

## When Depression is the Diagnosis, What Happens to Patients and Are They Satisfied?

Leif I. Solberg, MD; Lucy Rose Fischer, PhD; William A. Rush, PhD;  
and Feifei Wei, PhD

**Objectives:** To understand the process, outcomes, and patient satisfaction of usual primary care for patients given a diagnostic code for depression.

**Study Design:** Health plan data were used to identify patients with a diagnostic code for depression (and no such diagnosis in the preceding 6 months). Patients were surveyed by mail soon after the coded visit and again 3 months later about the care they had received; their charts were also audited.

**Methods:** The 274 patients in 9 primary care clinics who responded to both surveys reported on their personal characteristics, depression symptoms and history, the care received in that initial visit, and the follow-up care during the next 3 months. They also reported on their satisfaction with various aspects of that care.

**Results:** These patients were likely to be given antidepressant medications as their main or only treatment. Referral for mental health therapies was not used often, even though referral is readily available in this setting; other types of self-management recommendations and support were even less frequent. Patient outcomes and levels of satisfaction during a 3-month follow-up period were unimpressive.

**Conclusions:** To successfully maintain a key role in the care of this important problem for their patients, primary care physicians may need to incorporate a more comprehensive and systematic approach to management that involves other team members and is more satisfying to patients.

(*Am J Manag Care* 2003;9:131-140)

The many lay press articles on depression usually focus on the need to identify more people with the problem and to provide treatment, especially because treatment can help most patients and depression is now recognized as a disabling chronic disease.<sup>1-4</sup> The evidence base for the effectiveness of a variety of treatments has grown substantially in the past few years, but clearly their effective use requires organized multifaceted and collaborative systematic care approaches.<sup>5-10</sup> However, such approaches are rarely seen in nonre-

search practice settings, and many studies and commentaries emphasize the need for substantial improvement in depression care.<sup>11-14</sup> Those concerns about the quality of current care have focused primarily on underdiagnosis and undertreatment, including inadequate follow-up, and have led to the current Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set (HEDIS) performance measure. However, Simon and VonKorff<sup>15</sup> concluded that finding ways to discover more cases should await improvements in care management of the cases that are already diagnosed.

With all of this attention and controversy about current care, one might expect good information would be available about how depressed patients are currently being cared for and what their outcomes are in primary care, where most cases are identified and at least half receive all of their treatment. However, most of the literature on this subject consists of surveys of physicians about the care they think they provide<sup>16-19</sup> or limited studies of the care received by patients who were identified from screening all patients for depression symptoms during primary care visits.<sup>15,20-24</sup> Because patients screened for depression symptoms constitute a population that is different from those who receive a diagnosis, these studies provide little information about the care of diagnosed patients. For example, a recent study of primary care patients demonstrated that only 18% of the patients who self-reported significant emotional distress in the 4 weeks prior to that visit received a billing code diagnosis of either depression or anxiety at the screening visit.<sup>25</sup> Only

From HealthPartners Research Foundation, Minneapolis, MN.

Supported by a grant from the MacArthur Foundation Initiative on Depression and Primary Care.

Address correspondence to: Leif I. Solberg, MD, Associate Medical Director for Care Improvement Research, HealthPartners Research Foundation, P.O. Box 1524, Minneapolis, MN 55440-1524. E-mail: leif.i.solberg@healthpartners.com.

one study of the data in an electronic medical record describing the care received by patients with a newly coded diagnosis of depression appears to provide some information about the process of usual care.<sup>26</sup> This study found that half of the newly diagnosed patients received an antidepressant medication within 5 days of diagnosis and 90% of these patients had at least one contact within the next 6 months, but further details about this therapy, use of other therapies, or outcome results were lacking.<sup>26</sup>

In this age of concern about customer satisfaction and interest in the patient's perspective, one might also assume that many studies have assessed how depressed patients view their care.<sup>27,28</sup> However, we could find only 2 large sample surveys of US patients' preferences about the management of their emotional distress or depression, and both suggested large preferences for active treatment relying primarily on counseling.<sup>29,30</sup> Only a few studies have reported on patient satisfaction with depression care, and those studies involved selected research patients.<sup>31,32</sup>

Quality improvement theory suggests that quantitative measurement of current care is needed before improvements can begin, both to identify quality gaps and to serve as a baseline for knowing whether a change is an improvement.<sup>33-35</sup> Therefore, we used the claims database of a health plan to identify patients who had been diagnosed and coded as having a new depression diagnosis or episode by their primary care clinicians. Because depression for many patients is recurrent or chronic,<sup>2,4</sup> we selected patients whose claims data contained no record of an *ICD-9* code for depression or a prescription fill for an antidepressant in the 6 months prior to the visit producing a depression code. We surveyed these patients soon after the diagnosis and again 3 months later and combined that data with chart audits of those who consented to obtain quantitative measures of care as it was perceived and reported by the patients themselves. Our research questions were:

1. What care do patients with a new diagnostic code for depression receive during the initial visit and the next 3 months?
2. What are the short-term outcomes and satisfaction with care for these patients?

---

## METHODS

Nine of the 18 primary care clinics of a staff model medical group in a large metropolitan area were selected for this study. Three volunteered and the

other 6 were chosen to be comparable. These clinics had an average of 8 to 10 adult medical care providers (family physicians, internists, and nurse practitioners), 0.8 full-time equivalent mental health therapists on site, and cared for an average of 12 000 adult patients. Because nearly all of the patients attending these clinics were members of a single health plan, it was possible to obtain administrative data about all of their encounters. Each of these clinics had mental health counselors on site at least half of the time and all patients had access to off-site full-range mental health services, with no incentive or barrier to referral. Members were also entitled to seek care directly at mental health centers without needing to get a referral from their primary care clinic or clinician. Thus, mental health visits to the primary care clinic occurred because the patient chose to go to the clinic, as would be true of other primary care settings. Previous studies have demonstrated that nearly 99% of visits are coded in this care system.

Administrative records were searched for all adult (at least 18 years of age) visits to these primary care clinics during a 3-month period in the summer of 1998 and again during the same period in 1999. Patients were included in the survey sample if they had a family practice or internal medicine clinician visit during this time; a diagnostic code of 311 for depression (this is the only code available for depression in primary care); no other depression diagnostic code in the previous 6 months; no prescription fill for antidepressants in the previous 6 months; and no diagnosis of bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, or alcoholism in the previous year.

All patients fitting these criteria were mailed an 11-page, 49-item questionnaire within a week of their visit. The focus of the questionnaire was on what happened during the visit, but the survey also solicited information about satisfaction with the visit and contained the questions from the 12-item short-form functional status survey and the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) short-form depression screen.<sup>36-38</sup>

Three months after the initial mailing of each responding subject's questionnaire, a 25-item follow-up questionnaire was mailed. This survey focused on the care received during the intervening 3 months, reassessed satisfaction and other outcome measures, and included a page to consent to an audit of the respondent's medical record. All of these procedures were reviewed and approved by the relevant Institutional Review Board.

An audit was conducted of the medical records of all consenting respondents for the purpose of measur-

ing documentation of the actions of the care providers. This audit covered the index visit and the 3 months before and after that visit, and was conducted by 2 trained and experienced auditors after they verified high interrater reliability on 20 charts.

The depression scale in the surveys was recoded to create composite scores and change scores during the 3 months after the index visit.<sup>39</sup> To assess possible nonresponse selectivity effects, we compared nonrespondents with respondents at different stages in the data collection process. Age, sex, and provider specialty were compared among nonresponders to the baseline survey, nonresponders to the follow-up survey, respondents to the follow-up survey who did not consent to chart audit, and finally, respondents to the follow-up survey who also consented to chart audit. Then, responders to the follow-up survey were compared with nonresponders in terms of the baseline survey results; the same was done on the follow-up survey results between those who did and did not consent to chart audit. These comparisons demonstrated only a few small differences unlikely to affect the findings of the study in a significant way.

RESULTS

The initial questionnaire was mailed to the 634 patients who fit the criteria for new depression cases from the administrative data set. Completed questionnaires were returned by 368 people (58.0%). When these respondents were resurveyed 3 months later, 274 (74.4%) returned completed follow-up questionnaires. Of this latter group, 201 (73.4%) signed consent for chart audit and 189 (69.0%) had charts that could be located.

Comparisons among the nonrespondents to either survey, nonconsenting survey respondents, and those who completed both surveys and consented showed significant but small differences for age group, sex, and provider specialty. Comparisons on baseline survey questions between those who did and did not complete the follow-up survey revealed no significant differences except that follow-up survey nonrespondents were somewhat more likely to be full-time workers (52% vs 42%), be never married (20% vs 7%), and report that their physician asked about suicide (35% vs 20%). Comparisons of health status, disability, alcohol abuse, education, income, depression level, satisfaction, self-efficacy, and all other questions about physician actions showed no significant differences by response status.

**Table 1.** Characteristics of Respondents (n = 274)

Characteristic	Value, %
Age, (y)*	
20–39	20.8
40–59	48.5
60–79	26.7
80+	4.0
Female	74.1
White non-Hispanic	91.6
Marital status	
Married or remarried	60.6
Widowed/divorced/separated	29.0
Single	10.0
Living alone	18.2
Education	
High school or less	30.0
Vocational or some college	36.7
College graduate	33.3
Working	
Full time	43.8
Part time	14.6
Retired	24.8
Other	16.8
Annual household income <sup>†</sup>	
<\$25 000	24.6
\$25 000–\$60 000	44.4
>\$60 000	31.0
Health status	
Excellent/very good	33.3
Good	41.0
Fair/poor	25.7
Functional health status survey (SF-12), standardized score <sup>‡</sup>	
Physical scale	45.8 points
Mental scale	39.6 points
Current other chronic health problem	73.4
Currently acknowledged depression	71.5
2+ weeks of depression in past year	67.3
2+ years of depression in life	52.4
Depressed most of past year	45.7
>2 alcohol drinks/day	6.9
CES-D depression screen symptom score	
6–10	39.7
>10	30.8

\*Mean age = 52.4 years.

<sup>†</sup>42 refused to answer.

<sup>‡</sup>Where 50 = population mean score and ± 10 = 1 SD.

CES-D indicates Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression; SF-12, 12-item short-form.

CLINICAL

**Table 1** summarizes the respondents' demographic characteristics, self-ratings of their overall health and depression, and score on the depression screening instrument (CES-D short form).<sup>37</sup> The participants were predominantly female and white, and reported themselves to be in relatively poor overall health. Only 72% admitted to depression under the choices provided for a variety of chronic conditions, the same proportion who had a CES-D score in the depression range of 6 or more.

Only 149 (54.4%) of the 274 patients who were given a depression code reported that they were told that they had depression or received treatment or recommendations for depression at the index visit during which a depression code was recorded. However, 95% of patients with chart audits had documentation of such a discussion or a diagnosis of depression at that visit, and 213 (78%) reported that

they were currently taking antidepressants at the time they completed the questionnaire after the visit. Of the 149 who self-reported a discussion about depression with their doctor, 48% admitted to being limited in their work or activities by emotional problems in the previous 4 weeks, and 58% said they had felt depressed much of the time during the past year.

**Table 2** summarizes the frequency of various depression management activities reported to have occurred at the index visit by the 149 people who recalled discussing the subject with the clinician, as well as the results of the chart audits to provide a comparison for some items. Just over half of this group reported receiving a recommendation to see a mental health therapist. Although a similar proportion reported receiving recommendations for exercise or stress management, few said that they had

**Table 2.** Frequency (%) of Clinician Management Behaviors During Index Visit, as Indicated in Patient Reports and Chart Audits

Clinician Behavior	Patient Reports*	Chart Audits*
Asked about thoughts of hurting self	43.7	32.7
Medications		
Discussed sleep medications	40.5	—
Discussed medications to help with depression	93.9	100.0
Gave a prescription for depression medication	77.8	—
If depression medications were discussed		
Discussed how long before drug has an effect	71.9	—
Discussed side effects	54.4	24.4
Recommended patient see a mental health therapist		
In the primary care clinic	38.8	13.3
At a mental health clinic	15.5	0.0
Other treatments		
Physical exercise	53.0	15.0
Stress-reduction techniques	50.0	2.4
Written information about depression	23.0	2.4
Class or group session on depression	8.7	0.7
Written plan for managing depression	10.2	—
Other	20.0	—
Follow-up plans		
Return appointment	81.3	MD, 69.3; mental health therapist, 13.3
Offered to have someone call to see how patient is doing	12.0	—
Gave a phone number to call if patient wants to discuss depression	26.0	—

\*Patient reports, n = 149; chart audits, n = 127. These are the survey results from the 149 patients who reported that during the index visit coded for depression they were told about depression or received any treatment or recommendations for it. The 127 represents those of the 149 who consented to have their charts audited. Not all of the survey questions had a parallel chart audit item.

received any written information or other recommendations. Of the 77.8% who received a prescription for antidepressants, 94.2% said that they had filled it. Of the 81% who said that the doctor suggested a follow-up appointment, 73% said that they actually made the appointment.

Chart audit results from the 127 who signed consent were similar to patient reports for some clinician behaviors, but were markedly lower for documentation of discussions about suicide, medication side effects, therapist referrals, and any other type of self-management recommendations. In addition, the chart audit revealed that 62% of the patients in the chart audit had documentation of some kind of previous depression and at least 42% were already on antidepressants at the index visit.

Patients also reported on events over the 3 months since their index visit (Table 3). Very few (9%) reported having had any telephone conversations about their depression, and two thirds of those patients initiated the calls themselves. Although 24% were given new antidepressant prescriptions during this time, nearly 17% stopped taking them on their own, for a variety of reasons. Chart audits during this 3-month period confirmed that most patients who had been coded for depression were on antidepressant medications. However, only one third had documentation of receiving any type of lifestyle recommendations and virtually none had documentation of educational recommendations (Table 4). Moreover, while 111 (58.7%) had at least 1 follow-up visit for depression documented in the chart in the subsequent 3 months, only 19 (10%) had 3 or more visits during that time. Nearly all of those with 3 or more depression visits had those visits with the mental health therapist in the clinic. Only 69 patients (36%) had 1 follow-up visit with a physician in the next 3 months, 22 (12%) had 2 visits, and 2 (1%) had 3 or more.

**Table 3.** Patient-Reported Follow-Up Care During the 3 Months After the Index Visit (n = 274)

Behavior	n	% Reporting Behavior*
Over the last 3 months, have you talked on the telephone about depression or other emotional problems with a health professional?	25	9.1
• Did you make those calls?		68.0
During the past 3 months, were you given any new prescriptions to treat depression or other emotional problems?	67	24.4
• If yes, did you fill the prescriptions?		95.5
• Are you feeling better since you started the medication?		66.7
In the past 3 months, did you stop taking any depression medications before the doctor or other health provider told you to stop? If yes, was it because:	46	16.8
• You were having side effects?		43.5
• You felt worse or no better?		37.0
• You felt better?		26.1
• You did not need it?		23.9
• You were afraid of getting addicted to it?		8.7
• It cost too much?		8.7
• You had some other reason?		34.8

\*Bulleted questions were considered to be subquestions of an overall question, and the percentage listed is the percentage of those who answered Yes to the overall question.

Various patient-reported measurements of the severity of symptoms and dysfunction are provided in Table 5 for the index visit and again 3 months later. Although mean depression score on the CES-D screening measure improved a little (lower scores are better), 70% scored in the depressed range (>6) initially and 51% still did so after 3 months. And although the percentage of workers who reported good productivity at follow-up increased somewhat, levels of exercise and self-efficacy to deal with depression did not improve significantly. The relatively low level of satisfaction with depression care or feeling able to get the help needed for their depression remained unchanged.

Finally, Table 6 provides more detailed information about the extent to which these patients felt satisfied with various aspects of the care that they received during the 3 months. They seem to be relatively satisfied with the courtesy and respect shown to them, but there is considerable dissatisfaction with having choices of treatment, the ease of getting help or seeing specialists, and follow-up care.

**Table 4.** Chart Audit Documentation of Care During the 3 Months After the Index Visit (n = 189)

Action	Frequency	
	n	%
Any follow-up visits for depression		
MD	93	49.2
Nurse	2	1.0
Clinic therapist	31	16.4
Any of the above	111	58.7
Any lifestyle recommendations documented	59	31.2
Healthy diet	28	14.8
Regular exercise	34	18.0
Avoid alcohol	3	1.6
Enough sleep	20	10.6
Slow down	1	0.5
Support network	25	13.2
Stress reduction	15	7.9
Any educational recommendations documented	10	5.3
Written materials given	2	1.0
Internet/library	2	1.0
Health education phone line	2	1.0
Class or group session	4	2.1
Other	4	2.1

.....  
**DISCUSSION**

These results demonstrate that the principal management activities at the index visit (both from patient report and from the chart audit) appeared to be prescribing antidepressant medications and recommending a follow-up visit (probably related to the medication). However, only half of the patients reported receiving recommendations to see a mental health therapist or to use exercise or stress reduction techniques, and each of these actions were much less likely to be documented in the chart. Other educational or self-help approaches or telephone follow-up were used rarely during the next 3 months (whether relying on chart documentation or patient report), and actual follow-up rates were poor.

This approach to managing patients with depression does not appear to work well. Three quarters of those who had symptomatic depression scores at the index visit were still symptomatic 3 months later and two thirds as many scored in the severely depressed range as at the index visit. Only half demonstrated improvement whereas 15% were worse, and they reported no statistically significant improvements in feelings of self-efficacy in dealing with this problem

or in their work absenteeism. Although we have no comparison group and no similar group with outcome measures has been reported in the literature, another study of selected research subjects with major depression showed that 42% with usual care and 74% with a multifaceted intervention showed at least 50% improvement at 4 months.<sup>9</sup> Although outcomes may be affected by the apparent chronic nature of depression, these results suggest that care for depression could be improved.<sup>40-41</sup>

Equally important is our finding that the level of patient satisfaction with depression care was very low. With the possible exception of being treated respectfully, the levels of satisfaction were much lower than what is typically found on any satisfaction surveys of personal medical care, in which dissatisfaction rarely exceeds 7%.<sup>42</sup> If one considers

that the only really important satisfaction survey response category is the top alternative (because that choice reflects the percentage of respondents who like their care source well enough to recommend it to friends or to feel any loyalty to it), these results are unfortunate. Perhaps satisfying a depressed patient is more difficult than satisfying patients with other conditions; however, satisfaction has not been measured in most depression management trials, thus this area is important for further research. The few studies that have assessed satisfaction with usual care did not report it in a way that allows comparison with these more detailed measures.<sup>31,32</sup> However, 2 studies demonstrated higher satisfaction among patients who received collaborative care or a series of phone calls from a nurse than among patients who received usual care.<sup>9,32</sup> In this age of competition and emphasis on the attitudes and preferences of patients, their dissatisfaction is yet another reason to improve the process of depression care. Druss and coworkers<sup>43</sup> have provided still another reason to be concerned about patient dissatisfaction. They followed 1200 depressed health plan members for 2 years and found that those who

**Table 5.** Outcome Variables at Initial Visit and 3 Months Later (n = 274)

Measure	Initial Visit	After 3 Months	P
Depression score, mean (SD)	8.2 (4.7)	6.1 (4.7)	<.0001
>10	30.8%	19.9%	
6-10	39.7%	31.1%	
Change in depression, %			
Improved		48.1	
Unchanged		36.5	
Worse		15.5	
Self-efficacy score, mean (SD)	6.2 (2.3)	6.9 (2.3)	.12
Days of work missed in 4 weeks from illness, mean (SD)	1.01 (3.6)	1.07 (5.4)	.27
0 days	79.3%	82.4%	
1-2 days	13.6%	11.2%	
Productivity score at work in past 4 weeks*			
8-10	45.4%	64.4%	.0005
5-7	41.9%	28.2%	.0005
<5	12.8%	7.5%	.0005
>2 alcohol drinks/day	14.0%	12.1%	.37
Very satisfied with depression care	34.0%	34.1%	.91
Strongly agree can get the depression help needed	35.7%	35.1%	.80

\*On a scale of 1 (nothing accomplished) to 10 (best work performance) for those who work for pay.

**Table 6.** Patient Satisfaction (%) With Specific Aspects of Care During the Past 3 Months (n = 274\*)

How Would You Rate:	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A
Communication with health professionals	27.2	33.0	25.3	10.3	4.2	3.0
Explanations of treatments	19.0	35.9	29.1	11.8	4.2	11.2
Being given a choice of treatments	18.8	29.9	26.8	14.3	10.3	15.5
Courtesy and respect shown to you	44.1	30.3	18.4	5.7	1.5	3.0
Your involvement in care decisions	31.2	34.4	19.5	10.2	4.7	3.8
Ease of seeing mental health specialists	20.1	29.2	26.0	14.3	10.4	42.3
Ease of getting help for emotional problems	20.2	30.0	24.9	16.1	8.8	27.4
Follow-up care you received	25.7	29.1	23.6	11.0	10.5	10.9

\*All satisfaction category response percentages are limited to those who answered the question instead of choosing N/A (not applicable).

reported one or more problems with the care that they had received at the beginning of that period were 34% more likely to be depressed and 66% more likely to have decreased work effectiveness 2 years later than those who were not dissatisfied with care.<sup>43</sup>

Recently, a number of trials have been published that confirm the effectiveness of a more

aggressive, comprehensive, and proactive approach to depression management (beyond medications).<sup>5,10,31,32,44,45</sup> If it is true that the depression of most of the patients in this study was chronic or recurrent, it is particularly unfortunate that strategies such as collaboration with mental health personnel, use of cognitive behavioral or problem-solving therapies, self-management support, and

close follow-up were not more prominent in their treatment. Intensive efforts to provide follow-up outreach by nurses or other healthcare personnel over the phone has demonstrated real promise.<sup>32,45,46</sup>

Why do primary physicians fail to provide a more comprehensive and proactive approach to depression management? Part of the answer surely lies in some evidence that competing demands divert clinician attention.<sup>21</sup> Part of the answer may also lie in patient resistance to these other approaches to therapy, although the patient perspective has not been well studied and the few such studies suggest that most people with emotional distress would like some type of counseling.<sup>29,30</sup>

These findings also support recent suggestions that a much larger share of depression is chronic than is usually assumed, and that depressed patients have a significantly lower quality of life. As has been suggested by Glass,<sup>2</sup> perhaps we should consider most depression as a chronic illness and therefore prophylactic antidepressants should be used more freely. Both antidepressants and initial cognitive behavioral therapy have now been shown to be effective in reducing recurrences.<sup>2,40,41</sup> As demonstrated in another study, at least 80% of clinically depressed patients will have at least 1 more episode and at least 12% will be chronically depressed.<sup>4</sup> The subjects in our study also reported themselves to be in relatively poor health, and most reported at least 1 chronic health problem other than depression, with a mean of nearly 2 per person. Others have shown that even patients with mild-to-moderate depression have substantial limitations in function and quality of life.<sup>3</sup>

The principal limitations in these findings are that they are confined to members of 1 health plan being cared for by a staff model multispecialty care system and that the number of nonresponders was higher than desirable. However, if even middle class and largely employed people in a healthcare system with few barriers and generally high HEDIS scores for quality demonstrate this many problems, what might the problems be for others in less desirable circumstances? Although the response rates to our surveys are another potential limitation, our analyses of differences among the patients reported here and those who did not respond revealed few such differences. Another concern that might be raised is the large gap between patient report and chart documentation for certain care components in Table 2 (eg, discussion of side effects, recommendations for mental health therapists, and use of nonmedication treatment plans). Although we cannot rule out the

possibility of patients overreporting these actions, these types of care are known to be particularly poorly documented.<sup>47</sup> However, for medicolegal or quality assessments, the rule is normally that if a treatment is not documented then it did not happen; at least better documentation is needed. Finally, we did not collect detailed information about the dosing or adherence to antidepressant medication, so we cannot separate those aspects or the known medication discontinuance rates from the multiple other factors identified in this study that may have contributed to the outcomes.

Most of the attention and concern regarding the care of depression has centered on whether the condition is recognized at an adequate rate and whether individuals who receive antidepressants are receiving adequate doses for a long-enough time with enough follow-up visits. Those are the only care processes measured by HEDIS for depression care, because measures such as those in this report would require extra patient surveys.<sup>48</sup> These data and recent studies of combining antidepressant treatment with other forms of therapy and follow-up suggest that more attention should be paid to the rest of the care received. The evidence in the literature for quality improvement of care processes clarifies that what is needed are organized systems in office practice so that these other aspects of depression management will be provided more consistently.<sup>49</sup> Unless primary care clinicians learn to implement such office systems that are effective in improving depression care, they risk losing this important aspect of primary care to other providers or focused disease management systems.

#### Acknowledgments

Special thanks to the Steering Committee of the MacArthur Foundation Initiative on Depression and Primary Care for their encouragement and support of this study.

---

#### REFERENCES

1. Coulehan JL, Schulberg HC, Block MR, Madonia MJ, Rodriguez E. Treating depressed primary care patients improves their physical, mental, and social functioning. *Arch Intern Med.* 1997;157:1113-1120.
2. Glass RM. Treating depression as a recurrent or chronic disease. *JAMA.* 1999;281:83-84.
3. Hays RD, Wells KB, Sherbourne CD, Rogers W, Spritzer K. Functioning and well-being outcomes of patients with depression compared with chronic general medical illnesses. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1995;52:11-19.
4. Judd LL. The clinical course of unipolar major depressive disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry.* 1997;54:989-991.

5. DeRubeis RJ, Gelfand LA, Tang TZ, Simons AD. Medications versus cognitive behavior therapy for severely depressed outpatients: mega-analysis of four randomized comparisons. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1999;156:1007-1013.
6. Mynors-Wallis LM, Gath DH, Day A, Baker F. Randomised controlled trial of problem solving treatment, antidepressant medication, and combined treatment for major depression in primary care. *BMJ*. 2000;320:26-30.
7. Katon W, VonKorff M, Lin E, et al. Population-based care of depression: effective disease management strategies to decrease prevalence. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 1997;19:169-178.
8. Simon GE, Von Korff M, Rutter C, Wagner E. Randomised trial of monitoring, feedback, and management of care by telephone to improve treatment of depression in primary care. *BMJ*. 2000;320:550-554.
9. Katon W, Von Korff M, Lin E, et al. Collaborative management to achieve treatment guidelines. Impact on depression in primary care. *JAMA*. 1995;273:1026-1031.
10. Rubenstein LV, Jackson-Triche M, Unutzer J, et al. Evidence-based care for depression in managed primary care practices. *Health Aff*. 1999;18(5):89-105.
11. Hirschfeld RM, Keller MB, Panico S, et al. The National Depressive and Manic-Depressive Association consensus statement on the undertreatment of depression. *JAMA*. 1997;277:333-340.
12. Wang PS, Berglund P, Kessler RC. Recent care of common mental disorders in the United States: prevalence and conformance with evidence-based recommendations. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2000;15:284-292.
13. Goldman LS, Nielsen NH, Champion HC. Awareness, diagnosis, and treatment of depression. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1999;14:569-580.
14. Katz SJ, Kessler RC, Lin E, Wells KB. Medication management of depression in the United States and Ontario. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1998;13:77-85.
15. Simon GE, VonKorff M. Recognition, management, and outcomes of depression in primary care. *Arch Fam Med*. 1995;4:99-105.
16. Hartley D, Korsen N, Bird D, Agger M. Management of patients with depression by rural primary care practitioners. *Arch Fam Med*. 1998;7:139-145.
17. Williams JW Jr, Rost K, Dietrich AJ, Ciotti MC, Zyzanski SJ, Cornell J. Primary care physicians' approach to depressive disorders. Effects of physician specialty and practice structure. *Arch Fam Med*. 1999;8:58-67.
18. Meredith LS, Rubenstein LV, Rost K, et al. Treating depression in staff-model versus network-model managed care organizations. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1999;14:39-48.
19. Valenstein M, Klinkman M, Becker S, et al. Concurrent treatment of patients with depression in the community: provider practices, attitudes, and barriers to collaboration. *J Fam Pract*. 1999;48:180-187.
20. Katon W, Rutter CM, Lin E, et al. Are there detectable differences in quality of care or outcome of depression across primary care providers? *Med Care*. 2000;38:552-561.
21. Rost K, Nutting P, Smith J, Coyne JC, Cooper-Patrick L, Rubenstein L. The role of competing demands in the treatment provided primary care patients with major depression. *Arch Fam Med*. 2000;9:150-154.
22. Robinson JW, Roter DL. Counseling by primary care physicians of patients who disclose psychosocial problems. *J Fam Pract*. 1999;48:698-705.
23. Ormel J, Koeter MW, van den Brink W, van de Willige G. Recognition, management, and course of anxiety and depression in general practice. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 1991;48:700-706.
24. Thompson MA, Unutzer J, Katon WJ, Geyman JP, Gimlett D, Walker EA. Detection and treatment of depressive syndromes in a rural island clinic. *J Am Board Fam Pract*. 1999;12:120-127.
25. Callahan EJ, Jaen CR, Crabtree BF, Zyzanski SJ, Goodwin MA, Stange KC. The impact of recent emotional distress and diagnosis of depression or anxiety on the physician-patient encounter in family practice. *J Fam Pract*. 1998;46:410-418.
26. Ornstein S, Stuart G, Jenkins R. Depression diagnoses and antidepressant use in primary care practices: a study from the Practice Partner Research Network (PPRNet). *J Fam Pract*. 2000;49:68-72.
27. Mayer T, Cates RJ. Service excellence in health care. *JAMA*. 1999;282:1281-1283.
28. Laurus Health Alliance. *Consumers and Their Doctors: How the Relationship Drives Perceptions*. Irving, TX: VHA, Inc.; 1999.
29. Brody DS, Khaliq AA, Thompson TL 2nd. Patients' perspectives on the management of emotional distress in primary care settings. *J Gen Intern Med*. 1997;12:403-406.
30. Dwight-Johnson D, Sherbourne CD, Liao D, Wells KB. Treatment preferences among depressed primary care patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2000;15:527-534.
31. Katon W, Von Korff M, Lin E, et al. Collaborative management to achieve depression treatment guidelines. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1997;58(suppl 1):20-23.
32. Hunkeler EM, Meresman JF, Hargreaves WA, et al. Efficacy of nurse telehealth care and peer support in augmenting treatment of depression in primary care. *Arch Fam Med*. 2000;9:700-708.
33. Batalden PB, Mohr JJ, Nelson EC, Plume SK. Improving health care, part 4: concepts for improving any clinical process. *Jt Comm J Qual Improv*. 1996;22:651-659.
34. Berwick DM. A primer on leading the improvement of systems. *BMJ*. 1996;312:619-622.
35. Langley GJ, Nolan KM, Nolan TW, Norman CL, Provost LP. *Improvement Guide: A Practical Approach to Enhancing Organizational Performance*. San Francisco, Calif: Jossey-Bass; 1996.
36. Radloff LS. The CES-D Scale: a self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Appl Psychol Mea*. 1977;1:385-401.
37. Kohout FJ, Berkman LF, Evans DA, Cornoni-Huntley J. Two shorter forms of the CES-D (Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression) depression symptoms index. *J Aging Health*. 1993;5:179-193.
38. Ware JE Jr, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-item short-form health survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care*. 1996;34:220-233.
39. Garfein AJ, Herzog AR. Robust aging among the young-old, old-old, and oldest-old. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 1995;50:577-587.
40. Keller MB, Kocsis JH, Thase ME, et al. Maintenance phase efficacy of sertraline for chronic depression: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 1998;280:1665-1672.
41. Fava GA, Rafanelli C, Grandi S, Canestrari R, Morphy MA. Six-year outcome for cognitive behavioral treatment of residual symptoms in major depression. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1998;155:1443-1445.
42. Kottke TE, Solberg LI, Brekke ML, Cabrera A, Marquez M. Will patient satisfaction set the preventive services implementation agenda? *Am J Prev Med*. 1997;13:309-316.
43. Druss BG, Schlesinger M, Allen HM Jr. Depressive symptoms, satisfaction with health care, and 2-year work outcomes in an employed population. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2001;158:731-734.
44. Mynors-Wallis LM, Gath DH, Lloyd Thomas AR, Tomlinson D. Randomised controlled trial comparing problem solving treatment with amitriptyline and placebo for major depression in primary care. *BMJ*. 1995;310:441-445.
45. Wells KB, Sherbourne C, Schoenbaum M, et al. Impact of disseminating quality improvement programs for depression in managed primary care: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2000;283:212-220.

---

## CLINICAL

**46. Lynch DJ, Tamburrino MB, Nagel R.** Telephone counseling for patients with minor depression: preliminary findings in a family practice setting. *J Fam Pract.* 1997;44:293-298.

**47. Stange KC, Zyzanski SJ, Smith TF, et al.** How valid are medical records and patient questionnaires for physician profiling and health services research? A comparison with direct observation of patients visits. *Med Care.* 1998;36:851-867.

**48. Mainous AG 3rd, Talbert J.** Assessing quality of care via HEDIS 3.0. Is there a better way? *Arch Fam Med.* 1998;7:410-413.

**49. Solberg LI, Korsen N, Oxman TE, Fischer LR, Bartels S.** The need for a system in the care of depression. *J Fam Pract.* 1999;48:973-979.