EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES
(EEJMMS) ISSN: 2992-4103
©EEJMMS Publications Volume 6 Issue 1 2025

Integrating Mental Health Services into Primary Care

Mugo Moses H.

School of Natural and Applied Sciences Kampala International University Uganda

ABSTRACT

Integrating mental health services into primary care is a crucial step in addressing mental health disparities and improving healthcare outcomes. This paper examines the benefits of integration, including increased accessibility, reduced stigma, cost efficiency, and improved chronic disease management. It examines key challenges such as workforce shortages, cultural resistance, fragmented healthcare systems, and financial constraints. Various models of integrated care, including collaborative and co-located approaches, are analyzed alongside strategies for successful implementation, emphasizing training, communication, and policy support. The discussion extends to global perspectives, ethical considerations, and the role of technology and telehealth in enhancing mental health service delivery. A case study from Texas underscores the importance of structured evaluation and administrative backing in sustaining integration. Future directions highlight the need for policy advancements, innovative funding mechanisms, and continuous research to ensure long-term success in integrated mental healthcare.

Keywords: Mental health integration, primary care, collaborative care, co-located care, healthcare disparities, telehealth, mental health training.

INTRODUCTION

Mental health services must be a mainstay of primary care. Beginning with its first priority, this editorial considers the historical and policy background to integrating primary care and mental health in India. It then summarises the essays collected in this deliberates on the dimensions of mental health-care integration and advances recommendations for meeting mental health needs through primary care in India [1, 2].

Benefits of Integrating Mental Health Services into Primary Care

Access to mental health services is a widespread issue globally, and integrating these services into primary care can address this challenge by allowing patients to receive both mental and physical care in one location. This integration proves successful, offering numerous benefits, such as enhanced service access, reduced stigma, financial savings, and improved healthcare costs for chronic conditions. Patients are more inclined to seek mental health support when located in their regular medical clinics, saving time and effort by not requiring separate visits. With 60% of individuals with mental illnesses not seeking treatment, integration reduces stigma as patients can address their needs discreetly during routine checkups, avoiding the potential risks of traveling to distant facilities. Furthermore, placing services in underserved areas further diminishes stigmatization. Financial advantages include cost-effective treatments in primary care that lower overall healthcare expenses through improved management of comorbid conditions. Co-locating services allows for comprehensive treatment as mental health issues can increase the risk of other ailments like diabetes and heart disease. Integrated care fosters collaboration among healthcare professionals, creating tailored care plans for patients, leading to better health outcomes. Lastly, both patient and provider satisfaction rates are higher with integrated care compared to traditional methods, as it provides a holistic approach to health support. [3, 4].

Challenges and Barriers to Integration

Increased attention is drawn to the integration of mental health services into primary care to enhance the provision of mental health care and to reduce health disparities. While some primary care sites have successfully integrated mental health services, this practice is not yet widespread. There are challenges on systemic, organizational, regulatory, provider and patient levels that hinder the efforts to integrate care. The current research reveals these barriers and discusses the difficulties of promoting mental health

services initiatives in an existing primary care environment. Providing mental health services in primary care is a long-standing challenge that has yet to be fully addressed. The need to expand the range of available services is especially critical in a fragmented healthcare system, and for those under the poverty line with a higher prevalence of coexisting mental and physical health conditions. Unfortunately, addressing mental health issues is still difficult in these patients for a variety of reasons. First, there is a shortage of psychiatrists who can diagnose and treat mental disorders effectively. Second, there is a lack of resources for providing counseling and treatment services. Patients in under-resourced communities often do not receive support services to manage complex mental health issues. Third, there is cultural and organizational resistance to accepting mental health services within the primary care system. In many primary care environments, mental health issues are considered less urgent than physical health issues. Along with this attitude, mental health issues are often overlooked when making a diagnosis or referral. Fourth, regulations and policies that limit systemic and financial integration of care is another obstacle. For example, there is a lack of collaboration among providers to alleviate workload and deliver cohesive care in most primary care environments. Many times, mental health conditions go undiagnosed due to providers lacking the capacity to disclose information. On the patient side, there are various hurdles to accessing quality mental health care. In addition to social stigma about mental health, the understanding and awareness of mental health issues are generally much lower. Overall, this comprehensive picture illustrates the uphill battle for integrated care and the difficulty in establishing new mental health units in primary care [5, 6].

Models of Integrated Mental Health Care

Improved physical health outcomes arise from the effective integration of primary care and mental health services. This article highlights strategies and success factors that enhance the sustainability of such integration. Mental health services can now be incorporated into various primary care settings, including community mental health and public health centers. Common integration models include collaborative care, co-location, and fully integrated models, with recent publications emphasizing scalable models necessary for sustainable efforts. Integrated and colocated models show higher service usage than consultative models, while patient satisfaction is similar across colocation and integrated approaches. When a behavioral specialist is embedded in care for six months, significant improvements are observed in psychoeducation, medication treatment, and safety advice, alongside better communication and integrated care efforts from doctors. Experts agree that unifying mental health care, physical health care, and substance abuse services is essential to address the public health crisis of untreated mental illness and substance abuse, alongside inadequate physical health monitoring for affected individuals. In the USA, progress has been made in establishing comprehensive care models that bridge the mental-physical divide. Ongoing evaluations are crucial to assess the effectiveness of these new service systems, which contrast sharply with traditional, ineffective one-dimensional care models [7, 8].

Strategies for Successful Integration

To successfully integrate mental health services into primary care, provider organizations must adopt several strategies. Commitment from high-level leadership and organizational support is crucial, as financial and structural backing is necessary for any integration effort to succeed. Loose arrangements like purchase of services agreements can hinder continuity of care. Effective collaboration in cross-discipline teams relies on shared language and agreed treatment protocols for common mental health conditions. Team-building that fosters understanding of diverse roles and effective communication is essential during initial integration steps. Implementing screening tools and treatment protocols within primary care can lead to early detection of mental health issues and facilitate a stepped care treatment approach. Care agreements between mental health and primary care can vary from simple "inform and refer" arrangements to comprehensive service integration, including shared care management protocols. Most integration efforts find a balance between these extremes, incorporating defined patient pathways, co-location, and robust communication among staff. Continuous training and resources for GPs are vital to boost their confidence in handling common mental health challenges. Access barriers can be tackled through various strategies to enhance care continuity for mental health patients in primary care. Medication reviews, akin to community pharmacy practices, can manage polypharmacy. Establishing treatment plans aids collaboration between primary care providers and mental health professionals. Standardized initial assessments can identify patient needs sooner, potentially easing time constraints. For complex cases, scheduling an intake appointment after the PCMH order helps prevent lost follow-ups. Centralizing initial contact can ensure patients reach mental health providers upon arriving for their PCMH appointments, while including pertinent information in PCMH orders aids communication. In-

person warm hand-offs from primary care to mental health providers have proven to be effective in facilitating intercommunication, and pre-appointment access to medical records can enhance productivity [8, 9].

Training and Education for Primary Care Providers

Integration of mental health services into primary care offers many benefits for patients, including improved access, reduced stigma, and enhanced engagement with care. A range of collaborative care models are currently practiced and studied, which have increased effectiveness across a variety of interventions. However, there are many challenges to integrating behavioral health choice in primary care, and the lack of training and education in medical programs is commonly highlighted. In the past decade, there has been an increase in training opportunities for primary care providers, and yet, there remains a need for more curricular attention to mental health. The incorporation of mental health care in the clinical practices of nurse practitioners and other physician extenders produce a new set of challenges. Programs designed to increase awareness of behavioral health concerns and treatment knowledge has made an impact on confidence and competence in managing the symptoms of mental health problems. Evidence-based strategies such as didactic training, complex instruction, and reflective practice have been designed to improve knowledge and expertise in mental health assessments and interventions and increase positive perceptions and well-being. Educational opportunities have been particularly useful for developing knowledge and increasing confidence in identifying and treating mental health problems. This effort has been successful in gaining recognition for the critical role multidisciplinary practitioners play within the broader healthcare setting, and similar training should be implemented in all schools and health professions programs [10, 11].

Collaboration and Communication between Providers

Serving integrated mental health care in a demanding environment can feel overwhelming. As a clinician, you may wish for better communication with primary care providers (PCPs) or to clarify your role. Ideally, you and your PCP colleagues would develop a collaborative relationship. This guide aids in navigating these challenges. Imagine a scenario where every patient is billed for only one visit, reducing disputes about referrals and ensuring no one falls through the cracks. Improved teamwork among you, the PCPs, and other providers can lead to more efficient clinics and better health outcomes for patients with behavioral health issues. It's essential to recognize four basic functions that underlie the collaboration between primary care and behavioral health providers. A shared understanding of each patient's situation and respective responsibilities is vital to support these functions. Clear communication channels should be established, regardless of the site's readiness for immediate change. This might include shared records, secure emails, or written communications; for lower-tech options, patient summaries can be hand-delivered or faxed. Identifying contacts at each site helps with relationship-building. Regularly reviewing templates and workflows ensures efficiency and clarity regarding roles. Additionally, site-specific training on communication skills and provider scope of practice is crucial for both behavioral health and primary care staff. Scheduling routine meetings, such as weekly huddles, after joint visits can enhance collaboration. Lastly, a set of practical do's and don'ts will assist both newcomers and seasoned providers in improving behavioral health and primary care communication [12, 13].

Patient-Centered Care in Integrated Settings

Evaluative Concept Map, Visualizing the Structure of Primary Care Patient-centered care in integrated settings enhances service delivery and care processes focused on patients' needs and preferences. Patient preferences are critical for care decisions, with planning aligning with these preferences at each step. Services that incorporate patient feedback lead to preferred care with collaborative planning. Patients favor treatments tailored to their conditions, necessitating their involvement in planning care decisions. Patient-centered care emphasizes designing care around patient needs, expanding the understanding of integrated care to include patient preferences. While providers often focus on medical histories rather than holistic patient views, successful patient-centered services resolutely center around patients. Services involving patients in treatment planning align more closely with their preferences, requiring active engagement in service design. Three key principles of patient-centered care include accessibility, choice, and comprehensive patient-centered approaches across care settings, integrating cultural sensitivity with social determinants of health, ultimately enhancing patient satisfaction and positive outcomes. Long-term social determinants may influence health more significantly than clinical outcomes. Integration of services suggests practices that engage patients in health care and promote shared decision-making, particularly in psychotherapy. These practices can extend to general practitioner networks as well. In the medical

field, involving patients in care decisions correlates with better treatment adherence, trust, effective communication, and overall health improvement [14, 15].

Technology and Telehealth in Integrated Care

As payment models are changing, evolving to pay for value, there is a push for coordinating care across multiple providers, networks and geographic regions. The need to coordinate is increasing. There is strong evidence to suggest coordinating care for behavioral and somatic health conditions has benefits that improve outcomes across the board. For people we are working with, this is even more true. They are not presenting with one condition in isolation. There is often substance use, chronic illness, homelessness and a variety of other social determinants of health compounding the conditions they are presenting with. So you are an ambitious provider program trying to coordinate care across all those dimensions. Good luck. Right, so if this is sounding daunting, like it should sound daunting, what are some potential solutions? By now, hopefully everyone has heard of telehealth and envisioned a future of less in person visits, more at home patient monitoring and remote care coordination that reduces barriers to access and stigma. But if you just crinkled your brow trying to explain telemedicine reimbursement in between client appointments, maybe there are a few more advancements needed in the field. There is a chance the following procurement team has gone through this and have some experience to draw from. Would you believe it? Over the course of the last year, numerous technology vendors were interviewed and one was selected to deliver a tailored telehealth solution for integration within a coordinated care network. Here is a report on lessons learned, best practices and a step by step guide to how you can do the same [16, 17].

Evaluating the Effectiveness of Integrated Mental Health Services

This case example shows how a conceptual framework was used to evaluate a primary care and community mental health centers integrated care partnership. Three frameworks were used to operationalize qualitative and quantitative effectiveness indicators: the RE-AIM framework, the Colorado Research Informing Policy and Practice Model, and the Colorado State Innovation Model. Mixed-method cross-site case study. Three integration partnerships between primary care and community mental health centers in Texas were evaluated using qualitative and quantitative methods. The SETTING involved three primary care-integrating community mental health centers in Texas with an established integrated care partnership. The SAMPLE had Multimedia division staff and clients (N = 35). Interviews and focus groups were conducted with medical and behavioral health practitioners, care coordinators, and administrative staff at each of the three integrated care partnership community mental health centers and their primary care partner, with 20 providers participating at each site. Individual interviews were also conducted with a sample of primary care patients at each of the three community mental health centers. Focus groups and interviews occurred in diverse settings: an observation room at each clinic; a private room at a community service organization; and via phone. Meeting space was used for interviews in non-clinical sites. Informed consent was collected on paper at the time of the interview in person prior to the start of the interview. Participants were able to write their own signature or consent was witnessed by a non-researcher team member. Any potential risk of coercion was minimized by assuring participants that their decision about study participation would not affect care and reviewing with them that their participation was voluntary. An interview and focus group guide was developed, pilot tested, and refined for group discussions in the domains of patient, partnerships, and pragmatic issues related to service provision. Audio recording was conducted by a single note taker present in the room. With geographic separation between most researchers and the field sites, interviews with staff at the Texas community mental health centers and primary care providers were transcribed from audio recordings and analyzed thematically. These findings were then interpreted in context of administrative data and the quantitative portions of the three frameworks. Overall, between 2018 and 2019, N = 14 interviews and focus groups were transcribed from audio to text. For additional context concerning the administrative data, N = 10 meetings and ongoing communications with staff at the Texas community mental health centers were documented via notes made contemporaneous with the interaction. Following the completion of qualitative data collection and analysis for this overarching examination, these notes were used to further create detailed site summaries that were shared with the community mental health centers for feedback and dissemination. Quantitative data collection and themes interpretation were completed with care coordination data noted through ongoing interactions with the community mental health centers. Excerpts are shared as examples of identified themes. A modified grounded theory approach was employed to develop an initial coding framework after independent coding of transcripts by three researchers. Codes were organized in a hierarchical fashion and condensed into meaningful thematic

groupings. Efforts were made to ensure validity and reliability through iterative discussions among the coding team members and the employment of standard operational definitions for each code [18, 19].

Policy Implications and Funding Mechanisms

This article examines policy implications and funding mechanisms affecting efforts to integrate mental health care with primary care. To facilitate integration, psychiatric providers increasingly are joining primary care teams. Federal and state policies may help or hinder such initiatives, which will affect how sustainable they are. Supportive legislation or funding sources may be required for continued sustainability. To facilitate mental health facilities integrating physical health employees, it is important to understand how such employees can currently be funded. Several funding models may provide a path for integrating physical health employees into community mental health facilities. Funding for community mental health centres is involved in just over half of the case study settings. Because most billing agencies providing on-site primary care at community mental health centres only accept Medicare or Medicaid, more profitable clients may use private insurance; this incentivizes funding for physical care providers. However, in most case study settings physical health providers are employees of the community mental health provider, and physical care reimbursement rates are insufficient to cover their salaries when clients do not have Medicare. Therefore, physical care providers are typically funded primarily by grants. However, grants often cannot be renewed, which is a barrier to sustaining the physical health employees, and this may be a more general problem. Smaller or newer programs in each case study setting are less likely to embed physical care due to concerns that reimbursement rates will be insufficient to cover their salaries. Finally, in all settings, medical and mental health providers are contracted with different entities, which may inhibit their ability to easily share non-pharmacological treatment plans for mutual clients, as required by Medicaid. This is a potential barrier to community mental health centres successfully integrating physical care. Given the needs and gaps, participants articulated strategies that can disseminate best practices and educate policymakers with clear, simple talk points and fact sheets about the need, effectiveness, and savings of integrative care. Data can be used to debate local health officials and shape expectations for partnering with SGF support integrating health-behavioral care. Workforce capacity for training and tools across policy streams (integration, housing, Medicaid, etc.) is needed by organizations that operate primarily in a direct practice and, therefore have less prior advocacy experience at the state level. Advocacy trainings for community mental health centers and regional organizations are requested at coordinating support for statewide coalition-building, comprehensive policy platforms, and advocacy that goes beyond simple requests for continued or fixed grant funding. Participants also suggested SGFs can help prioritize the integration of training, capacity-building, and funding opportunities for a large and diverse group of stakeholders who have been driving far-reaching systems and policy change in Texas [20, 21].

Global Perspectives on Integrating Mental Health Services

Mental disorders impose a high burden both on individuals and on societies. These include direct costs of healthcare and social care, as well as indirect costs from reduced workplace productivity and increased rates of unemployment. The burden of mental disorders is particularly high for persons suffering from both mental and physical comorbidities. There has been a history of treating mental health and physical health in separate silos. Recent years have seen a growing recognition of the need to integrate these two sectors. Many countries are moving towards reforms of health systems that aim to put more emphasis on the integration of healthcare provision to enhance healthcare quality and accessibility and to make more efficient use of resources. In light of this global trend, this paper provides a series of succinct country examples of national and sub-national policy and practical developments in the integration of mental health and primary care. It attempts to capture the contemporary diversity of strategies and outcomes in a subset of both high-, middle- and lower-income country health systems. Highlighting the challenges faced by low- and middle-income countries are mental health integration, This paper also notes the cultural factors that influence the acceptance and delivery of integrated services. The findings presented have been drawn from the work and knowledge of 120 professionals from 35 countries who convened at the seminars. It also draws on the existing evidence of best practice, along with the lessons learned from real-world experiences that can help to inform efforts to integrate mental health care at the local level. Broad comparisons are made between the approaches of high-income countries (HICs) and low- or middle-income countries (LMICs), but there is no effort here to exhaustively survey the full range of experiences in any one of the three country groupings [22, 23].

Ethical Considerations in Integrated Care

This section addresses ethical considerations in integrating mental health services into primary care, outlining challenges, recommendations, and policy guidance. Core ethical principles such as patient autonomy and informed consent are often stretched in integrated care, complicating the maintenance of patient confidentiality due to record integration. Ethical difficulties arise when professional roles overlap, blurring practice boundaries. Primary care physicians (PCPs) worry that addressing social determinants of health and mental health may exceed their scope. Similarly, mental health providers report oversight regarding prescriptions made without documented diagnoses, causing communication gaps on medication changes. Equity remains a key concern; ethicists and providers must be mindful of disparities affecting diverse patient populations and their varied practice environments. Treatment strategies should reflect the complexities of integrated care settings. Ethical frameworks can effectively guide decision-making. In recent years, integrated care has gained attention in bioethics and medical ethics, especially with the Affordable Care Act emphasizing such arrangements. Ethical justification for integrated care initiatives is increasingly crucial. Literature explores ethical issues in these settings, particularly among marginalized, high-needs patients, highlighting the necessity for enhanced training in integrated care models. Professional ethics and training are vital for navigating ethical dilemmas, with many asserting that an ethical foundation is essential for fostering a culture of trust in these service environments [8, 24, 25, 26].

Future Directions and Innovations in Integrated Care

Mental health services are crucial for patient care, and integrated mental health care is continually evolving. Innovations in subspecialty care, crisis intervention, and technology can enhance the collaboration between mental health and primary care. However, these innovations often fade or are quickly superseded by newer ones, affecting the sustainability of how these services are delivered. Changes in healthcare models, payment policies, and organizational behavior may also unexpectedly impact integrated mental health care. Initial successes might diminish if homeostatic tendencies dampen the effects of specific trends, leading to unpredictable outcomes. New, unforeseen trends may emerge, significantly influencing integrated care's landscape. Despite challenges in predicting future developments, promising programs and technologies currently being implemented have the potential for wide-ranging impacts on mental health delivery. The future of integrated care will significantly shape what new scholars and stakeholders can achieve in the field. Therefore, prioritizing the understanding of integrated care's evolving direction is essential to maximizing the benefits of the integrated care movement and ensuring high-quality patient-centered care [27-30].

CONCLUSION

Integrating mental health services into primary care is essential for addressing mental health disparities, improving access, and enhancing healthcare efficiency. While integration offers numerous benefits, challenges such as workforce limitations, financial constraints, and cultural resistance must be addressed through targeted strategies, including provider training, effective communication, and policy reforms. The increasing role of telehealth and the global adoption of integrated models indicate promising advancements in the field. However, sustainability will depend on strong leadership, innovative funding mechanisms, and ongoing research. A holistic and patient-centered approach will be key to ensuring the long-term success of integrated mental health care.

REFERENCES

1. Krist AH, DeVoe JE, Cheng A, Ehrlich T, Jones SM. Redesigning primary care to address the COVID-19 pandemic in the midst of the pandemic. The Annals of Family Medicine. 2020 Jul 1;18(4):349-54.
2. Robertson LJ, Moosa MY, Jeenah FY. Strengthening of district mental health services in Gauteng Province, South Africa. South African Medical Journal. 2021 Jun 1;111(6):538-43. journals.co.za
3. Donnelly C, Ashcroft R, Bobbette N, Mills C, Mofina A, Tran T, Vader K, Williams A, Gill S, Miller J. Interprofessional primary care during COVID-19: a survey of the provider perspective. BMC Family Practice. 2021 Dec;22:1-2. springer.com
4. Connolly SL, Kuhn E, Possemato K, Torous J. Digital clinics and mobile technology implementation for mental health care. Current psychiatry reports. 2021 Jul;23(7):38.
5. Williamson SM, Prybutok V. Balancing privacy and progress: a review of privacy challenges, systemic oversight, and patient perceptions in AI-driven healthcare. Applied Sciences. 2024 Jan 12;14(2):675.

6. Siala H, Wang Y. SHIFTing artificial intelligence to be responsible in healthcare: A systematic review. Social Science & Medicine. 2022 Mar 1;296:114782.
7. Kroenke K, Unutzer J. Closing the false divide: sustainable approaches to integrating mental health services into primary care. Journal of general internal medicine. 2017 Apr;32(4):404-10.
8. Wells R, Breckenridge ED, Ajaz S, Narayan A, Brossart D, Zahniser JH, Rasmussen J. Integrating primary care into community mental health centres in Texas, USA: results of a case study investigation. International journal of integrated care. 2019 Oct 29;19(4):1.
9. Benzer JK, Beehler S, Miller C, Burgess JF, Sullivan JL, Mohr DC, Meterko M, Cramer IE. Grounded theory of barriers and facilitators to mandated implementation of mental health care in the primary care setting. Depression research and treatment. 2012;2012(1):597157.
10. Reist C, Petiwala I, Latimer J, Raffaelli SB, Chiang M, Eisenberg D, Campbell S. Collaborative mental health care: A narrative review. Medicine. 2022 Dec 30;101(52):e32554. lww.com
11. Carron T, Rawlinson C, Arditi C, Cohidon C, Hong QN, Pluye P, Gilles I, Peytremann-Bridevaux I. An overview of reviews on interprofessional collaboration in primary care: effectiveness. International journal of integrated care. 2021 Jun 22;21(2):31. nih.gov
12. Mohsen MM, Gab Allah AR, Amer NA, Rashed AB, Shokr EA. Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety at primary healthcare units: Effect on patients' outcomes. InNursing forum 2021 Oct (Vol. 56, No. 4, pp. 849-859). wiley.com
13. Alkhaqani AL. Importance of teamwork communication in nursing practice. Nursing Communications. 2022;6(0):e2022015.
14. Menear M, Girard A, Dugas M, Gervais M, Gilbert M, Gagnon MP. Personalized care planning and shared decision making in collaborative care programs for depression and anxiety disorders: A systematic review. PLoS One. 2022 Jun 10;17(6):e0268649.
15. Koehler AN, Trejo G, Sandberg JC, Swain BH, Marion GS, Kirk JK. Patient views of behavioral health providers in primary care: A qualitative study of 2 southeastern clinics. Journal of Patient Experience. 2020 Aug;7(4):527-33.
16. Prom MC, Canelos V, Fernandez PJ, Gergen Barnett K, Gordon CM, Pace CA, Ng LC. Implementation of integrated behavioral health care in a large medical center: benefits, challenges, and recommendations. The journal of behavioral health services & research. 2021 Jul;48(3):346-62. nih.gov
17. Reising V, Diegel-Vacek L, Dadabo L, Corbridge S. Collaborative care: integrating behavioral health into the primary care setting. Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association. 2023 Jul;29(4):344-51. [HTML]
18. Wolff LS, Flynn A, Xuan Z, Errichetti KS, Walker ST, Brodesky MK. The effect of integrating primary care and mental health services on diabetes and depression: A multi-site impact evaluation on the US-Mexico Border. Medical Care. 2021 Jan 1;59(1):67-76. [HTML]
19. Fortney JC, Bauer AM, Cerimele JM, Pyne JM, Pfeiffer P, Heagerty PJ, Hawrilenko M, Zielinski MJ, Kaysen D, Bowen DJ, Moore DL. Comparison of teleintegrated care and telereferral care for treating complex psychiatric disorders in primary care: a pragmatic randomized comparative effectiveness trial. JAMA psychiatry. 2021 Nov 1;78(11):1189-99. jamanetwork.com
20. Ugwu CN, Ugwu OP, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI, Uti DE. Sustainable development goals (SDGs) and resilient healthcare systems: Addressing medicine and public health challenges in conflict zones. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41535.
21. Lipson SK, Phillips MV, Winquist N, Eisenberg D, Lattie EG. Mental health conditions among community college students: A national study of prevalence and use of treatment services. Psychiatric services. 2021 Oct 1;72(10):1126-33. psychiatryonline.org
22. Hansen AS, Telléus GK, Mohr-Jensen C, Lauritsen MB. Parent-perceived barriers to accessing services for their child's mental health problems. Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health. 2021 Dec;15:1-1. springer.com
23. Goniewicz K, Carlström E, Hertelendy AJ, Burkle FM, Goniewicz M, Lasota D, Richmond JG, Khorram-Manesh A. Integrated healthcare and the dilemma of public health emergencies. Sustainability. 2021 Apr 19;13(8):4517. mdpi.com
24. Edyedu I, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI, Okon MB, Egba SI. The role of pharmacological interventions in managing

urological complications during pregnancy and childbirth: A review. Medicine. 2025 Feb 14;104(7):e41381.

25. Frieden TR, Lee CT, Lamorde M, Nielsen M, McClelland A, Tangcharoensathien V. The road to achieving epidemic-ready primary health care. The Lancet Public Health. 2023 May 1;8(5):e383-90. thelancet.com
26. McKeown A, Cliffe C, Arora A, Griffin A. Ethical challenges of integration across primary and secondary care: a qualitative and normative analysis. BMC Medical Ethics. 2019 Dec;20:1-3.
27. Ongesa TN, Ugwu OP, Ugwu CN, Alum EU, Eze VH, Basajja M, Ugwu JN, Ogenyi FC, Okon MB, Ejemot-Nwadiaro RI. Optimizing emergency response systems in urban health crises: A project management approach to public health preparedness and response. Medicine. 2025 Jan 17;104(3):e41279.
28. Gupta P, Muneshwar KN, Juganavar A, Shegekar T. Beyond the Asylum Walls: Tracing the Tapestry of Mental Health Interventions Across Eras and Cultures. Cureus. 2023 Nov 4;15(11).
29. Paul-Chima UO, Ugwu CN, Alum EU. Integrated approaches in nutraceutical delivery systems: optimizing ADME dynamics for enhanced therapeutic potency and clinical impact. RPS Pharmacy and Pharmacology Reports. 2024 Oct;3(4):rqae024.
30. Putra HN, Zani BN, Hasyim DM, Muntasir M. e-Health and digital transformation in increasing accessibility of health services. Journal of World Future Medicine, Health and Nursing. 2024 Jan 26;2(1):119-32. ypidathu.or.id

CITE AS: Mugo Moses H. (2025). Integrating Mental Health Services into Primary Care. EURASIAN EXPERIMENT JOURNAL OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL SCIENCES, 6(1):82-89