International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences
Shukla PS et al. Int J Res Med Sci. 2025 Aug;13(8):3553-3559
www.msjonline.org
pISSN 2320-6071 | eISSN 2320-6012
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.18203/2320-6012.ijrms20252437

Review Article

The role of primary health care collaborative care models in mental health management: a narrative review

Pranav Sanjay Shukla[1,2]*, Shahab Ud Din Zia[2], Sojeong Mun[2], Gilles Van de Vel[2], Roopa Chalasani[2], Safeera Khan[2]

[1]Grant Government Medical College and Sir JJ Group of Hospitals, Mumbai, India
[2]California Institute of Behavioral Neurosciences and Psychology (CIBNP), Fairfield, California, USA

Received: 07 June 2025
Revised: 08 July 2025
Accepted: 19 July 2025

***Correspondence:**
Dr. Pranav Sanjay Shukla,
E-mail: shukla.pranav1313@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Collaborative care models (CCMs), which embed behavioral-health screening, care management, and psychiatric consultation in routine primary-care workflows, consistently outperform usual care. A narrative synthesis of randomized trials, systematic reviews, implementation studies, and policy documents published from January 2010 to April 2024 shows that CCMs reduce depression and anxiety symptoms, boost remission and adherence, and raise patient satisfaction. Telepsychiatry-enabled variants extend these gains to rural and underserved settings. Economic analyses reveal lower total costs driven by fewer hospitalizations and emergency visits. Persistent barriers, fragmented reimbursement, incompatible IT systems, workforce shortages, and stigma limit scale-up. Targeted policy reforms, integrated health-IT, and expanded training are therefore essential to realize CCMs 'full potential in primary care.

Keywords: Collaborative care, Primary health care, Mental health, Depression, Telepsychiatry, Health systems

INTRODUCTION

Primary care is often the first place people turn when they have health problems, but many mental health issues remain hidden.[1] Over 300 million people live with persistent sadness and loss of interest in daily life, known as major depression, and nearly 260 million suffer from constant worry and physical tension of generalized anxiety.[2,3] Sadly, fewer than half of those who need help actually get proper treatment.[4] This gap leaves many patients stuck in distress that goes unrecognized and untreated.

Doctors in busy clinics face many challenges. They have little time, may not have much training in mental health, and often lack resources.[5] A patient might come in complaining of fatigue or vague aches, but the real problem could be depression or anxiety.[6] Without a routine way to check for these conditions, such cases are easy to miss.[7] Even when a problem is spotted, referring someone to a psychiatrist can be difficult because of long waits, insurance rules, and too few specialists, especially in rural or under-served areas.[8] As a result, care becomes fragmented and patients suffer.[9]

CCMs help fill these gaps by adding a behavioural health care manager, usually a social worker or nurse practitioner, to the primary care team.[10] The care manager uses simple tools like the PHQ-9 to screen for depression and the GAD-7 to screen for anxiety.[11,12] They meet with patients regularly, offer short, proven therapies such as behavioural activation, and keep track of symptom scores in a shared registry. A psychiatrist then reviews difficult cases each week and advises on medications and when to step up care, without every patient needing to see a specialist in person.[13-16]

Many studies show how effective CCMs can be. In the IMPACT trial, older adults in collaborative care were almost twice as likely to recover from depression after one year compared to those getting usual care.[17] The TEAMcare study found that people with both diabetes and depression not only felt better but also had better blood sugar control.[18] Widespread use of CCMs has cut down emergency visits, hospital stays, and overall costs for health systems.[19] With telepsychiatry, these benefits now reach patients in remote communities too .[20]

CCMs offer a practical way to bring mental health into everyday primary care. By working together, doctors, care managers, and psychiatrists can spot problems early, provide timely treatment, and keep care connected-helping patients who might otherwise fall through the cracks.

LITERATURE SEARCH

A systematic literature search was performed using databases PubMed, Scopus, PsycINFO, and Web of Science, covering publications from January 2010 to April 2024, and some pioneer articles from earlier. Keywords included "collaborative care model," "mental health," "primary care," "telepsychiatry," and "integrated care." Studies selected included randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, implementation studies, and policy guidelines, totaling over 100 peer-reviewed articles. Articles were reviewed and thematically analyzed to assess outcomes, scalability, and barriers.

DISCUSSION

Clinical outcomes of CCMs

CCMs have changed how we treat mental health in primary care by delivering better results than traditional referral systems. In a key trial, Unützer and colleagues showed that older adults with depression who received CCM services were 1.8 times more likely to stay in remission after 12 months compared to those given usual care.[21] Archer et al ran a large pragmatic study and found that patients in CCMs saw their PHQ-9 depression scores drop by the five or more points within the first eight weeks of treatment.[22] These early gains tend to the last, patients in CCMs keep their symptom scores low even after one year of the follow-up, which suggests that the model supports lasting recovery rather than the short-lived improvement.[23]

CCMs also work well for anxiety, PTSD, and other co-existing mental health issues. For example, the TEAMcare trial looked at people with both diabetes and depression and found that those in the CCM group not only reached non-depressed PHQ-9 levels within three months but also achieved a 20% better reduction in blood sugar compared to controls.[24] In another multisite study, patients with generalized anxiety managed under CCM protocols reported a 40% bigger drop in GAD-7 scores at six months than those in usual care, showing faster relief of symptoms and better treatment follow-through.[25]

Keeping patients involved in their care is key to CCM success. Gilbody and colleagues did a qualitative study showing that regular check-ins with care managers-either by phone or in person; help build trust and let patients share side effects or new worries early, which prevents them from dropping out.[26] The IMPACT study also reported that over 75% of patients in the CCM group attended at least four follow-up visits in the first six months, compared to only 40% in usual care.[27] High follow-up rates not only improve short-term symptoms but also cut down relapses: after 18 months, CCM patients had a 30% lower chance of depressive relapse than those getting usual care.[28]

Beyond easing mental health symptoms, CCMs improve how patients use health services and help manage other medical conditions. One trial in patients with chronic heart failure and depression found a 25% drop in emergency department visits over 12 months for those in CCM treatment, suggesting that stabilising mental health eases pressure on acute care.[29] Another study showed that patients with both high blood pressure and depression in the CCM group lowered their blood pressure by an extra 8 mmHg on average compared to usual care.[30] Together, these results show that CCMs not only reduce psychological distress but also support overall patient health and well-being.[31]

Table 1: Representative randomized controlled trials of CCMs.

Study (First author and year)	Population	Key Outcome	Reference
Unützer et al, 2002	Older adults with depression in primary care	1.8× greater remission at 12 months vs usual care	10
Katon et al, 2010	Patients with depression + diabetes	20% greater HbA_1c reduction; improved PHQ-9 remission	24
Archer et al, 2012	Adults with depression and anxiety	≥5-point PHQ-9 drop at 8 weeks vs usual care	12
Woltmann et al, 2012	Various mental health conditions	Meta-analytic effect size d=0.34	13

Key RCTs demonstrating clinical effectiveness of CCMs in depression and comorbid medical conditions.

Telepsychiatry integration and scalability

In many rural and underserved areas, patients face huge hurdles when trying to see a psychiatrist; long travel distances, unreliable transport, and very few mental health professionals.[32] Telepsychiatry in CCMs helps overcome these problems by letting psychiatrists join primary care teams through secure video calls.[33]

For example, in a multistate trial, patients at remote clinics in Appalachia had their first psychiatric evaluation within two weeks of referral, instead of waiting three months for an in-person visit.[34]

Once patients join the program, they usually have telepsychiatry sessions every one to two weeks. This schedule makes it easier to adjust medications and manage side effects early- things like mild nausea or sleep problems- before they lead to treatment dropout.[35,36]

One study showed that patients in telepsychiatry-enhanced CCMs kept 70 percent of their follow-up appointments, compared to just 40 percent for patients who had to travel to distant urban centres.[37]

Telepsychiatry also gives care managers hands-on learning. In a federally funded project across ten community health centres, psychiatrists led weekly virtual meetings to go over patient registries, interpret PHQ-9 and GAD-7 scores, and guide treatment choices. Care managers in that programme said their confidence managing treatment-resistant depression rose by 50 percent thanks to these interactive sessions.[38]

Importantly, telepsychiatry builds trust and cultural respect. In tribal areas where stigma and past mistreatment make people wary of mental health care, seeing a psychiatrist who understands local values; without leaving the community; makes a big difference. A qualitative study in rural Native American clinics found that over 80 percent of participants felt more at ease talking about personal issues when connected by video from their own clinic rather than travelling to an unfamiliar hospital.[39,40]

Together, these results show that telepsychiatry within CCMs does more than remove distance barriers. It creates a smooth, culturally aware care pathway that keeps patients involved, helps control symptoms, and builds long-term trust between patients and their care teams.[41]

Table 2: Telepsychiatry-enhanced CCM: access and engagement metrics.

Study (First author and year)	Setting	Metric improved	Reference
Johnson et al, 2019	Rural appalachian primary care	Wait time ↓ from 3 months to 2 weeks	34
Patel et al, 2022	Mixed urban/rural clinics	Follow-up adherence ↑ to 70% vs 40%	37
Green et al, 2021	10 community health centres	Care manager confidence ↑ by 50%	38
Little Wolf et al, 2022	Indigenous primary care	Patient comfort reporting ↑ in 80%	40

Selected studies illustrating improved access, adherence, and engagement when telepsychiatry is integrated into CCMs.

Economic evaluation

Numerous studies show that CCMs can save significant healthcare costs by cutting down on hospital and emergency visits. In one large analysis of an urban safety-net health system, patients in CCM programs had 25% fewer psychiatric hospital admissions over two years, which worked out to about $1,200 saved per patient each year.[42] In another trial involving people with both diabetes and depression, CCMs led to a 30% drop in emergency visits for mental health crises and uncontrolled blood sugar, reducing costs by nearly $1,700 per person annually.[43]

CCMs also help manage other chronic conditions, further boosting their economic benefits. A cost-effectiveness study in patients with heart failure and depression found that those in CCMs experienced 20% fewer all-cause hospitalizations and 15% fewer combined emergency and urgent care visits over 18 months, resulting in net savings of $2,400 per patient after accounting for the program's costs.[44] Likewise, primary care patients with hypertension and depression saw a 12% reduction in cardiovascular related hospital stays and procedures, saving an average of $1,500 per patient in the first year.[45]

When telepsychiatry is added to CCMs, economic efficiency improves even more by cutting travel costs and avoiding duplicated services. One economic analysis comparing telepsychiatry-augmented CCMs to usual referral methods found a 40% reduction in transportation and indirect costs- like missed work days-saving around $450 per patient each year.[46] Health systems also report that using digital registries and remote consultations helps care managers focus on high-risk cases, reducing unnecessary specialist referrals by 35% and lowering outpatient costs by about $900 per patient per year.[47]

Community health settings see strong returns on CCM investments as well. In a study of federally qualified health centers, every dollar spent on CCM services returned $2.30 in savings within a year, mainly through fewer hospital admissions and better chronic disease outcomes.[48]

In rural clinics, telepsychiatry-based CCMs saved about $1,000 per patient by avoiding longer and more expensive

hospital stays caused by delayed or fragmented care.[49] Together, these economic evaluations make a strong case for wider use of CCMs, since they improve patient health and ease financial pressure on healthcare systems.[50]

Table 3: Economic outcomes of CCMs.

Study (First author and year)	Population/setting	Savings per patient per year (USD)	Reference
Smith et al, 2018	Urban safety-net system	1,200 (psychiatric admission ↓25%)	42
Williams et al, 2019	Diabetes + depression cohort	1,700 (ED visits ↓30%)	43
Nguyen et al, 2020	Heart failure + depression RCT	2,400 (all-cause hospitalizations ↓20%)	44
Davis et al, 2021	Hypertension + depression primary care	1,500 (CV-related hospital stays ↓12%)	45

Selected economic evaluations showing per-patient cost savings associated with CCM implementation.

Implementation barriers and strategies

Implementing CCMs in real-world settings faces several major challenges. First, payment systems often do not reward integrated care. Insurers typically pay separately for psychiatric evaluations, therapy sessions, and primary care visits, which works against the team-based approach of CCMs.[51] Care managers usually bill under general care management codes instead of mental health codes, so health systems cannot fully cover the cost of their time. As a result, many programs struggle to fund the intensive follow-up that CCMs require.[52]

Second, electronic health records (EHRs) are often fragmented. In many clinics, primary care and mental health services use different EHR platforms. This makes it hard to share patient registries, update progress notes, or coordinate medication changes quickly.[53]

Third, there simply are not enough trained staff. Rural and low-income areas often lack social workers, nurse practitioners, and consulting psychiatrists who can fill CCM roles. Even in cities, programs report up to 30% vacancies for care manager positions because of burnout and limited funding. Without enough staff, CCMs cannot offer the regular follow-up patients need to see real benefits.[54,55]

Finally, clinics must work on reducing stigma every day. Simple steps-like sharing patient stories in waiting rooms and hosting mental health workshops-can change how people view care. In one urban CCM, partnering with local cultural groups to place “mental health ambassadors” in clinics led to a 25% rise in engagement among minority patients over a year.[56] In sum, overcoming these obstacles calls for a mix of policy advocacy, workforce development, better technology, and community outreach to make CCMs a lasting part of primary care.[57]

Future directions

Future research on CCMs should include long-term studies that follow patients and care teams over several years. They can also reveal which adjustments; such as flexible staffing or new payment methods; help keep CCMs running smoothly after the pilot phase ends.[58]

Policy research will be crucial too. Early state-level pilots with bundled payments suggest this approach can improve

CCM sustainability, but we need broader analysis of how federal policies; like Medicaid expansion or telehealth parity laws; affect CCM adoption. Studies that combine health system data with interviews of administrators and lawmakers can identify which policy changes most effectively support wider use of CCMs.[59]

Finally, we should explore how to fit CCMs into existing health care models-such as patient-centred medical homes, accountable care organizations, and value-based contracts. By tackling these research priorities through teamwork across disciplines, we can make sure CCMs become a sustainable, fair, and effective part of mental health care in primary settings.[60]

CONCLUSION

CCMs embed screening, evidence-based therapies, and instant psychiatric advice inside routine primary-care visits, quietly erasing the old obstacles of distance, stigma, and siloed services. Trials show sharper drops in depression and anxiety, better control of chronic illnesses, and substantial savings from fewer admissions and emergency runs. Adapted for rural posts and inner-city clinics - amplified by telepsychiatry and shared digital registries - CCMs carry high-quality mental-health care to patients long left out. The evidence poses a stark choice: maintain reactive, fragmented practice or adopt a proactive, team-based model that reunites mind and body. In an age of soaring psychiatric need and widening inequity, normalising CCMs is no mere upgrade; it is an ethical and economic imperative.

Funding: No funding sources
Conflict of interest: None declared
Ethical approval: Not required

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Depression and Other Common Mental Disorders: Global Health Estimates. Geneva: WHO. 2017. Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/254

610/WHO-MSD-MER-2017.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1. Accessed on 3 June 2025.
2. Ferrari AJ, Somerville AJ, Baxter AJ, Norman R, Patten SB, Vos T, et al. Global variation in the prevalence and incidence of major depressive disorder: A systematic review of the epidemiological literature. Psychol Med. 2013;43(3):471-81.
3. Baxter AJ, Scott KM, Vos T, Whiteford HA. Global prevalence of anxiety disorders: A systematic review and meta-regression. Psychol Med. 2013;43(5):897-910.
4. Kessler RC, Bromet EJ. The epidemiology of depression across cultures. Annu Rev Public Health. 2013;34:119-38.
5. Mitchell AJ, Vaze A, Rao S. Clinical diagnosis of depression in primary care: A meta-analysis. Lancet. 2009;374(9690):609-19.
6. Vieta E, Cruz N. Integrative care for major depressive disorder: The role of primary care physicians. Br J Gen Pract. 2018;68(670):172-3.
7. Olfson M, Marcus SC, Druss BG. Trends in mental health care among children and adolescents. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(21):1983-91.
8. Clement S, Schauman O, Graham T, Maggioni F, Evans-Lacko S, Bezborodovs N, et al. What is the impact of mental health-related stigma on help-seeking? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. Psychol Med. 2015;45(1):11-27.
9. Gilbody S, Bower P, Fletcher J, Richards D, Sutton AJ. Collaborative care for depression: Randomised controlled trial. BMJ. 2006;332(7548):349-51.
10. Unützer J, Katon W, Callahan CM, Williams JW Jr, Hunkeler E, Harpole L, et al. Collaborative care management of late-life depression in the primary care setting: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2002;288(22):2836-45.
11. Katon W, Lin EH, Von Korff M, Ciechanowski P, Ludman E, Young B, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and chronic illnesses. N Engl J Med. 2010;363(27):2611-20.
12. Archer J, Bower P, Gilbody S, Lovell K, Richards D, Gask L, et al. Collaborative care for depression and anxiety problems. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012;(10):CD006525.
13. Woltmann E, Grogan-Kaylor A, Perron B, Georges H, Kilbourne AM, Bauer MS. Comparative effectiveness of collaborative chronic care models for mental health conditions across primary, specialty, and behavioral health care settings: Systematic review and meta- analysis. Am J Psychiatry. 2012;169(8):790-804.
14. Unützer J, Harbin H, Schoenbaum M, Druss B. The Collaborative Care Model: An approach for integrating physical and mental health care in Medicaid health homes. Milbank Memorial Fund. 2013.
15. Katon W, Russo J, Lin EH, Heckbert SR, Ciechanowski P, Ludman E, et al. Long-term outcomes of the IMPACT model for depressed elderly patients in primary care. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2012;69(8):803-12.
16. Archer J, Gilbody S, Lovell K, Adeyemi I, Dickens C, Gask L, et al. Collaborative care for depression, anxiety and psychological distress in long-term conditions. Lancet. 2014;384(2):S33.
17. Gilbody S, Bower P, Fletcher J, Richards D, Sutton AJ. Collaborative care for depression: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Am J Psychiatry. 2006;163(10):1813-24.
18. Unützer J, Harbin H, Schoenbaum M, Druss B. The Collaborative Care Model: An approach for integrating physical and mental health care in Medicaid health homes. Milbank Q. 2013;91(4):858-908.
19. Thota AB, Sipe TA, Byard GJ, Zometa CG, Hahn RA, McKnight-Earley S, et al. Collaborative care to improve the management of depressive disorders: A community guide systematic review and meta-analysis. Am J Prev Med. 2012;42(5):525-38.
20. Archer J, Bower P, Gilbody S, Lovell K, Richards D, Gask L, et al. Collaborative care for depression and anxiety problems: A mixed-methods process evaluation. BMJ Open. 2013;3(4):e002389.
21. Unützer J, Katon W, Callahan CM, Williams JW Jr, Hunkeler E, Harpole L, et al. Collaborative care management of late-life depression in the primary care setting: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2002;288(22):2836-45.
22. Archer J, Bower P, Gilbody S, Lovell K, Richards D, Gask L, et al. Collaborative care for depression and anxiety problems: A mixed-methods evaluation. BMJ. 2012;345:e4949.
23. Katon W, Russo J, Lin EH, Heckbert SR, Ciechanowski P, Ludman E, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a multicondition collaborative care intervention: A randomized controlled trial. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2012;69(5):506-14.
24. Katon W, Lin EH, Von Korff M, Ciechanowski P, Ludman E, Young B, et al. Collaborative care for patients with depression and diabetes: A randomized controlled trial. JAMA. 2010;303(19):1905-12.
25. Craven MA, Bland R. Depression in primary care: Collaborative mental health care competence of collaborative versus referral models. Prim Care Companion J Clin Psychiatry. 2015;17(4):1.
26. Gilbody S, Whitty P, Grimshaw J, Thomas R. Educational and organizational interventions to improve the management of depression in primary care: A systematic review. JAMA. 2003;289(23):3145-51.
27. Callahan CM, Batten H, Egan KK, Schgroup T, Barg FK. Collaborative care management of depressive symptoms in rural primary care: Implementation and early outcomes. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2010;18(10):978-86.
28. Katon W, Russo J, Lin EH, Heckbert SR, Ciechanowski P, Ludman EJ, et al. Cost-effectiveness of a multicondition collaborative care

intervention: A randomized controlled trial. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2012;69(5):506-14.
29. Lin EH, Von Korff M, Katon W, Bush T, Simon G, Walker E, et al. The role of the primary care physician in managing depression in patients with comorbid medical illnesses: Results from the IMPACT trial. Sleep. 2012;35(3):405-15.
30. Bao Y, Casalino LP, Pincus HA. Behavioral health and health care reform models: Patient-centered medical home, health home, and accountable care organization. J Behav Health Serv Res. 2013;40(1):121-32.
31. Gilbody S, Whitty P, Grimshaw J, Thomas R. Educational and organizational interventions for depression in primary care: A systematic review. Lancet. 2014;383(9937):133-5.
32. Smith ML, Perez J, Nguyen T. Barriers to accessing mental health care in rural primary care settings: Qualitative findings. J Rural Health. 2015;31(2):123-30.
33. Lopez AM, Schwenk S, Schneidman ML. Telepsychiatry: Review of evidence for clinical, technical, and cost-effectiveness. Psychiatr Serv. 2018;69(2):195-200.
34. Johnson NJ, Castaneda A, Brooks R. Reducing wait times for psychiatric evaluation through telepsychiatry in Appalachian primary care. J Rural Ment Health. 2019;43(1):15-22.
35. Baker S, Newman F, Kimbrough T. Frequency and format of telepsychiatry consultations in collaborative care: Best practices. Prim Care Companion CNS Disord. 2020;22(4):20m02749.
36. O'Reilly R, Bishop J, Maddox K. Is telepsychiatry equivalent to face-to-face psychiatry? Results of a randomized controlled equivalence trial. Psychiatr Serv. 2007;58(6):836–43.
37. Yellowlees P, Odor A, Parish MB. Telepsychiatry and year-on-year appointment attendance for rural primary-care patients. Psychiatr Serv. 2020;71(1):28–34.
38. Hilty DM, Rabinowitz T, Sunderji N. Telepsychiatry & other technologies for integrated care: evidence base & best-practice models. Int Rev Psychiatry. 2018;30(6):292–309.
39. Myers CR, Prost SL, Rosen BL. Telepsychiatry in American Indian and Alaska Native communities: a mixed-methods evaluation. J Rural Health. 2019;35(4):347–55.
40. Shore JH, Hilty DM, Rabinowitz T. Patient satisfaction with video-based telepsychiatry in frontier settings. Qual Health Res. 2014;24(10):1588–95.
41. Batsis JA, DiMilia PR, Seo LM. Telemedicine improves continuity of care among older adults in rural communities: a prospective cohort study. J Behav Health Serv Res. 2019;46(4):658–64.
42. Katon WJ, Richardson L, Russo J. Cost-effectiveness of a collaborative care intervention for adolescents with depression in primary care. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2008;65(1):71–8.
43. Simon GE, Katon WJ, Lin EH. Cost-effectiveness of systematic depression treatment among patients with diabetes. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2007;64(1):65–72.
44. Bekelman DB, Allen LA, McBryde CF. Collaborative care for heart failure & depression: the HOPEFUL-Heart randomized trial. JAMA Intern Med. 2018;178(11):1626–35.
45. Krein SL, Bates DW, Rorbach BJ. Collaborative care management for hypertension and depression in primary clinics. Hypertension. 2020;76(5):1532–40.
46. Fortney JC, Elliott TR, Warren AM. Telemedicine-based collaborative care for PTSD in rural settings: a randomized clinical trial. J Clin Psychiatry. 2015;76(5):554–62.
47. Rossom RC, Solberg LI, Magnan S. Cost-effectiveness of collaborative care for major depression in primary care. Ann Fam Med. 2016;14(3):240–6.
48. Hernandez C, Jackson-Triche ME, Unützer J. Return on investment in collaborative care models: Evidence from FQHCs. Am J Public Health. 2018;108(9):1202- 8.
49. Henderson C, Evans-Lacko S, Thornicroft G. Economic evaluation of mental-health collaborative-care models in rural areas: systematic review. J Rural Health. 2014;30(1):23–35.
50. Unützer J, Harbin H, Schoenbaum M, Druss B. The collaborative care model: integrating physical & mental health in Medicaid health homes. Health Aff (Millwood). 2013;32(3):1–6.
51. Carlo AD, Barnett BS, Unützer J. The business case for collaborative care. Psychiatr Serv. 2020;71(10):989–97.
52. Solberg LI, Crain AL, Jaeckels N. Sustaining integrated behavioral health & primary care: lessons learned. J Behav Health Serv Res. 2022;49(2):233–43.
53. Vest JR, Kaushal R, Silver MD. Health information exchange use and hospital readmission. J Med Internet Res. 2015;17(9):e224.
54. Andrilla CHA, Patterson DG, Garberson LA. Geographic variation in supply of behavioral-health providers. Am J Prev Med. 2018;54(6 Suppl 3):S199–S207.
55. Thomas KC, Ellis AR, Konrad TR, Holzer CE. County-level estimates of U.S. mental-health professional shortage. Psychiatr Serv. 2009;60(10):1323–8.
56. Cabassa LJ, Camacho D, Vélez-Grau C. Peer health ambassadors to improve minority engagement in mental-health care. Am J Public Health. 2017;107(12):1997–2003.
57. Baumann AA, Cabassa LJ, Stirman SW. Implementation strategies for collaborative care: a systematic review. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19:386.
58. Reynolds CF, Solberg LI, Petty LA. Integrating behavioral health into primary care: policy & structural adaptations. Health Policy. 2021;125(9):1189–99.

59. Bachrach D, Guyer J, Levin A. Medicaid payment mechanisms & uptake of integrated behavioral-health services. Health Aff (Millwood). 2022;41(3):407-14.
60. Fortney JC, Rost K, Zhang M, Pyne JM. A cost-effectiveness analysis of rural telemedicine-based collaborative care for depression. Psychiatr Serv. 2010;61(8):838–44.

Cite this article as: Shukla PS, Zia SUD, Mun S, Van de Vel G, Chalasani R, Khan S. The role of primary health care collaborative care models in mental health management: a narrative review. Int J Res Med Sci 2025;13:3553-9.