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**ABSTRACT**

Depression is a socially and physically disabling condition. The chronic care model (CCM) was developed to promote better management of long-term conditions such as depression in primary care settings. The aim of the study was to identify barriers to and facilitators of success when implementing the CCM for the management of depression in primary care. A systematic search was conducted in electronic databases from January 2005 to December 2011. Thirteen articles met the inclusion criteria and were reviewed by means of a thematic analysis. The barriers were categorised under two themes, Lack of organisational, administrative and professional ability to change and implement the components of the CCM, and Lack of clarity pertaining to the responsibility inherent in the role of care manager (often a nurse) when it comes to promoting the patients’ self-management ability. In terms of the facilitators of success, two themes emerged, Leadership support and vision and Redesigning the delivery system. When shaping an environment for organisational change, leadership and professionals must work towards a common goal and vision. Such processes require a care manager with a clear role and responsibilities in order for the health care system to meet the needs of the person with depression.
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INTRODUCTION

Depression is an important cause of disability and the 4th leading contributor to the global burden of disease in 2000 (WHO 2012). The rate of depression has increased markedly over the past decade (Compton et al. 2006). By the year 2020, depression is projected to reach 2nd place in the ranking for all ages and both sexes (WHO 2012). Patten (2009) found that the estimates in a community sample were nearly twice as high (19.7%) as the lifetime prevalence reported in cross-sectional studies during the same time period. Late life depression is very common in primary care settings, affecting at least 5% to 10% of older primary care patients (Blazer 2003).

Depression is a socially and physically disabling condition associated with poor self-care, adverse medical outcomes, increased mortality and risk of suicide (Murray & Lopez 1996, Unützer et al. 2001). It is difficult to find a universal definition of or generally accepted criteria for depression. Quality concerns have surfaced in the mental health arena, where less than 15% of patients with chronic problems such as major depression, panic disorder or generalised anxiety disorder receive evidence-based treatment (Wang et al. 2000). Interest in evidence-based treatment and implementation issues has increased in the field of human services. According to Dawes et al. (2005 p. 1), ‘evidence based practice (EBP) requires that decisions about health care are based on the best available, current, valid and relevant evidence’. Implementation can be related to the development of EBP and programmes as well as to the concern that consumers will not benefit unless such practices and programmes are correctly implemented (Johansson 2010).

Wagner et al. (2001) presented the chronic care model (CCM) to promote quality and management of long-term conditions such as depression by means of more integrated organisation of care. The thinking that underpins the CCM is that healthcare systems represent the main barrier. The CCM is not an explanatory theory, but an evidence-based
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guideline and synthesis of the best available evidence. The model is intended to be flexible and open to change when new evidence emerges (Wagner et al. 2001). According to Wagner et al. (2001), the CCM consists of 6 components; 1) community resources and policy, 2) the health system and the organisation of health care, 3) self-management support, 4) delivery system design, 5) decision support and 6) clinical information systems.

There is a great deal of research on depression interventions in primary care. A meta-analysis of interventions to improve care for chronic illnesses including depression revealed that programmes with at least one CCM element had consistently beneficial effects on clinical outcomes and care processes across all conditions studied (Tsai et al. 2005). Several randomised control trials (RCTs) as well as other studies have incorporated elements of the CCM for depression management (Kilbourne et al. 2004). Reviews employing elements of the CCM have been conducted by Kristofco and Lorenzi (2007); Coleman et al. (2009) and Fuentes (2009). Kristofco and Lorenzi (2007) indicated that collaborative care was the most promising approach for quality improvement in the application of the CCM strategy. Coleman et al. (2009) suggested that the CCM can guide the redesign of practice, leading to improved care and better health outcomes. Fuentes et al. (2009) found a need for change in order to improve patient outcomes. However, none of these reviews identified the barriers to and facilitators of success when implementing one or all parts of the CCM in the management of depression. As stated by Solberg et al. (2006), there are no comprehensive examples of the implementation of the CCM that reveal the most effective changes. However, several barriers have been described in relation to which measurement system to use when validating the assessment of chronic illness care (Bonomi et al. 2002; Glasgow et al. 2005). Solberg et al. (2001) stated that the barriers to the implementation of the CCM should not be underestimated. The main problem was described as encouraging clinicians to adopt the model and commit to work environments characterised by limited resources and low morale.
Management of depression (Solberg et al. 2001). As suggested by Kilbourne et al. (2004), future studies should focus on both barriers to and facilitators of good depression care, as well as on cost analyses and employment-related outcomes.

**AIM**

The aim of the study was to identify barriers to and facilitators of success when implementing the CCM for the management of depression in primary care.

**METHOD**

This systematic review was inspired by Pope et al. (2007) and Dixon-Woods et al. (2006). According to Dixon-Woods et al. (2005), current systematic review methods have tended to favour quantitative forms of evidence and often disregard qualitative evidence. Excluding any type of evidence on the grounds of its methodology could have potentially serious consequences (Dixon-Woods et al. 2005).

**Literature search**

We combined a number of strategies, including a systematic search of the following electronic databases; EBSCOhost/Academic Search Premier/CINAHL, OVID MEDLINE, PubMed, ProQuest and Cochrane, from January 2005 to December 2011. The search also included relevant theoretical papers as suggested by Dixon-Woods et al. (2006). The following search words were used in combination and separately; Chronic Care Model, primary care, depression. In addition, we conducted a manual search related to the topic. The searches revealed 797 abstracts, non-empirical, theoretical and empirical studies. However, the majority did not meet the inclusion criteria despite the low threshold intended to maximise the number of studies on the implementation of and/or theoretical discussion on the CCM.
Our intention was to prioritise papers that appeared relevant to the aim as opposed to particular types of study or paper that met specific methodological standards as suggested by Dixon-Woods et al. (2006). In view of the need to limit the number of papers in a synthesis, we decided to include 13 in this review.

**Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

A total of 65 studies and papers were read and 13 deemed appropriate as they met the inclusion criteria; published in English, implementation or use of the CCM, primary care and depression as one of the chronic illnesses covered. The exclusion criteria were; not using the CCM, chronic illnesses not including depression and reviews. Studies published in books and dissertations were also excluded.

Five quantitative, four qualitative and four theoretical studies were included in this review (Table 1).

**Assessment of the quality of the studies**

When assessing the quality of the studies, the researchers adapted a framework from both the qualitative and the quantitative research traditions (Evans & Kowanko 2000). According to Slade and Pribe (2006), EBP is associated with a particular understanding of what constitutes evidence. In the process of evaluating the evidence in the quantitative studies, the authors reviewed the methodological procedures related to implementation and design such as sample size, reliability, validity and transferability (Schneider et al. 2007). In the qualitative studies, the authors reviewed the use of methodology and concepts such as trustworthiness, credibility, confirmability, dependability and transferability (Lincoln & Guba 1985; Polit & Beck 2010). The evaluation included how the implementation process was described as well as its design and analysis.
Thematic analysis

The present review used thematic analysis to produce a synthesis, as described by Pope et al. (2007), for identifying, grouping and summarising findings. The thematic analysis included quantitative as well as qualitative data and was based on a narrative inductive approach in which the themes emerged from the analysis process. Themes were identified by reading and re-reading the studies in order to synthesise the findings, primarily on the basis of the use of words and text. By identifying patterns and concepts across the data, the authors searched for common meanings that could be considered expressions describing the barriers to the CCM and made a narrative synthesis of the data as suggested by Dixon-Woods et al. (2006) and Pope et al. (2007). The process explored the frequency of certain themes and was refined by the identification of key themes and sub-themes. The authors discussed the themes and sub-themes several times before finally reaching consensus on the labelling.

A thematic analysis can have some important limitations when exploring data (Pope et al. 2007). The intention was to identify how the studies described, expressed or understood important aspects of implementing the CCM. In order to ensure trustworthiness, the authors attempted to avoid bias by not focusing on one study at the expense of another, as recommended by Pope et al. (2007).

Determining quality

The authors reviewed the methodological procedures of the five quantitative studies in terms of; implementation, design, measurements, sample size, statistical analysis and generalisation (Schneider et al. 2007; Polit & Beck 2010). Demographic characteristics, ethical approval and context were evaluated in all of the empirical studies.
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Implementation; Four of the quantitative studies were on the subject of implementation (Table 1).

Design; Three studies were surveys (Table 1). One was part of a larger evaluation (Pearson et al. 2005) and one had a time-series design (Katzelnick et al. 2005).

Sample size and response rate; Four of the studies had a small sample (Table 1). One study had a low response rate (Pearson et al. 2005), while another reported a high response (Schmittdiel et al. 2006).

Measurements; One study recommended using more sensitive, reliable and valid tools (Solberg et al. 2006). Four studies employed self-reported measurements (Katzelnick et al. 2005; Pearson et al. 2005; Meredith et al. 2006; Schmittdiel et al. 2006). Two studies stated that the validity of the measures used was uncertain (Schmittdiel et al. 2006; Solberg et al. 2006).

Statistical analysis; The analysis is described in Table 1.

Validity; It was explained in one study that construct validity could be related to how well the concepts employed correlated with the CCM (Schmittdiel et al. 2006). Four of the studies had no methodological evaluation or description of validity (Katzenick et al. 2005; Pearson et al. 2005; Meredith et al. 2006; Solberg et al. 2006).

Generalisation; It was stated in one study that the diverse sample of organisations might preclude generalisation of the findings to all primary care contexts (Meredith et al. 2006). Another study focused on the small sample size that might limit generalisation of the findings (Schmittdiel et al. 2006). Three studies with small samples had no evaluation of whether or not and how the findings could be generalised to a broader population (Katzelnick et al. 2005; Pearson et al. 2005; Solberg et al. 2006).
Future studies; It was reported in two studies that the implementation of the CCM could guide future efforts to examine the measures of implementation performance (Meredith et al. 2006; Pearson et al. 2005). Two studies described the need for more research to estimate changes in the CCM process (Katzelnick et al. 2005; Solberg et al. 2006). Solberg et al. (2006) claimed that the findings must be considered preliminary and tentative.

In order to determine the quality of the methodology in the qualitative studies, we focused on implementation, design, trustworthiness and analysis.

Implementation; Three of the qualitative studies were on the subject of implementation (Belnap et al. 2006; Hroscikoski et al. 2006; Nutting et al. 2007).

Design; Of the qualitative studies, three were described as case studies, (Bachman et al. 2006; Belnap et al. 2006; Hroscikoski et al. 2006), one was based on grounded theory (Henke et al. 2008), while a further four were theoretical (Solberg et al. 2005; McEvoy & Barnes 2007; Suter et al. 2008; Fortney et al. 2010).

Trustworthiness; In one study it was stated that credibility was enhanced by the research team’s experience (Hroscikoski et al. 2006). In another, it was suggested that reliability could be strengthened by a team member manually coding the transcripts (Henke et al. 2008). In three studies (Bachman et al. 2006; Belnap et al. 2006; Henke et al. 2008), no mention was made of the concepts of trustworthiness, validity or reliability as recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Analysis; Three studies did not describe the type of analysis used (Table 1). In one study it was stated that the analysis was described elsewhere (Hroscikoski et al. 2006).

Generalisation; In one study it was suggested that generalisation could be improved by using a large health care system in one region (Hroscikoski et al. 2006).
Evaluation, demographic and socio-economic characteristics, ethical approval and contextual aspects

Demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Three of the quantitative (Meredith et al. 2006; Schmittdiehl et al. 2006; Solberg et al. 2006) and two qualitative studies (Belnap et al. 2006; Hroscikoski et al. 2006) described the demographic characteristics of the participants.

Context. The participants in the studies were from different primary care institutions (Table 1).

SYNTHESIS OF THE FINDINGS

Barriers

The barriers identified were categorised under two themes, Lack of organisational, administrative and professional ability to change and implement the CCM components and Lack of clarity pertaining to the responsibility inherent in the role of care manager (often a nurse) when it comes to promoting the patients’ self-management ability. In terms of the facilitators of success, two themes emerged; Leadership support and vision and Redesigning the delivery system.

Lack of organisational, administrative and professional ability to change and implement the components of the CCM

A barrier to implementing the CCM was the challenge of persuading an organisation’s administrative and professional staff to change. Four studies revealed that professionals were unwilling to implement changes, thus making this the most common barrier, mainly on the part of primary care providers (Solberg et al. 2005, Hroscikoski et al. 2006, Meredith et al. 2006, McEvoy & Barnes 2007). Solberg et al. (2005) described how primary care physicians needed to change their approach when treating patients with chronic diseases. Meredith et al.
Management of depression (2006) explained the problem of encouraging physicians to accept and implement changes. McEvoy and Barnes (2007) discussed how to develop a care plan where leadership helped to overcome resistance to change. It was explained in three studies that lack of ability to change was related to size, as it could be difficult to distribute information to every member of a large organisation (Hroscikoski et al. 2006, Meredith et al. 2006, Schmittdiel et al. 2006). Meredith et al. (2006) emphasised that change was inconsistent with the model’s objective of achieving a successful outcome across all six components. Pearson et al. (2005) explained the difficulty involved in improving all components of the CCM within the space of one year. Hroscikoski et al. (2006) revealed that implementation was not equally divided across all six components. Schmittdiel et al. (2006) reported that only 1.3% of the participants implemented all of the 6 CCM components.

*Lack of clarity pertaining to the responsibility inherent in the role of care manager (often a nurse) when it comes to promoting the patients’ self-management ability.*

In this theme four of the studies (two qualitative and two theoretical) described lack of clarity pertaining to the role and responsibilities of the care manager as the greatest barrier to CCM implementation (Belnap et al. 2006, Solberg et al. 2005, Henke et al. 2008, McEvoy & Barnes 2007). Belnap et al. (2006) stated that the care manager is responsible for providing patients with support and encouragement, monitoring their depressive symptoms and teaching them self-management skills. Thus in order to overcome barriers, patients must be involved as active partners in the management of their condition (McEvoy & Barnes 2007; Henke et al. 2008). Suter et al. (2008) suggested integrating theories from fields other than medicine, for example, adult education and social psychology, in order to contribute knowledge that seems to have been neglected in the past. Bachman et al. (2006) recommended self-management programmes to structure the care manager’s encounters with depressed individuals by
developing written action plans for tracking their current stage of change and goals. Henke *et al.* (2008) revealed that one important part of the care manager’s role is educating patients as a means of overcoming resistance and providing information on the cause, symptoms and history of depression, treatment risks, benefits, outcomes and early warning signs of relapse. In two studies it was stated that once the person is ready to make a change, improved self-efficacy and self-management become evident when using an Internet evidence-based guideline (Suter *et al.* 2008; Fortney *et al.* 2010).

**Facilitators**

*Leadership support and vision*

In the CCM framework, Pearson *et al.* (2005) found changes in proactive follow-up, where leadership support received the greatest focus in terms of quantity and depth. Meredith *et al.* (2006) reported that leadership support, structure and location were the most frequently reported facilitators for implementing improvements. Hrosciskoski *et al.* (2006) revealed that leadership should be spread over multiple levels from clinical leaders to various professional categories. New forms of teamwork were described as developing trust, communication and stable, self-reinforcing work relationships and it was essential to have a shared vision of enhanced care and change among the leadership and clinicians at practice level (Hrosciskoski *et al.* 2006). Hrosciskoski *et al.* (2006) described the importance of a few strong clinical leaders, such as the head physician and nursing managers, who envisaged the specific changes needed and of supervisors who supported their vision. Solberg *et al.* (2006) explained that the CCM seemed to help leaders to adjust to certain constraints and options resulting from organisational priorities.
Redesigning the delivery system

During implementation it may be necessary to redesign the delivery system, which requires focus on proactive follow-up, organisational characteristics and the care manager’s role (Pearson et al. 2005, Meredith et al. 2006). Hroscikoski et al. (2006) reported that change required major alterations and time. McEvoy and Barnes (2007) discussed how to redesign organisational systems and change the emphasis from reactive to planned care and prevention. In total, nine studies described coordination and teamwork as facilitators of success when implementing the CCM (Katzelnick et al. 2005; Pearson et al. 2005; Solberg et al. 2005; Solberg et al. 2006; Belnap et al. 2006; Hroscikoski et al. 2006; Meredith et al. 2006; Henke et al. 2008; Fortney et al. 2010). Pearson et al. (2005) pointed out that a team approach aimed at improving care coordination should include telephone follow up of patients, the implementation of planned home visits and walk-in appointments. Solberg et al. (2005) stated that a team approach is especially helpful for depressed patients who are less likely to adhere to treatment recommendations. In two studies it was stated that the role of the nurse on the team included care coordination, symptom monitoring and informational support to ensure compliance and efficacy in achieving self-care (Hroscikoski et al. 2006; Henke et al. 2008). When redesigning the delivery system, the implementation of the CCM was related to information systems (Katzelnick et al. 2005; Pearson et al. 2005; Meredith et al. 2006; Solberg et al. 2006; Suter et al. 2008). Two of the above-mentioned studies described changes in information systems as a major success factor (Pearson et al. 2005; Meredith et al. 2006).
DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to identify barriers to and facilitators of success when implementing the CCM for the management of depression in primary care. The barriers identified were categorised under two themes; Lack of organisational, administrative and professional ability to change and implement the CCM components, and Lack of clarity pertaining to the responsibility inherent in the role of care manager (often a nurse) when it comes to promoting the patients’ self-management ability. In terms of the facilitators of success, two themes emerged; Leadership support and vision and Redesigning the delivery system.

The possibility of facilitating change in practice seemed to be an important factor in the implementation of the CCM. However, according to Melnyk and Fineout-Overholt (2005), lack of administrative support in the implementation process makes implementation impossible. Efforts to bring about change seemed limited and were met by several forms of resistance on the part of professionals (Meredith et al. 2006), described as resistance in an organisation (Prochaska et al. 2001). Resistance could be the result of a poorly planned implementation and the main reason for the failure of an implementation initiative. According to Melnyk and Fineout-Overholt (2005), attempts to change a system can lead to scepticism. Evidence alone cannot change practice, as the barriers can pose significant challenges (cf. Melnyk and Fineout-Overholt et al. 2005) and should not be underestimated (McEvoy & Barnes 2007). Even the best strategic plans can go awry due to barriers to implementation, which seemed difficult if the goal was to cover all six components of the CCM. One could overcome these barriers using one component, for example self-management support, described as a solution in three of the studies (Solberg et al. 2006, Meredith et al. 2006, Schmittdiel et al. 2006). Lack of resources such as time, money and personnel constitutes a significant barrier (cf. Pearson et al. 2005, Meredith et al. 2006).

However, Wagner et al. (2001) revealed that the CCM could serve as a guide to changing the
management and health care system and finding solutions to resolve financial problems. As the professionals seemed overburdened with paperwork and administrative tasks, they had difficulty allocating time to help depressed persons.

The responsibility and role of the care manager seem important for the implementation of the CCM (cf. Solberg et al. 2005) and appear to need clarification (cf. Belnap et al. 2006). In order to facilitate clarification, one could initiate a discussion about how practice should include cooperation, relationships and information flow (cf. Henke et al. 2008) and how to make guidelines available to patients (Pearson et al. 2005). Building a personal relationship through face-to-face contact should be one of the most important aspects of the care manager’s role in line with the more client-centred approach suggested by Bachman et al. (2006). Such an approach highlights the fact that change is an individualised process, consistently meeting the patient ‘where she/he is’ and adopting a non-directive, non-judgmental attitude (cf. Bachman et al. 2006). Care managers could engage the patient in problem-solving in order to address the latter’s barriers and positively reinforce change (Bachman et al. 2006), which represents an existential view of human beings’ different needs. Wagner et al. (2001) stated that in order to achieve self-management, the focus must shift from a didactic education to encouragement and support. This view is relatively new and underdeveloped in primary care settings. The care manager might need to reflect on the individuals’ need to be seen as human beings. A reflective way of being and acting is based on theories that focus on values, emotions and recognises each person’s courage to live and act as suggested by Tillich (1994). A sense of strength can enhance human accomplishment and personal well-being.

Leadership has an essential role, as the results revealed the need to involve health professionals in creating a plan that facilitates their commitment to the project (cf. Melnyk & Fineout-Overholt 2005). According to Melnyk and Finout-Overholt (2005), communication is
the key to successful organisational change. Leadership could shift from using the whole CCM to a few focused concepts (Hroscikoski et al. 2006). Facilitators of success seemed to include leadership, key policy and care management (Belnap et al. 2006). Leadership must be visible and communities as well as professionals should collaborate in the planning and design of the programme prior to its implementation. However, the most important aspect seemed to be involvement by all parties. Melnyk and Fineout-Overholt (2005) suggested that the narration and sharing of real life examples within EBP can make a difference. A key to success could be developing leadership in the team, often comprising a nurse, psychologist, primary care physician or psychiatrist. Vision is described as important for leadership, and it is essential to communicate visions that appeal to people’s emotions.

Redesigning the delivery system was described as a success factor (Pearson et al. 2005; Meredith et al. 2006; Hroscikoski et al. 2006; McEvoy & Barnes 2007). In order to be successful, one has to make some far-reaching changes in the way in which care is provided for depressed persons. One method could be to reorganise the management of depressed patients. However, such redesigning seemed to require new attitudes to and awareness of the value of relationships, coordination and teamwork, mentioned in one way or other in the majority of the included studies. Wagner et al. (2001) explained that the delivery system should provide high-quality care and every depressed person must have a practice team that organises and coordinates it. Success seemed to be related to the care management contribution, especially the decisions made by key policy and opinion leaders (cf. Belnap et al. 2006). Most organisations today have electronic records for coordinating care as well as an established registry of patients diagnosed with depression (cf. Solberg et al. 2005; Schmittdiel et al. 2006). The study by Pearson et al. (2005) might already be out-of-date in this regard, with its comments about the learning of computer skills.
Limitations of the reviewed studies

The implementation of all CCM components in the quantitative studies seemed to be a methodological limitation related to measurements (cf. Pearson et al. 2005). To avoid methodological limitations, a conceptual framework for interventions and change-related activities could be developed, in addition to procedures, interview protocols and a rating system to improve the implementation methodology, as suggested by Polit and Beck (2010). Implementation can be deficient across all CCM components and the measurements subject to bias. As demonstrated by Solberg et al. (2006), when depression was the focus of the improvement effort, the main components of the quality of depression care seemed to remain the same.

CONCLUSION

These findings highlight the need to adopt the CCM to enhance the management of depression in mental health nursing. The evidence demonstrated that due to barriers, implementation of the CCM in primary care settings is not an easy task. Change in the practical setting can face many challenges such as resistance on the part of mental health nurses. Leadership needs a vision that appeals to mental health nurses’ emotions. Redesigning the delivery system requires a mental health nursing leadership and management that are aware of the value of relationships, coordination and teamwork. Building a personal relationship by means of an existential view of the human being’s various needs appears to be one of the most important aspects of the care manager’s role. Another crucial aspect can be encouraging the team to collaborate with the health care system in primary and specialist care.
Management of depression
Conflict of interest statement

There is no conflict of interest related to this systematic review.
REFERENCES


Management of depression


Management of depression


Management of depression


http://www.who.int/mental_health/management/depression/definition/en/#

Table 1  An overview of the studies on the Chronic Care Model (CCM) in the management of depression in primary care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; author, year, reference</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Method, design, context</th>
<th>Analysis, sample</th>
<th>Summary of the outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bachman et al. 2006 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>CCM Qualitative. Case studies. No analysis described.</td>
<td>A focus group of experts met to discuss the key components of self-management programmes.</td>
<td>Six key components emerged; (1) implement behavioural change interventions, (2) plan for crisis and relapse prevention, (3) reestablish personal meaning, (4) attend to patients’ experience, context and community, (5) build a patient-clinician partnership and (6) create an integrated self-management support structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Belnap et al. 2006 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of CCM. Qualitative. Case studies. No analysis described.</td>
<td>Municipal employees in Michigan and Massachusetts.</td>
<td>It is important to clarify the scope of care management services when using the CCM. It is necessary to develop, evaluate and compare the quality and value of health care services. It might not be feasible to locate care managers in primary care practices. Quality supervision should be provided for professionals who work as care managers. It can be difficult to find a reliable method for identifying patients who would benefit from a depression care management program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fortney et al. 2010 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Theoretical study Net-DSS in the University of Arkansas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Net-DSS has been used to provide evidence-based depression care management to more than 1,700 primary care patients. Intervention protocols can be successfully converted to Web-based decision support systems that facilitate the implementation of evidence-based CCM in routine care with high fidelity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Henke et al. 2008 USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation of CCM. Qualitative. Grounded theory. An analysis based on the grounded theory approach. N=23</td>
<td>17 physicians working in primary care were recruited from three health care organizations in the Southeast, West, and Mid-Atlantic regions.</td>
<td>Six barriers emerged from the interviews: difficulty diagnosing depression, patient resistance, fragmented mental health system, insurance coverage, lack of expertise as well as competing demands and other responsibilities of a primary care provider. A number of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interventions were deemed helpful for addressing these barriers – including care managers, mental health integration, and education - while others received mixed reviews. Mental health consultation models obtained the least endorsement. Two system-related barriers, the fragmented mental health system and insurance coverage limitations, did not appear to be fully addressed by the interventions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Hroscikoski et al. 2006 USA</th>
<th>Implementation of the CCM. Qualitative. Case study. The analysis is described in another study. N=45</th>
<th>A large 600 physician multispecialty group in Minneapolis-St. Paul.</th>
<th>The change process failed to achieve a satisfactory outcome. Several barriers were identified, including too many competing priorities, lack of specificity and agreement about the changes desired in the care process and little involvement on the part of physicians.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Katzelnick et al. 2005 USA</td>
<td>CCM Quantitative survey. A standard 1-5 scale analysis. N=20</td>
<td>Fifteen of 20 teams were from community health centers funded by the Bureau of Primary Health Care in the United States.</td>
<td>Seventeen of the 20 organizations obtained a faculty assessment of at least 4 (5 indicates significant improvement). Patients had the following outcomes: 56% had a significant change in their depressive symptoms at 12 weeks, 87% completed follow-up assessments, 54% continued antidepressant medication for at least 10 weeks and 90% completed a structured diagnostic assessment before treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. McEvoy &amp; Barnes 2007 UK</td>
<td>CCM Theoretic study.</td>
<td>This study illustrated the difference made by adopting the CCM. Radical changes in work practices may be required to implement the model. There was sufficient evidence to justify a shift in emphasis from research to dissemination and implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meredith et al. 2006 USA</td>
<td>Implementation of the CCM. Quantitative. Univariate and network analyses. N=17</td>
<td>Of the 23 organizations 17 were included, of which 11 were community health centers supported by the Health Resources and Services</td>
<td>Despite several challenges, there was evidence of success in terms of implementation and maintenance of quality improvement in depression treatment in primary care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Study Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson et al.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Implementation of the CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmittiel et al.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Implementation of the CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solberg et al.</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solberg et al.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Implementation of the CCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suter et al.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>CCM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management of depression and should be central in home-based care delivery. The HBCCM is grounded in the CCM and maximizes the potential for successful disease self-management.

Assessing Chronic Illness Care (ACIC), Bipolar collaborative chronic care model (B-CCMs), Chronic Care Model (CCM), (Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQL), Chronic care quality improvement (QI); Home-Based Chronic Care Model (HBCCM), Innovative Care for Chronic Conditions (ICCC), The Net Decision Support System (NetDSS); Voluntary chronic care improvement (CCI-I), Three component model (TCM).