
Mann	0.82	No Data	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Rickles	.	0.08	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
Swindle	0.88	0.142	1	1	9	9	1	1	4

* See Methods section for full description of the impact variable. See Table 1 for full descriptions of the remaining variables.

Table 8. Design Features Ranked by Overall Impact*

Study	Overall Impact (<i>impact</i>)	Number of Practices (<i>practice group</i>)	Type of Randomization	Type of referral
	1= High 2 = Medium 3 = Low 4 = Little or None	Small = 1 to 2 Medium = 3 to 10 Large >10	1 = Patient Level 2 = Practice Level 3 = Provider Level	1 = Referred by PCP and on medications or willing to take medications 2 = Referred by PCP or screened and referred 3 = On medications 4 = Screened
Araya	1	M	1	4
Katon 1995	1	S	1	1
Katon 1996	1	S	1	1
Katon 1999	1	M	1	1
Katon 2004	1	M	1	1
Katzelnick	1	L	3	4
Simon 2004	1	M	1	3
Unutzer	1	L	2	4
Wells	1	community	1	4
Bruce	2	L	2	4
Dietrich	2	L	2	1
Hunkeler	2	S	1	1
Oslin	2	M	3	4
Peveler	2	L	1	3
Rost	2	L	2	4
Simon	2	M	1	3
Datto	3	L	2	2
Fortney	3	M	2	4
Hedrick	3	M	2	2
Waterreus	3	L	1	2
Adler	4	M	1	4
Brook	4	community	1	3
Cappocia	4	S	1	1
Dobscha	4	M	3	4
Finley	4	S	1	1
Mann	4	L	1	2
Rickles	4	Community	1	3
Swindle	4	S	2	4

* See Methods section for full description of the impact variable. See Table 1 for full descriptions of the remaining variables.

Table 9: Understanding Self-Management Support

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
Araya, 2003	A	Modality: Delivered by: Content: Theory: Quantity: Others Involved: Materials:	Psychoeducational intervention group Social workers and nurses Depression assessment Treatment options Problem-solving techniques Scheduling positive activities Basic cognitive and relapse-prevention techniques 7 weekly sessions and 2 booster sessions Structured pharmacotherapy program with PCP if severe depression after 6 weeks Manual with examples and exercises
Katon, 1995	A	Modality: Delivered by: Content: Theory: Quantity: Others Involved: Materials:	Psychiatry visits Psychiatrist Depression assessment Understanding antidepressant action and side effects Review of stressful life events No formal psychotherapy 2 to 4 visits with psychiatrist PCP visits alternated with psychiatrist visits Booklet on biology of depression and how antidepressants work Booklet on simple cognitive-behavioral techniques for managing depression Video with doctor-patient vignettes Questionnaire to motivate active patient role

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention														
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support															
Katon, 1996	A	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Modality:</td> <td>Psychotherapy</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delivered by:</td> <td>Psychologist</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Content:</td> <td>Depression assessment Antidepressant assessment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Theory:</td> <td>Therapeutic techniques based on social cognitive theory and social learning theory models Sessions 1-4: education, skills training, homework assignments or behavioral experiments to improve mood and facilitate generalization of skills to daily life Sessions 5-6 (optional): skills training in assertion, problem-solving communications in conflictual situations, and relaxation training</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quantity:</td> <td>4 to 6 direct contacts followed by 4 telephone contacts</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others Involved:</td> <td>Optional referral to psychiatrist for nonresponding patients</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Materials:</td> <td>Booklet on biology of depression and how antidepressants work Booklet on simple cognitive-behavioral techniques for managing depression; "I can If I Want To" Video with doctor-patient vignettes</td> </tr> </table>	Modality:	Psychotherapy	Delivered by:	Psychologist	Content:	Depression assessment Antidepressant assessment	Theory:	Therapeutic techniques based on social cognitive theory and social learning theory models Sessions 1-4: education, skills training, homework assignments or behavioral experiments to improve mood and facilitate generalization of skills to daily life Sessions 5-6 (optional): skills training in assertion, problem-solving communications in conflictual situations, and relaxation training	Quantity:	4 to 6 direct contacts followed by 4 telephone contacts	Others Involved:	Optional referral to psychiatrist for nonresponding patients	Materials:	Booklet on biology of depression and how antidepressants work Booklet on simple cognitive-behavioral techniques for managing depression; "I can If I Want To" Video with doctor-patient vignettes
Modality:	Psychotherapy															
Delivered by:	Psychologist															
Content:	Depression assessment Antidepressant assessment															
Theory:	Therapeutic techniques based on social cognitive theory and social learning theory models Sessions 1-4: education, skills training, homework assignments or behavioral experiments to improve mood and facilitate generalization of skills to daily life Sessions 5-6 (optional): skills training in assertion, problem-solving communications in conflictual situations, and relaxation training															
Quantity:	4 to 6 direct contacts followed by 4 telephone contacts															
Others Involved:	Optional referral to psychiatrist for nonresponding patients															
Materials:	Booklet on biology of depression and how antidepressants work Booklet on simple cognitive-behavioral techniques for managing depression; "I can If I Want To" Video with doctor-patient vignettes															
Katon, 1999	A	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Modality:</td> <td>Psychiatry visits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Delivered by:</td> <td>Psychiatrist</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Content:</td> <td>Depression assessment Review of stressful life events Review of medication adherence and side effects Review of medical, family, and social history</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Theory:</td> <td>Optional psychotherapy for patients with severe psychosocial stressors</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quantity:</td> <td>2 sessions with psychiatrist with additional visits based on clinical response—brief telephone call between visits</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Others Involved:</td> <td>PCP encouraged to discuss patient reactions/questions regarding educational materials</td> </tr> </table>	Modality:	Psychiatry visits	Delivered by:	Psychiatrist	Content:	Depression assessment Review of stressful life events Review of medication adherence and side effects Review of medical, family, and social history	Theory:	Optional psychotherapy for patients with severe psychosocial stressors	Quantity:	2 sessions with psychiatrist with additional visits based on clinical response—brief telephone call between visits	Others Involved:	PCP encouraged to discuss patient reactions/questions regarding educational materials		
Modality:	Psychiatry visits															
Delivered by:	Psychiatrist															
Content:	Depression assessment Review of stressful life events Review of medication adherence and side effects Review of medical, family, and social history															
Theory:	Optional psychotherapy for patients with severe psychosocial stressors															
Quantity:	2 sessions with psychiatrist with additional visits based on clinical response—brief telephone call between visits															
Others Involved:	PCP encouraged to discuss patient reactions/questions regarding educational materials															

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Materials:	Book and videotape addressing biology of depression, antidepressant medications, psychotherapy, and active self-management
Katon, 2004	A	Modality:	Pathways case management intervention—antidepressant medications and/or PST-PC
		Delivered by:	Depression Clinical Specialist Nurse
		Content:	Enhanced education Support for antidepressant medication
		Theory:	Problem-solving treatment in primary care (PST-PC)
		Quantity:	Initial visit, step 1—twice monthly contacts for 10-12 weeks, step 2—bimonthly contacts for 8-12 weeks, step 3—referral to mental health system for longer-term follow-up if needed, continuation phase—monthly contacts or groups if significant decrease in symptoms
		Others Involved:	Optional psychiatric consultation, collaboration with PCP
		Materials:	None specified
Katzelnick, 2000	P	Modality:	Telephone-based treatment coordination
		Delivered by:	Treatment coordinators some with mental health background
		Content:	Depression assessment Treatment adherence and medication effects
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	PCP visits: initial, follow-up at 1, 3, 6, 10 weeks, then every 10 weeks; treatment coordinator

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
			contacts: at 2, 10 weeks, and if needed at 18, 30, 42 weeks
		Others Involved:	PCP, Psychiatric consultation encourage if no response to treatment at 10 weeks or if complicated depression
		Materials:	Booklet on "Depression isn't Just a Mental Problem," video, RHYTHMS depression education program if appropriate to support antidepressant use
Simon, 2004	A	Modality:	Psychotherapy (telephone-based)
		Delivered by:	Psychotherapists
		Content:	Depression assessment Antidepressant use and adverse effects
		Theory:	CBT program
		Quantity:	CBT: 1—motivation, 2 to 4—increasing pleasant and rewarding activities, 5-7—identifying challenges and distancing from negative thoughts, 8—self-care plan
		Others Involved:	Care managers: mental health clinicians with bachelor's or master's degrees (care management program in addition to psychotherapy)
		Materials:	Detailed care management workbook emphasizing activation, addressing negative thought, developing self-care plan
Unutzer, 2002	A	Modality:	IMPACT intervention—antidepressant medications and/or PST-PC
		Delivered by:	Nurses or psychologists trained as depression care managers
		Content:	Depression assessment
		Theory:	Problem-solving treatment in primary care (PST-PC)
		Quantity:	PST-PC: 6-8 sessions; care manager contacts every other week during the acute phase and monthly if reduction in symptoms up to 12 months
		Others Involved:	Psychiatrist contact if lack of response or diagnostic challenge; PCP
		Materials:	Video, booklet

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	<p>A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques)</p> <p>P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact)</p> <p>N = No evidence of self-management support</p>		
Wells, 2000	A	<p>Modality:</p> <p>Delivered by:</p> <p>Content:</p> <p>Theory:</p> <p>Quantity:</p> <p>Others Involved:</p> <p>Materials:</p>	<p>Psychotherapy or antidepressant medication support</p> <p>QI meds: Nurse specialists QI therapy: Psychotherapists</p> <p>QI meds: depression assessment, support adherence QI therapy: individual and group CBT</p> <p>CBT</p> <p>Initial visit for assessment, education, and activation QI meds: monthly contacts QI therapy: 12 to 16 sessions</p> <p>Not specified</p> <p>Videos and pamphlets</p>
Bruce, 2004	A	<p>Modality:</p> <p>Delivered by:</p> <p>Content:</p> <p>Theory:</p> <p>Quantity:</p> <p>Others Involved:</p> <p>Materials:</p>	<p>Treatment management</p> <p>Depression care managers</p> <p>Depression assessment Treatment adherence and medication adverse side effects PCP could recommend interpersonal psychotherapy if patient declined medication</p> <p>Not specified</p> <p>At scheduled intervals or when clinically necessary—frequency not specified</p> <p>Collaborated with PCP</p> <p>Not specified</p>
Dietrich, 2004	A	<p>Modality:</p> <p>Delivered by:</p> <p>Content:</p> <p>Theory:</p>	<p>Telephone-based care management</p> <p>Care managers—most with backgrounds in primary care or mental health nursing</p> <p>Overcoming barriers to adherence Supported self-management practices (e.g., exercise, social activities)</p> <p>Not specified</p>

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Quantity:	Initial contact, contacts monthly thereafter or as needed
		Others Involved:	Intervention clinician
		Materials:	Not specified
Hunkeler, 2000	A	Modality:	Telehealth care
		Delivered by:	Primary care nurses
		Content:	Antidepressant adherence, side effects, questions Emotional support to find pleasurable activities and to be more active Support for behavior plan
		Theory:	Not specified
		Quantity:	Weeks 1-2: 1 to 2 calls per week; weeks 3-8: 1 call per week; weeks 9-16: 1 call every other week
		Others Involved:	Peer support in addition to nurse telehealth care in 35% of intervention patients
		Materials:	Not specified
Oslin, 2003	A	Modality:	Telephone disease management
		Delivered by:	Behavioral health specialist (nurses with behavioral health experience)
		Content:	Depression assessment Treatment adherence and adverse effects Education and motivation support
		Theory:	Not specified
		Quantity:	Calls at 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, 18, and 24 weeks after initial assessment
		Others Involved:	PCP
		Materials:	Not specified for depression; workbook for alcohol intervention
Peveler, 1999	P	Modality:	Drug counseling
		Delivered by:	Primary care nurses
		Content:	Education—depression, self-help, treatment adherence

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	At weeks 2 and 8
		Others Involved:	Not specified
		Materials:	Information leaflet
Rost, 2001	A	Modality:	Pharmacotherapy and/or psychotherapy
		Delivered by:	Nurses
		Content:	Depression assessment Education about treatments Supported activation/engagement
		Theory:	Not specified
		Quantity:	Average of 5.2 contacts during the first 8 weeks after index visit
		Others Involved:	PCP, access to specialty care psychotherapy
		Materials:	AHCPR pamphlet
Simon, 2000	N	Modality:	Care management (1 of 2 interventions)
		Delivered by:	Care managers
		Content:	Antidepressant use, side effects Depression assessment General support
		Theory:	No specific psychotherapeutic content
		Quantity:	Brief initial call followed by 2 calls at 8 and 16 weeks
		Others Involved:	PCP
		Materials:	Not specified
Datto, 2003	N	Modality:	Telephone disease management
		Delivered by:	Nurses

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Content:	Education topics: depression, treatment options, coping skills, risk factors, suicide prevention, reinforcing followup Depression assessment Treatment adherence
		Theory:	Not specified
		Quantity:	Followup contact at least every 3 weeks; formal assessment at baseline, 6, 12, and 16 weeks
		Others Involved:	PCP
		Materials:	Not specified
Fortney, 2006	A	Modality:	Telemedicine-based collaborative care (stepped care)
		Delivered by:	Nurses
		Content:	Education Activation and barrier assessment/resolution activities Depression assessment Treatment adherence and side effects
		Theory:	Psychotherapy was available but not facilitated
		Quantity:	Followup: acute—every 2 weeks, watchful waiting or continuation—every 4 weeks for up to 12 months
		Others Involved:	PCP, pharmacist
		Materials:	Pamphlet and website

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
Hedrick, 2003	P	Modality: Delivered by: Content: Theory: Quantity: Others Involved: Materials:	Collaborative care (treatment options: antidepressant medication initiation or adjustment, CBT, scheduling with psychologist or psychiatrist, mental health specialty care) CBT: Psychologist or social worker Encourage adherence Address treatment barriers Depression assessment CBT CBT: 6 sessions Team: clinical psychologist, psychiatrist, social workers, psychology technician Video and workbook
Waterreus, 2004	A	Modality: Delivered by: Content: Theory: Quantity: Others Involved: Materials:	Multifaceted package of care Community psychiatric nurse (CPN) Depression assessment Education Psychological interventions: 94% of intervention patients Pharmacotherapy: 66% of intervention patients Personal supportive therapy, behaviour therapy and relaxation, family and marital work, bereavement counseling Weekly visits over 3 months and contact phone number GP Not specified
Adler, 2004	P	Modality: Delivered by: Content:	Antidepressant medication support Pharmacist Medication adherence General social support

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	Contacts at 2,4,6,8 weeks and 6,9,12,18 months
		Others Involved:	Not specified
		Materials:	Not specified
Brook, 2005	P	Modality:	Antidepressant medication support
		Delivered by:	Pharmacist
		Content:	"a list of important themes" not specified
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	3 coaching contacts
		Others Involved:	Not specified
		Materials:	Video
Cappocia, 2004	N	Modality:	Collaborative care
		Delivered by:	Pharmacist
		Content:	Depression assessment Antidepressant concerns addressed Support and education Antidepressant medication adjustments and side effects management Facilitation of mental health provider appointments
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	Weeks 1-4—weekly calls, weeks 5-12—calls every 2 weeks, months 3-12—calls every other month
		Others Involved:	PCP , psychiatrist
		Materials:	Not specified
Dobscha, 2006	P	Modality:	Decision support
		Delivered by:	Depression decision support nurse care manager

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
		Content:	Education--explore barriers, treatment adherence, encourage communication with providers
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	1 early telephone contact
		Others Involved:	Psychiatrist
		Materials:	Supplemental educational materials
Finley, 2003	N	Modality:	Drug therapy management (feature of collaborative care)
		Delivered by:	Pharmacist
		Content:	Antidepressant adherence and adverse effects, titrate medications Depression assessment Other social and medical factors
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	Calls at weeks 1,2,4,10, and 16, clinic visits at weeks 6 and 24
		Others Involved:	Not specified
		Materials:	Not specified
Mann, 1998	N	Modality:	Monitoring (1 of 2 interventions)
		Delivered by:	Practice nurses
		Content:	Content of interview recorded as follows: monitoring change in mental health, encouraging compliance, providing education, facilitating social intervention
		Theory:	No formal psychotherapy
		Quantity:	8 hours per patient over 4 months recommended
		Others Involved:	GP
		Materials:	Not specified
Rickles, 2005	N	Modality:	Telemonitoring of antidepressant use
		Delivered by:	Pharmacist
		Content:	Medication adherence and adverse effects

Studies Ranked by Impact	Type of Self-Management Support	Type of Patient Intervention	
	A = Active (use of behaviorally-oriented techniques) P = Passive (educational materials without personal contact) N = No evidence of self-management support		
			Patient concerns Theory: No formal psychotherapy Quantity: 3 monthly telephone calls Others Involved: Not specified Materials: Not specified
Swindle, 2003	N		Modality: Monitoring Delivered by: Mental health clinical nurse specialists Content: Depression assessment Review side effects Encourage compliance with antidepressants Theory: No formal psychotherapy Quantity: Contacts at 2 weeks, 1 month, and 2 months after initial contact Others Involved: PCP, referral to mental health clinic if patient unable to take antidepressant medication for CBT or more complex medication regimen Materials: Not specified

REFERENCES

- (2005). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions 4.2.5 [updated May 2005]. The Cochrane Library. J. G. Higgins, S. Chichester, UK, 7 John Wiley and Sons: 187-8.
- Adler, D. A., K. M. Bungay, et al. (2004). "The impact of a pharmacist intervention on 6-month outcomes in depressed primary care patients." *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 26(3): 199-209.
- Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (1993). Clinical Practice Guideline: Quick Reference Guide for Clinicians, AHCPR Publication No. 93-0552.
- Araya, R., G. Rojas, et al. (2003). "Treating depression in primary care in low-income women in Santiago, Chile: a randomised controlled trial." *Lancet* 361(9362): 995-1000.
- Bartels, S. J., E. H. Coakley, et al. (2004). "Improving access to geriatric mental health services: a randomized trial comparing treatment engagement with integrated versus enhanced referral care for depression, anxiety, and at-risk alcohol use." *Am J Psychiatry* 161(8): 1455-62.
- Berkey, C. S., D. C. Hoaglin, et al. (1995). "A random-effects regression model for meta-analysis." *Stat Med* 14(4): 395-411.
- Bodenheimer, T., E. H. Wagner, et al. (2002). "Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness." *JAMA* 288(14): 1775-9.
- Bodenheimer, T., E. H. Wagner, et al. (2002). "Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness: the chronic care model, Part 2." *JAMA* 288(15): 1909-14.
- Bower, P. and B. Sibbald (2000). "On-site mental health workers in primary care: effects on professional practice." *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(3): CD000532.
- Brook, O. H., H. van Hout, et al. (2005). "A pharmacy-based coaching program to improve adherence to antidepressant treatment among primary care patients." *Psychiatr Serv* 56(4): 487-9.
- Bruce, M. L., T. R. Ten Have, et al. (2004). "Reducing suicidal ideation and depressive symptoms in depressed older primary care patients: a randomized controlled trial." *JAMA* 291(9): 1081-91.
- Butler, M., R.L. Kane, et al. (2008). Integration of Mental Health/Substance Abuse and Primary Care. AHRQ Publication No. 09-E003, Oct. Available at <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/tp/mhsapctp.htm>. Accessed 1/09.
- Capoccia, K. L., D. M. Boudreau, et al. (2004). "Randomized trial of pharmacist interventions to improve depression care and outcomes in primary care." *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 61(4): 364-72.
- Craven, M. A. and R. Bland (2002). "Shared mental health care: a bibliography and overview." *Can J Psychiatry* 47(2 Suppl 1): iS-viiiS, 1S-103S.

- Craven, M. A. and R. Bland (2006). "Better practices in collaborative mental health care: an analysis of the evidence base." *Can J Psychiatry* 51(6 Suppl 1): 7S-72S.
- Datto, C. J., R. Thompson, et al. (2003). "The pilot study of a telephone disease management program for depression." *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 25(3): 169-77.
- Dietrich, A. J., T. E. Oxman, et al. (2004). "Re-engineering systems for the treatment of depression in primary care: cluster randomised controlled trial." *BMJ* 329(7466): 602.
- Dobscha, S. K., K. Corson, et al. (2006). "Depression decision support in primary care: a cluster randomized trial." *Ann Intern Med* 145(7): 477-87.
- Finley, P. R., H. R. Rens, et al. (2003). "Impact of a collaborative care model on depression in a primary care setting: a randomized controlled trial." *Pharmacotherapy* 23(9): 1175-85.
- Fortney, J. C., et al (2006). Telemedicine-based collaborative care to reduce rural disparities. Health Services Research and Development Meeting. Washington, DC.
- Gilbody, S., P. Bower, et al. (2006). "Collaborative care for depression: a cumulative meta-analysis and review of longer-term outcomes." *Arch Intern Med* 166(21): 2314-21.
- Gilbody, S., P. Bower, et al. (2006). "Costs and consequences of enhanced primary care for depression: systematic review of randomised economic evaluations." *Br J Psychiatry* 189: 297-308.
- Gilbody, S., P. Whitty, et al. (2003). "Educational and organizational interventions to improve the management of depression in primary care: a systematic review." *JAMA* 289(23): 3145-51.
- Goldberg, D. P., J. J. Steele, et al. (1980). "Training family doctors to recognize psychiatric illness with increased accuracy." *Lancet*: 521-523.
- Hedrick, S. C., E. F. Chaney, et al. (2003). "Effectiveness of collaborative care depression treatment in Veterans' Affairs primary care." *J Gen Intern Med* 18(1): 9-16.
- Hepner, K. A., M. Rowe, et al. (2007). "The effect of adherence to practice guidelines on depression outcomes." *Ann Intern Med* 147(5): 320-9.
- Higgins, J. and S. Green Approaches to summarizing the validity of studies. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 4.2.5 [updated May 2005]; Section 6.7. In: the Cochrane Library, Issue 3, 2005. Chichester, UK, John Wiley & Sons.
- Hunkeler, E. M., J. F. Meresman, et al. (2000). "Efficacy of nurse telehealth care and peer support in augmenting treatment of depression in primary care." *Arch Fam Med* 9(8): 700-8.
- IMPACT Implementation Center (2008). Tools and Materials for Depression Care. Available at: http://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/pic.htm. Accessed 1/09.
- Institute of Medicine (2001). *Crossing the Quality Chasm : A New Health System for the 21st Century*. Washington, National Academy Press.

- Katon, W. (1995). "Collaborative care: patient satisfaction, outcomes, and medical cost-offset." *Fam Syst Med* 13(3-4): 351-65.
- Katon, W., P. Robinson, et al. (1996). "A multifaceted intervention to improve treatment of depression in primary care." *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 53(10): 924-32.
- Katon, W., C. Rutter, et al. (2001). "A randomized trial of relapse prevention of depression in primary care." *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 58(3): 241-7.
- Katon, W. and H. Schulberg (1992). "Epidemiology of depression in primary care." *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 14(4): 237-47.
- Katon, W., M. von Korff, et al. (1992). "Adequacy and duration of antidepressant treatment in primary care." *Med Care* 30(1): 67-76.
- Katon, W., M. Von Korff, et al. (2001). "Rethinking practitioner roles in chronic illness: the specialist, primary care physician, and the practice nurse." *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 23(3): 138-44.
- Katon, W., M. Von Korff, et al. (1999). "Stepped collaborative care for primary care patients with persistent symptoms of depression: a randomized trial." *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 56(12): 1109-15.
- Katon, W., M. Von Korff, et al. (1995). "Collaborative management to achieve treatment guidelines. Impact on depression in primary care." *JAMA* 273(13): 1026-31.
- Katon, W. J., M. Von Korff, et al. (1995). "Collaborative management to achieve treatment guidelines: Impact on depression in primary care." *Journal of American Medical Association* 273(13): 1026-1031.
- Katon, W. J., M. Von Korff, et al. (2004). "The Pathways Study: a randomized trial of collaborative care in patients with diabetes and depression." *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 61(10): 1042-9.
- Katzelnick, D. J., G. E. Simon, et al. (2000). "Randomized trial of a depression management program in high utilizers of medical care." *Arch Fam Med* 9(4): 345-51.
- Lin, E. H., W. J. Katon, et al. (2000). "Low-intensity treatment of depression in primary care: is it problematic?" *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 22(2): 78-83.
- Lo Sasso, A. T., K. Rost, et al. (2006). "Modeling the impact of enhanced depression treatment on workplace functioning and costs: a cost-benefit approach." *Med Care* 44(4): 352-8.
- Macarthur Foundation (2003). *Depression in Primary Care Tools and Materials*. Chicago, IL, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Available at <http://depression-primary-care.org/>. Accessed 1/09.
- Mann, A. H., R. Blizard, et al. (1998). "An evaluation of practice nurses working with general practitioners to treat people with depression." *Br J Gen Pract* 48(426): 875-9.
- Miles, M. B. and A. M. Huberman (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A source book for new methods*. Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

- Mitchell, G., C. Del Mar, et al. (2002). "Does primary medical practitioner involvement with a specialist team improve patient outcomes? A systematic review." *Br J Gen Pract* 52(484): 934-9.
- Murray, C. J. and A. D. Lopez (1997). "Alternative projections of mortality and disability by cause 1990-2020: Global Burden of Disease Study." *Lancet* 349(9064): 1498-504.
- Ormel J, V. M., Ustun TB, Pini S, Korten A, Oldehinkel T (1994). "Common mental disorders and disability across cultures. Results from the WHO Collaborative Study on Psychological Problems in General Health Care." *JAMA* 272: 1741-8.
- Oslin, D. W., S. Sayers, et al. (2003). "Disease management for depression and at-risk drinking via telephone in an older population of veterans." *Psychosom Med* 65(6): 931-7.
- Oxman, T. E., A. J. Dietrich, et al. (2002). "A three-component model for reengineering systems for the treatment of depression in primary care." *Psychosomatics* 43(6): 441-50.
- Peveler, R., C. George, et al. (1999). "Effect of antidepressant drug counselling and information leaflets on adherence to drug treatment in primary care: randomised controlled trial." *BMJ* 319(7210): 612-5.
- RAND (2000). Partners in Care Tools and Materials. Available at: http://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/pic.htm. Accessed 1/09.
- Rickles, N. M., B. L. Svarstad, et al. (2005). "Pharmacist telemonitoring of antidepressant use: effects on pharmacist-patient collaboration." *J Am Pharm Assoc* (2003) 45(3): 344-53.
- Robinson, K. A. and K. Dickersin (2002). "Development of a highly sensitive search strategy for the retrieval of reports of controlled trials using PubMed." *Int J Epidemiol* 31(1): 150-3.
- Rollman, B. L., B. H. Hanusa, et al. (2002). "A randomized trial using computerized decision support to improve treatment of major depression in primary care." *J Gen Intern Med* 17(7): 493-503.
- Rost, K., P. Nutting, et al. (2001). "Improving depression outcomes in community primary care practice: a randomized trial of the quEST intervention. Quality Enhancement by Strategic Teaming." *J Gen Intern Med* 16(3): 143-9.
- Rubenstein, L. V., D. R. Calkins, et al. (1989). "Improving patient function: A randomized trial of functional disability screening." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 111: 836-842.
- Rubenstein, L. V., J. M. McCoy, et al. (1995). "Improving patient quality of life with feedback to physicians about functional status." *J Gen Intern Med* 10(11): 607-14.
- Rubenstein, L. V., L. S. Meredith, et al. (2006). "Impacts of evidence-based quality improvement on depression in primary care: a randomized experiment." *J Gen Intern Med*. 21(10): 1027-35. Epub 2006 Jul 7.
- Rubenstein, L. V., L. E. Parker, et al. (2002). "Understanding team-based quality improvement for depression in primary care." *Health Serv Res* 37(4): 1009-29.

- Schoenbaum, M., C. Sherbourne, et al. (2005). "Gender patterns in cost effectiveness of quality improvement for depression: results of a randomized, controlled trial." *J Affect Disord* 87(2-3): 319-25.
- Schoenbaum, M., J. Unutzer, et al. (2002). "The effects of primary care depression treatment on patients' clinical status and employment." *Health Serv Res* 37(5): 1145-58.
- Simon, G. E., E. J. Ludman, et al. (2004). "Telephone psychotherapy and telephone care management for primary care patients starting antidepressant treatment: a randomized controlled trial." *JAMA* 292(8): 935-42.
- Simon, G. E. and M. VonKorff (1995). "Recognition, management, and outcomes of depression in primary care." *Arch Fam Med* 4(2): 99-105.
- Simon, G. E., M. VonKorff, et al. (2000). "Randomised trial of monitoring, feedback, and management of care by telephone to improve treatment of depression in primary care." *BMJ* 320(7234): 550-4.
- Stata (2006). *Statistical Software Manual*. College Station, TX, Stata Corp.
- Stone, E. G., S. C. Morton, et al. (2002). "Interventions that increase use of adult immunization and cancer screening services: a meta-analysis." *Ann Intern Med* 136(9): 641-51.
- Sutton AJ, A. K., Jones DR, Sheldon TR, Song F (2000). "Methods for Meta-Analysis in Medical Research." Wiley: 29-31.
- Swindle, R. W., J. K. Rao, et al. (2003). "Integrating clinical nurse specialists into the treatment of primary care patients with depression." *Int J Psychiatry Med* 33(1): 17-37.
- Thompson, C., A. L. Kinmonth, et al. (2000). "Effects of a clinical-practice guideline and practice-based education on detection and outcome of depression in primary care: Hampshire Depression Project randomised controlled trial." *Lancet* 355(9199): 185-91.
- Unutzer, J., W. Katon, et al. (2002). "Collaborative care management of late-life depression in the primary care setting: a randomized controlled trial." *JAMA* 288(22): 2836-45.
- Von Korff, M., J. Gruman, et al. (1997). "Collaborative management of chronic illness." *Annals of Internal Medicine* 127(12): 1097-102.
- Wagner, E. H., B. T. Austin, et al. (2001). "Improving chronic illness care: translating evidence into action." *Health Aff (Millwood)* 20(6): 64-78.
- Wagner, E. H., B. T. Austin, et al. (2001). "Improving chronic illness care: translating evidence into action." *Health Aff (Millwood)* 20(6): 64-78.
- Wagner, E. H., R. E. Glasgow, et al. (2001). "Quality Improvement In Chronic Illness Care: A Collaborative Approach." *Joint Commission Journal on Quality Improvement* 27(2): 63-80.

- Waterreus, A., M. Blanchard, et al. (1994). "Community psychiatric nurses for the elderly: well tolerated, few side-effects and effective in the treatment of depression." *J Clin Nurs* 3(5): 299-306.
- Wells, K. B., C. Sherbourne, et al. (2000). "Impact of disseminating quality improvement programs for depression in managed primary care: a randomized controlled trial." *JAMA* 283(2): 212-20.
- Wells, K., C. Sherbourne, et al. (2005). "Quality improvement for depression in primary care: do patients with subthreshold depression benefit in the long run?" *Am J Psychiatry* 162(6): 1149-57.
- Williams, J. W., Jr., M. Gerrity, et al. (2007). "Systematic review of multifaceted interventions to improve depression care." *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 29(2): 91-116.
- Zhang, M., K. M. Rost, et al. (1999). "A community study of depression treatment and employment earnings." *Psychiatr Serv* 50(9): 1209-13.