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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Brain Disorders, including both mental and neurological disorders, represent an enormous burden on both individuals and societies. The broad impact of brain disorders, which in the future is likely to be even greater, is threatening the quality of life of millions of European citizens with important consequences on the sustainability of health systems and implications for potential achievement of the Europe 2020 strategy on economic growth.

To compound this public health major issue and beside brain disorders escalating costs, many individuals with brain disorders remain untreated although effective treatments exist.

The current healthcare system does not fully respond to the needs of patients living with brain disorders. The current healthcare system, fragmented and essentially reactive - responding mainly when a person is sick - has many deficiencies in the management of patients with brain disorders who need a long-term care and treatment. The reorganisation of care delivery requires a paradigm shift and the adoption of three intertwined principles, namely, patient-centric integrated care, improved hospital efficiency, and interventions in an optimal settings, either in hospitals, at home or in communities.
A patient-centric coordinated care model (combining effective team care and planned dynamic interactions with the patients, and considering the whole spectrum and continuum of care from early detection, diagnosis to care, treatment, rehabilitation) is seen as an interesting solution to overcome the deficiencies of the current model of care. To translate this paradigm shift into concrete outcomes, a certain number of effective initiatives at country level (in-hospital patient journeys, intra-extra muros care pathways, multidisciplinary care models based on the bio-psychosocial approach,…) have already been implemented with promising health outcomes. However, evidence on cost-effectiveness and sustainability is still lacking but increasingly researched.

This has been capitalized by the European Commission with the “Investing in Health” 2013 policy framework linking health and social policy. Recent EU initiatives looking into greater integration were also put in place as cooperative efforts for better health in the areas of cancer, ageing, mental health and well-being, chronic diseases, digital health, innovation and research (Horizon 2020).

More research evidence definitely appears to be necessary. In this context, the EBC Project on the Value of Treatment for Brain Disorders will explore through case studies analysis the potential for innovative patient-centric coordinated care models, generating evidence on the socioeconomic benefits of healthcare interventions, and assessing optimal options and strategies to close the treatment gap in Europe.

A comprehensive evaluation of treatment gaps and best practices available will be conducted in selected EU countries, in order to identify commonalities and differences between various brain diseases towards building an overarching holistic framework based on integrated care principles and economic analysis. A model of care will then be adopted based on well-defined indicators (government, clinical practice, patients) for further policy recommendations.

The concept of integrated care is to be seen as a process, essential prior to a coordinated plan development and implementation by health authorities at national and decentralized levels, to complement necessary quality assurance norms.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mental and neurological disorders, both comprehensively referred to “disorders of the brain”, represent an enormous disease burden, in terms of human suffering and economic costs.

European countries have faced major gains in population health in past decades, resulting in an increased life expectancy coupled with major scientific breakthroughs in medicine and significantly improved chances of surviving diseases: for example, mortality rates relating to stroke have sharply decreased. Notably, there is a transition from ‘acute patients’ to ‘chronic patients’. Pressure on health and social systems is therefore building up and is expected to further increase due to demographic changes and, particularly, the growing share of older people, high cost of technological progress and the rising burden of chronic diseases. Many brain disorders are chronic and incurable conditions whose disabling effects may continue for years or even decades and requiring an ongoing management.

Today, budgetary restrictions are challenging the sustainability of the European social welfare model, as a whole, and making cost-effectiveness of health systems and its deliverables increasingly necessary. In fact, the sizeable share of public money that is devoted to health and the ever-increasing cost pressures and demands to cut public expenditure, put health systems at the heart of the policy debate. In particular, chronic conditions shear range, the multiplicity of determining factors (health, socio-economic, genetic, environmental and behavioural), the long-term nature of care and treatment have all served to compound hospital traditional, fragmented and top-down led responses.

These developments are calling for organisational hospital and delivery systems changes. According to WHO: “There is a widespread recognition that health care systems need to change to respond to the long-term trends in demography and epidemiology as well as adapt to changes in medical processes and technology that require very different delivery models from those currently in use. In most of the European region the short term impact of the financial crisis and the long term challenge of rising costs and shaky funding streams give the need for change even greater urgency while at the same time limiting the options that are available to policy makers”.

This leads us to the “integrated, coordinated care” approach with an expectation that it might support the achievement of the so-called “Triple Aim” in the respect of patient’s needs: a simultaneous focus on improving health outcomes, enhancing the quality of care and increasing cost-efficiency. In order to realise such aim, literature review suggests to initiate a process of reorganisation of care, with the following priorities: 1) access to care, 2) sustainability of healthcare system and 3) cost-efficiency interventions (human workforce, technologies including the potential of digital health,…).
Therefore, the following questions are raised to examine options and optimal strategies to improve patients’ quality of life and reduce the socio-economic burden of mental and neurological disorders: could the approach of integrated care for brain disorders (e.g. comprehensive mental and somatic healthcare models, seamless care models to service the elderly, care pathways promoting the bio-psychosocial approach) 1) be considered as a response to the fragmented delivery of health and social services? 2) be considered as a relevant solution to close the diagnosis and treatment gap as well as improve the accessibility to care? Are interventions based on the components of the integrated care model cost-effective? Which quality strategies – complemented by and integrated with existent strategic initiatives – would have the greatest impact on the outcomes delivered by health systems?

To address these questions, we need a comprehensive evaluation of the existing literature and best practices available, in order to identify the commonalities and differences between various brain diseases in an overarching holistic framework based on integrated care principles and economic analysis.

International literature commonly emphasizes that there is a need for a thoughtful, multidisciplinary, holistic (patient, family and carers), bio-psychosocial approach to the practical implementation of a coordinated system based on patient-centred and continuous care. In such a system, health promotion, disease prevention, detection and early diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, research as well as healthcare and social care are seen as one continuous link of actions across different healthcare professionals and areas (e.g. hospitals, psychiatric hospitals, specialist care, primary care, homecare, institutional care or nursing home, social care, pharmacies), in order to deliver patient care and improve health outcomes. As the potential for integration are being explored – and case studies analysis will be the opportunity to evaluate healthcare interventions (in comparison with the cost-burden of delayed, inadequate or non-treatment) and to come up with ideal approach around the integrated care concept, solid evidence needs to be built to assess and support the best option for further policy development.

In the following section, we elaborate on brain disorders and burden of disease, reflecting on future challenges and suggest possible steps towards the development of a workable coordinated care model.
Recent analyses demonstrate that, beside brain disorders’ escalating costs, there is a considerable gap in terms of diagnosis and treatment (“unmet needs”). This is particularly blatant for mental illnesses in Europe, with only about a third of all cases receiving the therapy or medication needed (ranging from alcohol abuse and dependence with the widest treatment gap to schizophrenia). There are also no consistent indications of improvements with regard to delayed diagnosis and treatment provisions and grossly inadequate treatment, with considerable differences in the treatment gap within and between countries (health inequalities).  

As health budgets, particularly those related to prevention and health promotion, have been dramatically cut during the past few years, particularly in South and South Eastern Europe, institutions such as the European Commission, WHO, and OECD examined the impact of the crisis and reduced budgets on health outcomes and health systems in Europe in order to develop adequate frameworks for action. Findings of such studies include, for example, a correlation between rises in unemployment and debt, and significant short-term increases in mental health disorders such as depression and suicide. Moreover, it is likely that there will be negative effects on health in the longer term, particularly if the number of long-term unemployed people continues to increase, if social safety nets experience further cutbacks, and if there are changes in access to much needed healthcare and services. In this respect, the WHO pointed out that “health systems and public health in general are not a drain on resources but an investment in health and wealth – that is in the health of the population and in economic growth.”  

This was further developed by the European Commission with the “Investing in Health” 2013 policy framework linking health and social policy. Many initiatives looking into more integration were put in place as cooperative efforts for better health in the area of ageing, cancer, mental health and well-being, innovation and research (Horizon 2020). As an example of “health and social care become one”, the “Smart Care” project under the Digital Agenda for Europe, a Europe 2020 Initiative published a White Paper in July 2015 on Pathways for integrated eCare. The project aims to define a common set of standard functional specifications for an open ICT platform enabling the delivery of integrated care to older European citizens.  

### 2.2. CHALLENGES DESERVING SPECIAL ATTENTION FOR THE FUTURE  

E-health practices and solutions are powerful tools for integrated care and healthcare reform. Many EU countries, in the development of telemedicine, e-prescribing, e-referral and e-reimbursement capabilities, are making progress towards modern e-health infrastructures and implementations. Challenges remain to achieve wider implementation at country level and the implementation of a coherent EU approach for overall coordination. Large-scale deployment will occur once the pilot phases of current research projects end. Commitment and leadership by health authorities, on issues related to finance and organisation, are essential elements for the successful deployment of e-health services in order to improve the way healthcare is provided. It needs to be combined with organisational changes and the development of new user skills. The EU supports various projects in the field of eHealth, and to ensure that policy making stays informed by the latest developments and information such as the Europe 2020 Initiative on Digital Agenda for Europe. With the help of ICT, care can be offered in an integrated way; no longer in an institution, but in the own home environment.  

**New treatments and technologies** are needed for a number of diseases including brain disorders. Various new technologies, therapies and treatments are emerging, including gene and cell therapy, regenerative medicine, the development of nanomedicines and medical technology (medical devices, assistive devices such as implantable brain stimulators e.g. for Parkinson’s disease). These advanced therapies herald revolutionary treatments of a number of diseases such as neurological disorders – and therefore have a huge potential for patients as well as research and development, and industry.  

In addition, **sustained work integration** for people with a severe mental illness (e.g. schizophrenia) is an important issue in the society today. Indeed, work is not only an essential factor in people’s social integration but is also a stepping-stone towards recovery, it is also essential for the informal care giver. Health promotion in the workplace, as well as well-defined programs and services related to work integration are being developed and implemented. The awareness of the impact of the workplace environment on the work integration of people with a severe mental illness increases the need to find solutions and develop environmentally sensitive clinical strategies to overcome during the work integration.  

### 2.3. RATIONALE: BRAIN DISORDERS AS CHRONIC CONDITIONS FROM COORDINATED CARE TO BUILDING A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK  

**Chronic diseases including brain disorders and long term conditions** can represent up to 70-80% of a country’s total health expenditure.  

According to the OECD, among the biggest drivers of healthcare costs are the priorities that have governed the healthcare systems in their management and their financing since their inception, and which are proving resistant to change. European countries share a common problem, which is the lack of preventive care and inadequate coordination of care between health and social services. Based on past legacy healthcare structures, both the financing and delivery of healthcare remain highly fragmented, and oriented to providing acute, rather than chronic, care to face more intractable medical conditions than in the past such as chronic diseases. Many local communities retain their own full-service hospitals, resulting in system-wide duplication, medical education is oriented around hospitals. Payment systems are oriented around particular interventions and biomedical research is still based on the assumption that people have single diseases at a time, but already the biggest challenge is multiple
morbidities. These require a more longitudinal or multidisciplinary network approach linking health and social care (see figure 1: paradigm shift) and payment systems that can cope with care provided in more than one setting38.

In some cases, better health outcomes and reduced costs are associated with shifting certain types of care from hospitals to step-down, rehabilitation, and community care. The concept of integrated care seems particularly important to service provision to the elderly, as elderly patients are likely to be chronically ill and subjects to co-morbidities, and therefore in special need of continuous care39. Almost half of all people with chronic illness have multiple conditions40. Prevalence of co-morbidity increases with age but is not just an issue for older adults41.

Figure 1: Paradigm shift

From an international perspective, the paradigm shift is leading to the transformation of health care and illustrates one or perhaps the most applied strategy for improving the quality of care for people with chronic conditions such as many brain disorders which is the integrated Chronic Care Model42.

The aim of the Chronic Care Model (see figure 2) is to meet patient’s needs and transform the daily care for patients with chronic illnesses from a system that is essentially reactive - responding mainly when a person is sick - to one that is proactive and focused on patient-oriented care. It is designed to accomplish these goals through a combination of effective team care and planned interactions with the patients; self-management support; patient registries and other supportive information technology such as digital solutions allowing better exchange of information. These elements are designed to work together to strengthen the health care providers-patient relationship and improve health outcomes43.

This care model (with a possible expanded focus on prevention and social environment) could be of particular interest for the management of mental and neurological disorders as it can be applied to a variety of chronic conditions, health care settings and target populations. The Chronic Care Model identifies the essential elements of a health care system that encourage high-quality care. These elements are: (1) community, (2) health system, (3) self-management support, (4) delivery system design, (5) decision support and (6) clinical information systems. Evidence-based change concepts under each element, in combination, foster productive interactions between informed patients who take an active part in their care and providers with resources and expertise. The Chronic Care Model, summarizes the basic elements for improving care in health systems at the community, organization, practice and patient levels44.

Figure 2: Chronic Care Model

All across Europe, various forms of provider networks and interventions have been set up for instance to close the gap between primary and hospital services or in advanced practice nurses (APNs), ...

2.3.1 TRANSFORMATION OF HEALTH CARE AND “PARADIGM SHIFT”: PATIENT-CENTRED CARE

Another important concept for the organisation of care is emerging with the principle of “patient-centred care”: a person living with one or more chronic condition(s), including brain disorder(s), has needs that evolve according to the stage of his/her disease(s)45. For instance, home care services play a major role most of the time but acute services are necessary in case of acute episodes whereas end-stage diseases call for accessible palliative care. The needs of the patient with long-term disease may be grouped along four main dimensions46: biological needs (mainly the relief of the physical symptoms, as pain), psychological needs (need for tailored information e.g. on treatment options, evolution of the disease; and need for psychological support to deal with emotions such as fear, frustration, depression, distress)
related to chronic condition), health care services needs (coordination of care provision and integration between the different settings), and social needs: can be a major concern for chronic patients with mental and neurological disorders, in particular issues in relation to their autonomy and social isolation.

Efforts to empower patients to be engaged in responding to their health needs may improve health outcomes, adherence to treatment, and has the potential for patients to make more informed decisions with regard to their health. Research shows that adherence among patients suffering from chronic conditions is only 50% on average.

To ensure that health care is centred on patients, the patient journey approach aims at giving patients a “voice” through enhancing collaborative multidisciplinary teamwork, shared ownership and decision-making, providing evidence to substantiate change, and achieving results (see figure 3).

Figure 3: Patient journey phases

Nowadays, mental and neurological disorders are diagnosed reliably and accurately. Whilst all can be successfully managed and treated, some disorders can even be prevented. As of today, there is currently no cure for Alzheimer’s disease, neither for schizophrenia, epilepsy or other brain disorders. In the case of schizophrenia for instance which is one of the most severe and disabling mental illnesses, the treatment success rate with antipsychotic medications and psycho-social therapies can be high. The treatment gap including delayed diagnosis and treatment applies for all brain disorders, particularly for mental illness, and it is a major issue.

Reducing the burden of mental and neurological disorders relies on both timely diagnosis and treatment of disorders by health professionals through pharmacological, non-pharmacological and psychosocial interventions. In the meantime, the complex basis of these conditions (including co-morbidities) requires constantly assessing the situation and the level of risk for a patient (see figure 4), which may vary according to the severity of the pathology. Case management by a healthcare provider being responsible for the assessment of need and implementation of care plans may be an additional support to coordinate medical care, paramedical care and well being. It is usually required for individuals who have a serious and persistent mental illness or severe neurodegenerative disease and need ongoing support in areas such as housing, employment, social relationships, and community participation (e.g. patients with a major psychotic disorder or with a severe neurological condition, such as Parkinson’s disease).

Figure 4: Kaiser Permanent risk stratification pyramid

The reorganisation of care delivery requires a paradigm shift and the adoption of three intertwined principles, namely: patient-centric care, improved hospital efficiency, and interventions in an optimal settings, either in hospitals, at home or in communities. All these developments underpin the need to address the integration between the different healthcare providers and the different settings.

2.3.2 INTEGRATED, COORDINATED CARE CHALLENGES

Though strategies to achieve better integration may differ, the principal driving forces behind the system reform are similar in many countries. The strongest impetus for transforming care delivery processes is driven by:

■ The rapidly increasing demand for chronic care for patients with mental illness or neurological disorder being exacerbated by the rising health care costs calls for the integration of services.

■ On the supply side, the development of medical technology and information systems and the restrictions from economic pressures (such as shortening hospitals length of stay and the need to avoid unnecessary readmissions) call for reforms to contain costs. Whereas demand-side factors mainly force the integration of services, supply-side factors such as medical technology and information systems may facilitate it.
There is consensus that new ways are required for delivering high quality healthcare, involving integration (in contrast with fragmentation) of care providers (e.g. specialists, general practitioners and other healthcare providers such as pharmacists, nurses, psychologists, physiotherapists) and much closer coordination (multidisciplinary care) of their activities across levels of care and multiple sites, all of which need to be optimally embedded within a system that promotes patient empowerment.

Integrated care, disease management or care pathway for pathologies such as diabetes, heart disease, depression, schizophrenia and others can be characterized by the following key elements:

- Comprehensive care: multidisciplinary care for entire disease cycle;
- Integrated care, care continuum; coordination of the different components;
- Population orientation (defined by a specific condition);
- Active client-patient management tools (health education, empowerment, self-care);
- Evidence-based guidelines, protocols, care pathways;
- Information technology, system solutions; and
- Continuous quality improvement.

Disease management has traditionally targeted a single disease or condition but what makes chronic conditions management complex including brain disorders is that co-morbidity is increasingly recognized as a critical clinical issue in medical care, in part because it is an independent predictor of adverse outcomes, including quality of life (QOL), mortality, healthcare, disability, and complications of treatment beyond the effects of the individual conditions.

2.3.3 PROPOSED OPTIMAL FRAMEWORK: A HOLISTIC CARE MODEL FOR MENTAL AND NEUROLOGICAL DISORDERS

The Framework for Action towards Integrated Health Services Delivery (FFA IHSD) as defined by WHO Regional Office for Europe (2013) is proposed as a generic framework for coordinating care interventions. This model is currently being implemented by European Member States as part of the framework for action. This framework –adapted to consider the full spectrum of care– aims to ensure the delivery of these services, across settings of care by removing gaps in care or poor coordination that adversely affects care and, ultimately, health outcomes. A number of initiatives and approaches or processes (see figure 5) have been introduced to create needed linkages across settings and services, from delivery system redesign, the introduction of decision supports and modern information systems among a number of other approaches.

Integrated health care components of the Framework for Action towards Integrated Health Services Delivery are described here (see figure 7) as a suggestion for the defined template/checklist to be used for the case studies analysis: system (re-)design in the delivery of services; support and shared information among professionals; improved information integration through the use of modern technologies (e.g. clinical registries and patient records); and self-management or patient integrated care towards individual empowerment of their personal health needs.

A step-by-step guide for developing profiles on health services delivery transformations was released in January 2016.
There are effective interventions to be shared. As illustrations, initiatives such as the “RAI” (Resident Assessment Instruments) for home care, RAI for mental health (RAI MH), or the “hospitalization at home” can be referred to as current initiatives that are being implemented in Europe.

- RAI MH is a comprehensive, multidisciplinary mental health assessment system for use with adults in facilities providing acute, long-stay, forensic, and geriatric services. The Resident Assessment Instrument-Mental Health (RAI-MH) comprehensively assesses psychiatric, social, environmental, and medical issues at intake, emphasizing patient functioning. Data from the RAI-MH are intended to support care planning, quality improvement, outcome measurement, and case mix-based payment systems.

- RAI for home care is the same instrument but used particularly for patients ranging from medically complex patients needing close attention to relatively older adults who receive and require less formal support.

- Hospitalization at home is defined as a service that provides active treatment by health care professionals in the patient’s home, of a condition that otherwise would require acute hospital in-patient care, always for a limited period.

All across Europe, various forms of provider networks and interventions (case management, trans-mural care) have been set up to close the gap between primary and hospital services. From the literature research, experience of integrated care so far is limited but promising to improve care, several components of the model seem to be effective but there are still insufficient rigorously designed large-scale population-based evaluations. It is highlighted that information and communication technologies (ICT) are broadly perceived as facilitators for the implementation of integrated care to enable prospective follow-up of the patients. More user-friendly and efficient ICT platforms are needed that include shared decision-making, the process by which a healthcare choice is made jointly by the practitioner and the patient. Ideally, an innovative patient management program would combine ICT, shared decision-making and personalized education of the patient, together with his/her caregiver, about multidisciplinary approaches.

Coordinated (integrated) care can be a key strategy in reforming health systems to improve quality of care and access to care (including access to drugs), reduce costs and lead to better population health outcomes in the long run. The changing nature of the demands made on hospitals means that it is particularly important for them to work closely with the different health and social care services. There is a strong business case for investing in the early intervention and community-based interventions proven to generate savings or value-for-money gains through reduced inpatient admission, or through other routes. Research confirms that patient’s perception of the quality of care is largely determined by the success of this coordination. Research also suggests that better outcomes occur by addressing diseases through an integrated approach in a strong primary care system (see figure 8): hospitals have to be integrated with primary health care and the gatekeeping function of general practitioners (GPs) is to be fully effective.
Initiatives to integrate care are frequently driven by a need to contain cost; yet as mentioned, investing in integrated care does not necessarily imply an economic gain. This will depend on the part of the cost associated with the disease burden or level of need that can be averted or reduced through the intervention set against the cost of carrying out the initiative in question.\(^7\)

Literature review highlights the lack of evidence on cost-effectiveness of selected integrated care interventions.\(^7\) As such, indicators are needed to measure outcomes. This is the objective of the OECD with “delivering health care value by improving outcomes” (see Table 2). The OECD is expanding its activities on consolidating and refining data and indicators.

Table 2: OECD Delivering health care value by improving outcomes (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An evolving view of outcomes</th>
<th>Rational of measures and data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Deaths</td>
<td>- Mortality and life-expectancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Public health perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data source: death registries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Diseases</td>
<td>- Prevalence and incidence of diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Outcome measures to capture the reduction in morbidity and for specific diseases (e.g. QALYs, SF-36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Medical/clinical perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data source: clinical registries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Linking to costs/value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At system level: burden of diseases studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For specific services and interventions: cost-effectiveness studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Disability</td>
<td>- Outcomes to address the way a health system deals with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At system level: DALY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At health services: e.g. inter RAI initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Data sources: administrative data-bases and surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Discomfort and Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>- Outcomes experienced by citizens/patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PROMs (patient reported outcomes) including EQ5D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- PREMs (CAHPS, Picker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. CONCLUSIONS AND NEXT STEPS

As from the official EBC Kick Off meeting and first working groups meeting to be held on 27 January 2016, a combined template on health care services delivery model and economic model (or check list) will be developed (it will be used as a “standard or ideal approach” reference framework for the case studies analysis, this will help for the analysis and the reporting). This common template for all case studies analysis will enable to consolidate the research framework and together with this discussion paper, both documents will be released for the start of project phase 2 (see figure 9).

Figure 9: EBC Project – Three expected deliverables

1) EBC Discussion Paper (Phase 1)

2) Case Studies Analysis (Phase 2)

3) Consolidated Study (EBC White Paper) with policy recommendations (Phase 3)
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