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Summary
Randomised controlled trial to evaluate the effectiveness of collaborative care in a Dutch occupational healthcare setting: 126 workers on sick leave with major depressive disorder were randomised to usual care (n=61) or collaborative care (n=65). After 3 months, collaborative care was more effective on the primary outcome measure of treatment response (i.e. reduction in symptoms of ≥50%) on the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9). However, the groups did not differ on the PHQ-9 as a continuous outcome measure. Implications of these results are discussed.
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Eviden c-based treatments for major depressive disorder are available, yet show disappointing results in daily practice. To improve depression outcomes, a primary care treatment model, collaborative care, has been developed in the USA. Key elements of collaborative care are: continuous monitoring of symptoms, collaboration between healthcare professionals and access to a consultant psychiatrist. Moreover, the role of a care manager is introduced, who coordinates care, assists in the management of major depressive disorder and monitors treatment progress. Currently, extensive evidence supports the effectiveness of collaborative care, and new research projects are studying the effectiveness of collaborative care in other countries, populations and healthcare settings.1,2 In this study, collaborative care was evaluated in a Dutch occupational healthcare setting (trial registration: ISRCTN78462860).3

Major depressive disorder is a prevalent condition in Dutch occupational healthcare settings. Dutch workers with major depressive disorder are absent eight to nine times more often than their colleagues without major depressive disorder.4 In The Netherlands, occupational physicians play a central role in the care of workers on sick leave. However, because treatment and sickness certification are separated in the Dutch legislation, there is a lack of communication and collaboration between occupational physicians and the curative sector.5 Furthermore, access to treatment in specialised mental healthcare is often hampered by waiting lists. Therefore, occupational physicians aim to play a more prominent role themselves in the care of workers on sick leave with major depressive disorder.6 In the present study, the effectiveness of collaborative care, applied by occupational physician–care managers, is examined for workers with depression on sick leave.

Method

In this randomised controlled trial (RCT), the effectiveness of a collaborative care treatment for major depressive disorder was compared with usual care. Computer-generated randomisation took place at participant level. In both groups, participants received sickness guidance as usual by their company’s occupational physician, however, only participants allocated to the intervention group also received collaborative care from an occupational physician–care manager. The study protocol, including a power calculation and the method of masking, is described in greater detail elsewhere.3,7

Workers on the sick list for between 4 and 12 weeks were screened with the depression subscale of the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9).8 Workers who reached the cut-off score of 10 were contacted for the administration of a diagnostic interview. Those who met the DSM-IV9 criteria for major depressive disorder and gave informed consent were included. Exclusion criteria are described elsewhere.3

The collaborative care intervention consisted of the following elements: 6–12 sessions of problem-solving treatment, manual-guided self-help, a workplace intervention and anti-depressant medication. The treatment was closely monitored using the PHQ-9. A web-based tracking system supported the occupational physician–care manager in monitoring and in adhering to the protocol. A psychiatrist was available for consultation.3

Data were collected at 3 months after baseline by self-report questionnaire. The primary outcome measure was response, as measured with the PHQ-9 and defined as a reduction of at least 50% in depressive symptoms.8 The PHQ-9 as a continuous measure is also reported.

Data were analysed with logistic and linear multilevel analyses, using MLwiN software, version 2.15 for Windows XP. Multilevel analyses make it possible to take into account the hierarchy of the data, with locations of occupational physician–care managers constituting the upper level and participants the level below. Depressive symptom severity at screening was included as a baseline correction. Post hoc, the intervention effect was explored in participants with a baseline PHQ-9 score ≥15, by including an interaction term of that covariate with the intervention variable.

Results

Of 14 595 workers approached, 2955 (20.2%) filled in the screening questionnaire, of whom 52.5% (n=1551) screened positive for depression (online Fig. DS1). Subsequently, 1425 workers were excluded and 126 participants were included and randomised in the usual care group (n=61) or collaborative care group (n=65). Three months after baseline, 98 participants filled in the questionnaire. Almost two-thirds (62%) of the collaborative
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Data supplement

Table DS1 Baseline characteristics of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usual care group</th>
<th>Collaborative care group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years, mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>43.4 (11.4)</td>
<td>41.9 (11.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, % male</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married or cohabiting, %</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch nationality, %</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symptoms and conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressive symptoms (range 0–27), mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>16.0 (5.4)</td>
<td>15.9 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatic symptoms (range 0–30), mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>12.3 (5.1)</td>
<td>13.6 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalised anxiety, %</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panic disorder, %</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of comorbid chronic medical conditions (range 0–27), mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>1.3 (1.3)</td>
<td>1.2 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job characteristics, mean (s.d.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision latitude (range 24–96)</td>
<td>64.2 (12.4)</td>
<td>67.6 (12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological job demands (range 12–48)</td>
<td>35.8 (5.4)</td>
<td>34.3 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical job demands (range 5–30)</td>
<td>11.3 (3.8)</td>
<td>9.5 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job insecurity (range 3–12)</td>
<td>7.9 (1.0)</td>
<td>7.8 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support (range 8–32)</td>
<td>20.5 (3.8)</td>
<td>21.4 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table DS2 Depressive symptoms in the study population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>At 3 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual care group (n = 61)</td>
<td>Collaborative care group (n = 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual care group (n = 48)</td>
<td>Collaborative care group (n = 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ-9, mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>16.0 (5.4)</td>
<td>15.9 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.9 (5.7)</td>
<td>8.9 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PHQ-9, Patient Health Questionnaire.

Table DS3 Depressive symptoms in participants with at baseline a Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) score of at least 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>At 3 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual care group (n = 37)</td>
<td>Collaborative care group (n = 39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usual care group (n = 27)</td>
<td>Collaborative care group (n = 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHQ-9, mean (s.d.)</td>
<td>19.4 (3.3)</td>
<td>19.2 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1 (6.2)</td>
<td>8.9 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td>0.022*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at P<0.05.

Table DS4 Healthcare utilisation in the study population within 3 months after baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthcare professional</th>
<th>Usual care, % (n)</th>
<th>Collaborative care group, % (n)</th>
<th><strong>P</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 48)</td>
<td>(n = 50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with occupational physician–care manager</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>62.0 (31)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with occupational physician</td>
<td>89.6 (43)</td>
<td>88.0 (44)</td>
<td>0.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with general practitioner</td>
<td>79.2 (38)</td>
<td>66.0 (33)</td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with mental health professional (psychologist, psychiatrist, psychotherapist)</td>
<td>79.2 (38)</td>
<td>72.0 (36)</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day treatment for mental health problems</td>
<td>14.6 (7)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with social worker</td>
<td>12.5 (6)</td>
<td>12.0 (6)</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with medical specialist</td>
<td>18.8 (9)</td>
<td>14.0 (7)</td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with paramedic</td>
<td>18.8 (9)</td>
<td>22.0 (11)</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at P<0.01.
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