



JAT

Journal of
Applied Therapeutics

Advancing Evidence, Practice, & Policy



Volume 1 | Issue 1 | July 2026

Institute of Applied Therapeutics (IAT), Chennai

Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Gauthamadas U., MD (Psychiatry),
PhD, Professor and Former Head,
Department of Psychiatry

Founder, [Institute of Applied Therapeutics](#) (IAT),
Chennai, India

Executive Editor

Dr. Vaibhavi P. S., MD (Psychiatry)
Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, Adichunchanagiri
Institute of Medical Sciences, India
Editor, Official Newsletter, Indian Association of
Biological Psychiatry (IABP)
Editorial Team Member, [Journal of Medical Sciences
and Health](#) (JMSH)

Managing Editor

Ms. Archana V., MPhil (Clinical Psychology)
Dean, [Institute of Applied Therapeutics](#) (IAT),
Chennai, India

Associate Editor

Dr. Sasikala S., MPhil, PhD
Head (In-charge), Department of Counselling
Psychology, University of Madras, India

Assistant Editors

Dr. Susmita Sarkar, MD (Psychiatry)
Peer Reviewer, [Journal of Psychosexual Health](#)

Dr. Kaushik Kumar, MD, AB (Internal Medicine)
Rutgers Health, USA

Editorial Board Members

Dr. K. Namitha Bhuvaneshwari, MS (Ophthalmology)
Professor & Head, Department of Ophthalmology,
Meenakshi Medical College Hospital & Research
Institute, India

Dr V. Subramanian, MRCP (Pediatrics), AB
(Pediatrics), AB (Neonatology)
Assistant Professor of Neonatology, Mizzou College of
Medicine - Columbia - USA

Ms. Ghayathri Swetha Kumari R. A., MPhil
Head, Department of Psychology, M.O.P. Vaishnav
College for Women, India

Advisory Panel

Dr. S. Geethalakshmi, MD, PhD
Vice Chancellor, Dr. M.G.R. Educational and Research
Institute (Deemed to be University), India
Former Vice Chancellor, Tamilnadu Govt, The Dr MGR
Medical University, India

Prof. T. S. S. Rao, MD (Psychiatry) PhD
Editor, [Journal of Psychosexual Health](#)
Former Editor, [Indian Journal of Psychiatry](#)

Dr. Soumitra Pathare, MD (Psychiatry)
Director, [Centre for Mental Health Law & Policy](#)
Co-Director, [SPIRIT](#) (NIMH-funded suicide
prevention research initiative)

Dr. D. Balakrishnan, MS PhD
Senior Advisor, Bioethics
Formerly Lead Head, Indian Network - UNESCO Chair
in Bioethics

Dr Pragna B Dolia, MD (Biochemistry)
Former Dean, ACS Medical College and Hospitals,
India
Director, Dr. MGR Educational and Research Institute,
India

Dr. María José Rivera Baeza, PhD
Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile
President-Elect, Division 3 (Psychology and Societal
Development),
International Association of Applied Psychology

Journal of Applied Therapeutics (JAT)

Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026)

Table of Contents

EDITORIAL

Applied Therapeutics: Scope, Direction, and Relevance

Gauthamadas. U

ORIGINAL ARTICLE(S)

Understanding Disability and Rehabilitation Barriers Faced by Individuals with Head Injury

Archana. V and Smitha Ruckmani. V

An Integrated Neurobehavioral Outpatient Mental Health Care Pathway to Improve Treatment Acceptance: An Observational Practice Model

Dharya Easwar and Pritika E

REVIEW ARTICLE(S)

Causation in Suicide: Clinical, Legal and Policy Interfaces Insights from an Interdisciplinary Roundtable

Shivani Kalingarayar A.C

VIEW POINT

Pain Management as a Core Component of Modern Medicine: A Clinical Perspective

Sharat Narayanan

CASE REPORT(S)

Logopenic Variant Primary Progressive Aphasia Presenting with Severe Depressive Syndrome and Suicidal Behaviour: A Case Report

Sanjana Thomas and Gauthamadas. U

An Integrated Neurobehavioral Outpatient Mental Health Care Pathway to Improve Treatment Acceptance: An Observational Practice Model

Dharya Easwar¹ and Pritika E²

¹ Bachelor of Arts (Hons.) in Sociology, Economics, and Psychology, Christ University, India

² Clinical Psychologist; Doc Gautham's Neuro Centre, Chennai, India

ABSTRACT

Background: Mental disorders are a major contributor to disability worldwide, yet many individuals delay treatment, discontinue care early, or fail to receive adequate continuity of care. Several factors that could lead to treatment failure are stigmatization, fear of receiving a psychiatric label, family refusal, behavioral avoidance, financial insecurity, and barriers to follow-ups. While prior literature on the topic includes studies on the collaborative care approach, experiences of patients, and measurement-based care approaches, less is known about the implementation of how these components are operationally integrated within routine outpatient psychiatric practice.

Aim: The present paper describes a single-site interdisciplinary observational report on an integrated neurobehavioral outpatient mental health treatment program designed to improve treatment acceptance using integrated clinical, behavioral, social, and operational procedures.

Methods: The program consisted of structured initial communication, transparent bundled pricing, psychometric assessments, circuit-based psychoeducation, early review processes, integrating psychotherapy into treatment, maintenance via tele-follow-up and logistics of psychotropic medications, and multidisciplinary collaboration.

Results: Observations from daily practice suggested improved participation in structured assessment pathways, strong referral patterns through existing patient networks, positive feedback from patients and caregivers, and continued utilization despite transparent pricing structures.

Keywords: Outpatient Psychiatry, Treatment Engagement, Integrated Care

Address for correspondence: Pritika E

Clinical Psychologist, Doc Gautham's Neuro Centre, Chennai

Email: pritikaclinicalpsychologist@gmail.com

Submitted: 26.04.2026

Accepted: 10.05.2026

INTRODUCTION

Mental illnesses are a major contributor to disability, occupational impairment, family burden, and reduced quality of life worldwide. Despite the availability of evidence-based pharmacological and psychological interventions, a substantial proportion of individuals experiencing mental health difficulties either delay seeking treatment, discontinue care prematurely, or fail to maintain long-term engagement with services.²⁵ As a result, treatment gaps remain a major public health concern across both developed and developing countries. The consequences of untreated or inadequately treated mental illness extend beyond symptom persistence and may include reduced educational attainment, impaired occupational functioning, strained interpersonal relationships, increased healthcare utilization, and diminished overall well-being.

A wide variety of factors contribute to the treatment gap. Previous literature has identified stigma, family resistance, uncertainty regarding psychiatric medications, discouragement from prior treatment experiences, denial of illness, financial concerns, and practical barriers to accessing services as common obstacles to help-seeking and treatment continuation.²² Qualitative research has further demonstrated that treatment engagement is influenced by family dynamics, psychological avoidance, concerns regarding legitimacy of illness, time constraints, and perceptions of available services.¹¹ Importantly, these barriers rarely occur independently. Individuals seeking mental healthcare often encounter multiple barriers simultaneously, creating a cumulative burden that may discourage initiation of treatment or contribute to early dropout.

Within routine psychiatric practice, additional challenges are frequently observed. These may include fear of psychometric assessment, uncertainty regarding treatment costs, concerns regarding psychiatric labels, reluctance to initiate psychotherapy, travel burden associated with repeated visits, and withdrawal from follow-up after partial symptom improvement. While each of these barriers may appear relatively minor in isolation, their combined effect can substantially reduce treatment participation. Consequently, improving

engagement may require interventions that address not only clinical symptoms but also the broader psychological, social, and operational factors that influence patient behaviour throughout the treatment process.

Several service models have attempted to improve treatment engagement through different mechanisms. Patient-centred approaches emphasize communication, therapeutic relationships, and responsiveness to patient needs and have been associated with improved satisfaction and participation.² Collaborative care models have demonstrated benefits in enhancing access, improving coordination among providers, and supporting continuity of care.²⁶ Similarly, measurement-based care approaches have been shown to improve symptom monitoring and facilitate timely treatment modification through structured feedback processes.⁸ Although these approaches have independently demonstrated value, they are often implemented as separate strategies. Reviews of integrated healthcare models have highlighted a relative lack of implementation-focused literature describing how such principles may be operationalized together within routine clinical practice.²⁷

An additional consideration involves how psychiatric symptoms are explained to patients and families. Psychoeducation has long been recognized as an important component of mental healthcare because explanatory models influence perceptions of illness, treatment acceptance, and adherence. In many settings, individuals continue to interpret psychiatric symptoms through frameworks involving personal weakness, character flaws, or family failure. Such interpretations may contribute to stigma, self-blame, and reluctance to engage with treatment. To address these concerns, the present model incorporates circuit-based psychoeducation, which conceptualizes emotional and behavioural symptoms as disruptions in interconnected neurobehavioral systems involved in regulation, threat processing, motivation, attention, and self-control. By providing a simplified neurobehavioral explanation of symptoms, the approach seeks to reduce self-blame, normalize mental health difficulties, and increase readiness for treatment participation.

The present paper describes an observational report of a specialist outpatient mental health service model that integrates clinical, behavioural, social, and operational processes into a structured care pathway designed to improve treatment acceptance and continuity. Rather than focusing on a single intervention, the pathway was developed to address multiple barriers across different stages of care through coordinated service design. The objective of this report is to describe the components of the pathway, the rationale underlying its development, and routine practice observations related to treatment engagement and continuity.

METHODOLOGY

Design

This paper presents an observational descriptive report of a real-world service model from a specialist outpatient clinic. The report describes an integrated care pathway that was intentionally structured to address commonly observed barriers to psychiatric treatment participation through targeted service processes.

This pathway encompasses a clearly defined first-contact communications process to mitigate anxiety and confusion regarding the first contact appointment; a clear bundled fee structure to remove ambiguity from cost; and a psychometric evaluation with an explanation of results for diagnosing clarity. To further alleviate anxiety towards psychiatric medications, early feedback cycles were incorporated into the patient's circuit-based psychoeducation. Continuity systems, including teleconsultation and medication logistical support, were utilized to decrease the follow-up burden and maintain engagement of patients over time. Resistance to psychotherapy was addressed by providing phased and structured treatment packages. Finally, perceptions of neglect were mitigated through coordination in staff interaction.

This report describes the purpose of developing operational processes around barriers to participation of people in psychiatric treatment, as well as routine service indicators that are related to treatment acceptance and continuity. As an observational descriptive report, it does not include

experimentation or patient-identifying information.

Setting

Implementation took place in a psychiatric-led specialist mental health outpatient clinic based in an urban South Indian setting, aided by professionally trained clinical psychologists, administration, and operations staff.

Under supervision, as part of training exposure, the lead author had opportunities to observe case conferences involving multidisciplinary clinical review, where clinical psychologists presented cases, psychometric findings, therapeutic progress, and other management challenges.

CARE PATHWAY DESIGN AND BARRIER REDUCTION LOGIC

Structured Exploratory First Contact

Initial enquiries are addressed through a guided exploratory call process. The usual elements comprise clarification of symptoms and concerns, fee structure, expected timelines, and reassurance about the process. The barrier effect at the social level includes normalizing consultation. At the psychological level, anxiety reduction and at the economic level, lowering uncertainty regarding expenditure.

Transparent Bundled Initial Pathway

The first engagement consists of a specialist consultation, brief counselling/orientation, and development of a treatment plan. Barrier effects include providing social legitimacy and credibility of the care pathway provider, reducing fear of “nothing happening” psychologically, and decreasing the economic transaction costs by providing predictable bundled pricing.

Therapeutic Environment Design

The environmental features include climate-controlled waiting rooms with educational media, supportive staff, and refreshments upon request. These features enhance the legitimacy of the psychiatric care socially and reduce distress and perceived neglect psychologically.

Staged Psychometric Assessment

Where indicated, psychometric assessment occurs across structured sessions over several days, followed by explanatory feedback. Barrier effects

include reframing mental illness as assessable and understandable socially, improving insight and confidence psychologically and reducing perceived burden through segmented sessions economically.

Circuit-Based Psychoeducation

After an assessment, a simplified explanation of emotional and behavioral problems using a circuit-based framework is conducted. The focus is on using the framework to understand symptoms as problems in the brain's interconnected systems instead of as personal flaws. Patients and their families are educated about how hyperactivity or hypoactivity in a circuit system that controls regulatory, threat, motivational, and attentional systems can cause common mental health problems. This model is used to reduce guilt and family shame, normalize mental health challenges, and improve patient willingness to engage in therapy. By presenting symptoms as understandable and modifiable patterns of functioning, the approach aims to increase treatment acceptance.

Early Review Cycle

Patients are typically reviewed in the first week since the start of treatments. Some barrier effects include reinforcing patients psychologically in their vulnerable period, reassuring families socially of active case monitoring, and saving money on prolonged ineffective treatment due to timely modification.

Psychotherapy Integration

When required, psychotherapy is recommended in phased packages. This structure improves predictability and frames therapy as an integral part of treatment.

Continuity Systems

As patients stabilize, continuity systems, consisting of tele-consultation, digital payment, and organized medical dispatch, are utilized. Barrier effects include reducing travel and opportunity costs at the economic level, maintaining engagement after improvements in symptoms and at the psychological level, and finally supporting discreet treatment when stigma is present socially.

Daily Multidisciplinary Review Conference

Routine multidisciplinary review meetings are conducted, comprising the lead psychiatrist, clinical psychologists, and relevant clinical staff. During these meetings, active cases, psychometric findings,

therapy processes, treatment barriers, and complex cases requiring clarification and reformulation are discussed. Such meetings enable supervision and consistency in clinical decision-making.

RESULTS

Routine practice observations have revealed improved participation in assessments, strong patient-referral networks, positive feedback from patients and caregivers and acceptance of premium specialist pricing and services.

Firstly, looking into assessment participation, a higher psychometric uptake was observed. Earlier participation was estimated at approximately 50%–60% and often required active persuasion. In more recent periods, uptake increased to approximately 90%, with patients more readily consenting to evaluation.

Secondly, there was evidence of a strong referral network; new patients indicated they learned about the service through social networks.

Thirdly, positive feedback was frequently reported, with patients and caregivers citing clarity, responsiveness, and perceived improvement.

Fourthly, patients continued to access services despite premium pricing because they perceived that the quality of care justified the cost.

Finally, there was high acceptance of remote continuity pathways (e.g., tele-follow-up) and increased engagement among established patients through continuity pathways.

Discussion

The present observational practice model suggests that treatment participation in outpatient psychiatry may be better understood as a multidimensional behavioural process rather than a purely clinical event. In routine psychiatric practice, barriers to engagement rarely occur in isolation and frequently involve a combination of stigma, fear of psychiatric medications, uncertainty regarding treatment costs, reluctance toward psychometric assessment, travel burden, and withdrawal from follow-up after partial symptom improvement. Consequently, the current pathway was developed with the assumption that treatment participation is influenced not only by symptom severity but also by psychological, social, and operational factors. Structured communication

before consultation, transparent pricing, explanatory assessment feedback, early review cycles, continuity systems, psychotherapy integration, and multidisciplinary collaboration were therefore incorporated with the aim of reducing barriers across different stages of care. Circuit-based psychoeducation further sought to normalize psychiatric symptoms and reduce self-blame, thereby improving readiness to participate in treatment.

Observations from routine clinical practice revealed increased participation in psychometric assessments, positive feedback from patients and caregivers, strong referral patterns, sustained engagement through continuity systems, and continued utilization of services despite transparent premium pricing. Although causal conclusions cannot be drawn from the present observational design, these findings suggest that barriers to treatment participation may be modifiable through service-level interventions. Rather than viewing treatment engagement solely as a consequence of symptom improvement or patient motivation, the present observations support the possibility that the manner in which care is organized and delivered may itself influence treatment acceptance and continuity. This interpretation may be particularly relevant in psychiatric settings, where stigma, uncertainty, and concerns regarding long-term treatment frequently contribute to disengagement. Some aspects of the present framework resemble measurement-based care (MBC). Measurement-based care emphasizes the systematic use of symptom monitoring and clinical feedback to facilitate timely modifications in treatment¹⁴. Previous studies have demonstrated that MBC improves identification of treatment non-response, enhances quality of care, and promotes patient engagement through collaborative review of symptoms^{14,15}. However, implementation challenges, including workflow limitations and response burden, have also been described¹⁵. In the present pathway, psychometric assessment and early review cycles were incorporated into routine clinical workflows rather than being implemented as separate activities. Consequently, measurement became integrated into the overall treatment process instead of functioning as an isolated

exercise. Such integration may facilitate greater acceptance of psychometric evaluation and reduce resistance toward follow-up among individuals who are initially apprehensive about psychiatric assessment.

The pathway also demonstrates similarities with collaborative care and integrated behavioural health approaches. Coordination among psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, therapists, and administrative staff reflects a team-based approach to service delivery. Similarly, staged treatment planning and continuity mechanisms parallel features commonly observed in integrated behavioural health models⁸. Previous literature has shown that collaborative approaches can improve access to care and strengthen coordination among providers²⁶. Nevertheless, most collaborative care models have traditionally been implemented within primary care settings and larger healthcare organizations. In contrast, the present model evolved within a specialist outpatient psychiatric setting and was designed specifically around barriers commonly encountered in routine practice. This flexibility enabled the integration of clinical, behavioural, and operational processes into a single framework to promote continuity and long-term participation.

An additional and relatively distinctive feature of the present pathway was the incorporation of circuit-based psychoeducation during assessment feedback and treatment planning. Psychoeducation has been shown to improve understanding of illness, reduce misconceptions, facilitate adherence, and enhance reintegration into everyday functioning²¹. Furthermore, psychoeducation may promote treatment-seeking by helping individuals perceive their difficulties as manifestations of a treatable condition rather than as evidence of personal weakness²². In the current model, emotional and behavioural symptoms were explained through a neurobehavioural framework that posits interconnected systems responsible for regulation, threat processing, motivation, attention, and self-control. Such explanations were intended to reduce guilt, family shame, and stigma while increasing understanding of symptoms. Although formal outcome measures were not employed, circuit-based explanations appeared to provide patients and caregivers with a framework through which

symptoms could be viewed as understandable and modifiable rather than as personal failings. This may be particularly relevant in sociocultural contexts where stigma and self-blame continue to influence help-seeking behaviour.

Certain aspects of the pathway also resemble boutique or concierge psychiatry services. Features such as extended consultations, continuity of care, individualized follow-up, and increased accessibility have been associated with higher patient satisfaction and engagement, although evidence regarding their effect on long-term mental health outcomes remains limited. However, the current model extends beyond conventional concierge approaches. In addition to providing accessibility and continuity, it incorporates psychometric staging, circuit-based psychoeducation, structured review cycles, and multidisciplinary collaboration. Thus, the emphasis of the pathway is not merely on convenience or personalization but on the deliberate design of behavioural and operational processes intended to facilitate sustained treatment participation.

An important implication emerging from the present model is that treatment engagement may be conceptualized as a dynamic process influenced by multiple interacting factors rather than as a single decision to seek care. Previous studies have identified stigma, accessibility barriers, financial concerns, family attitudes, and uncertainty regarding treatment as important determinants of mental healthcare utilization ^{2,22,25}. However, these barriers often coexist and interact within routine practice. Concerns regarding medications may occur alongside financial uncertainty and fear of social judgment, whereas symptom improvement itself may paradoxically contribute to premature discontinuation of follow-up. Consequently, treatment participation may be influenced not only by clinical symptoms but also by the broader social and operational environment within which care is delivered. The present pathway was therefore developed around the assumption that barriers should be addressed across multiple stages of care rather than exclusively through clinical interventions.

The findings may have particular relevance within the Indian context, where substantial treatment gaps

continue to exist despite increasing awareness regarding mental disorders. Inadequate availability of services, unequal distribution of resources, stigma, and difficulties in maintaining continuity of care have all been recognized as important contributors to poor treatment coverage. Improvement in mental healthcare utilization requires attention not only to the availability of services but also to factors influencing treatment acceptance and continuation. In this regard, the present pathway illustrates one example of how operational and behavioural strategies may be integrated within routine outpatient psychiatric practice to improve engagement and continuity.

The principal contribution of this report lies not in demonstrating efficacy but in describing how clinical, psychological, social, and operational elements can be integrated into a coherent service model aimed at reducing barriers to participation. Administrative procedures are often regarded as separate from clinical care; however, the present observations suggest that communication processes, continuity mechanisms, psychometric feedback, and multidisciplinary coordination may themselves function as therapeutic facilitators. Although the findings remain exploratory and should be interpreted cautiously, the observed patterns of assessment participation, referral behaviour, continuity engagement, and positive feedback are broadly consistent with reduced barriers to treatment participation. The model may therefore be conceptualized as a behaviourally informed therapeutic ecosystem in which clinical interventions are supported by social and operational architecture. Further prospective studies are required to determine the effectiveness, scalability, and generalizability of such integrated outpatient mental health service models.

Limitations

There are several factors to consider when interpreting this report. Firstly, it is based on one outpatient mental health setting and cannot be generalized to other settings, such as public primary care settings and lower-resource practices. Secondly, the study utilized a descriptive observational design and did not engage in comparison with a control group or another comparable practice. It also did not

engage in systematic outcome tracking or objective patient outcome measures. Thus, causal conclusions between the integrated care pathway and observed patterns of treatment participation cannot be drawn. Thirdly, because the report indicators were estimated by observations in the normal course of service delivery without a standardized approach for measurement and auditing, the chance of observer bias is to not be ruled out. Finally, the model was implemented within a specific operational context that included dedicated staffing, workflow flexibility and service infrastructure, which may affect scalability in settings with fewer resources.

Future Directions

Future research should formally evaluate whether integrated outpatient mental health service models improve treatment participation and continuity outcomes using prospective designs. Since the current study emphasizes operational and logistical redesign, future research can specifically delve into engagement-based outcomes looking into the rates of treatment initiation, assessment uptake, early dropout and consistency in follow-up. Comparative studies with other standard consultation outpatient models can help clarify whether structured service integration plays a role in improving engagement patterns. Further, qualitative studies involving patients and caregivers will provide greater depth in understanding how communication, financial transparency, and continuity systems influence treatment acceptance.

Conclusion

This report suggests that treatment participation in outpatient psychiatry may be influenced not only by clinical interventions but also by how care systems are designed and delivered. This integrated pathway was designed to overcome stigma-induced barriers and promote engagement and continuity by means of clinical, psychological, and operational integration.

Although findings remain exploratory, it is clear that communications networks, circuit-based psychoeducation, continuity structures, and multidisciplinary collaboration can all play the role

of facilitators of treatment engagement. In the context of mental health facilities characterized by a high prevalence of delayed care and early dropout, the architecture of services can be regarded as an important yet overlooked determinant of treatment outcome. Further prospective research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness and scalability of such models.

DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to this manuscript.

Funding

No external funding was received.

Ethical Statement

No patient-identifiable information is included. This paper describes an observational service model only.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the contributions of the counselling, administrative, and operational teams involved in the implementation of structured patient-care processes.

REFERENCES

1. Andrade LH, Alonso J, Mneimneh Z, Wells JE, Al-Hamzawi A, Borges G, et al. Barriers to mental health treatment: results from the WHO World Mental Health surveys. *Psychol Med*. 2014;44(6):1303-1317.
2. Beach MC, Inui T; Relationship-Centered Care Research Network. Relationship-centered care: a constructive reframing. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2006;21 Suppl 1. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2006.00302.x.
3. Bhattacharjee D, Rai AK, Singh NK, Kumar P, Munda SK, Das B. Psychoeducation: a measure to strengthen psychiatric treatment. *Delhi Psychiatry J*. 2011;14(1):33-39.
4. Charles C, Gafni A, Whelan T. Shared decision-making in the medical encounter: what does it mean? (or a model of shared decision-making). *Soc Sci Med*. 1997;44(5):681-692. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(96)00221-3.
5. Deen TL, Fortney JC, Pyne JM. Relationship between satisfaction, patient-centered care, adherence and outcomes among patients in a collaborative care trial for depression. *Adm*

- Policy Ment Health Ment Health Serv Res. 2011;38(5):345-355.
6. Elwyn G, Frosch D, Thomson R, Joseph-Williams N, Lloyd A, Kinnersley P, et al. Shared decision making: a model for clinical practice. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2012;27(10):1361-1367. doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2077-6.
7. Epstein RM, Street RL Jr. The values and value of patient-centered care. *Ann Fam Med*. 2011;9(2):100-103. doi:10.1370/afm.1239.
8. Fortney JC, Unützer J, Wrenn G, Pyne JM, Smith GR, Schoenbaum M, et al. A tipping point for measurement-based care. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2017;68(2):179-188. doi:10.1176/appi.ps.201500439.
9. Gaboury I, Lapierre LM, Boon H, Moher D. Interprofessional collaboration within integrative healthcare clinics through the lens of the relationship-centered care model. *J Interprof Care*. 2011;25(2):124-130.
10. Goodrich DE, Kilbourne AM, Nord KM, et al. Mental health collaborative care and its role in primary care settings. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2013;15:383. doi:10.1007/s11920-013-0383-2.
11. Lamb J, Bower P, Rogers A, Dowrick C, Gask L. Access to mental health in primary care: a qualitative meta-synthesis of evidence from the experience of people from "hard to reach" groups. *Qual Health Res*. 2012;22(1):135-145. doi:10.1177/1049732311421736.
12. Lewis CC, Boyd M, Puspitasari A, Navarro E, Howard J, Kassab H, et al. Implementing measurement-based care in behavioral health: a review. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(3):324-335.
13. Luxford K, Safran DG, Delbanco T. Promoting patient-centered care: a qualitative study of facilitators and barriers in healthcare organizations with a reputation for improving the patient experience. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2011;23(5):510-515. doi:10.1093/intqhc/mzr024.
14. McCay E, Cleverley K, Danaher A, Mudachi N. Collaborative partnerships: bridging the knowledge practice gap in client-centred care in mental health. *J Ment Health Train Educ Pract*. 2015;10(1):51-60.
15. Mead N, Bower P. Patient-centredness: a conceptual framework and review of the empirical literature. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000;51(7):1087-1110.
16. Moothedan E, Katoju SV, Nguyen OT, Faldu A, Motwani K, Feller DB. Patient-level factors associated with referral rates to mental health services in a network of student-run free clinics: a pooled cross-sectional study. *J Stud Run Clin*. 2024;10(1).
17. Moudatsou M, Stavropoulou A, Philalithis A, Koukouli S. The role of empathy in health and social care professionals. *Healthcare (Basel)*. 2020;8(1):26. doi:10.3390/healthcare8010026.
18. Oliveira CT, Dias ACG. How can psychoeducation help in the treatment of mental disorders? *Estud Psicol (Campinas)*. 2023;40.
19. Patel V, Xiao S, Chen H, Hanna F, Jotheeswaran AT, Luo D, et al. The magnitude of and health system responses to the mental health treatment gap in adults in India and China. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10063):3074-3084.
20. Soklaridis S, Adler Nevo G, Lieff S. Relationship-centred care in health: a 20-year scoping review. *Patient Exp J*. 2016;3(1):130-145.
21. Stewart M, Brown JB, Weston WW, Freeman TR, Ryan BL, McWilliam CL, et al. Patient-centered medicine: transforming the clinical method. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press; 2014.
22. Thornicroft G. Stigma and discrimination limit access to mental health care. *Epidemiol Psychiatr Soc*. 2008;17(1):14-19. doi:10.1017/S1121189X00002621.
23. Tunks A, Berry C, Strauss C, Nyikavaranda P, Ford E. Patients' perspectives of barriers and facilitators to accessing support through primary care for common mental health problems in England: a systematic review. *J Affect Disord*. 2023.
24. Wanzer MB, Booth-Butterfield M, Gruber K. Perceptions of health care providers' communication: relationships between patient-centered communication and satisfaction. *Health Commun*. 2004;16(3):363-384.
25. Wang PS, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, Alonso J, Angermeyer MC, Borges G, Bromet EJ, et al. Use of mental health services for anxiety, mood, and substance disorders in 17 countries in the WHO world mental health surveys. *Lancet*. 2007;370(9590):841-850. doi:10.1016/S0140-

6736(07)61414-7.

26. 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. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2012.11111616.
27. Zolnieriek KBH, DiMatteo MR. Physician communication and patient adherence to treatment: a meta-analysis. *Med Care*. 2009;47(8):826-834. doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e31819a5acc.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED THERAPEUTICS (JAT)
Call for Papers and Author Submission Information
Institute of Applied Therapeutics (IAT), Chennai
Volume 1 | Issue 1 | June 2026

JAT invites submissions from researchers, clinicians, academicians, healthcare professionals, and interdisciplinary scholars whose work advances therapeutic science and practice.

Submission Process

Authors may submit manuscripts through the Journal's online submission system by following the steps below:

- Step 1:** Create/Register an author account through the journal submission portal.
- Step 2:** Log in with your registered credentials, then select New Submission.
- Step 3:** Complete the submission checklist and provide all required manuscript details, including title, authorship information, abstract, keywords, and declarations.
- Step 4:** Upload the manuscript and any supplementary files, figures, tables, or ethical approval documents where applicable.
- Step 5:** Review all entered information carefully and complete the submission process.
- Step 6:** Authors will receive confirmation upon successful submission and may track manuscript progress through the online system.

Editorial and Peer Review Process

All submitted manuscripts undergo an initial editorial assessment followed by a double-blind peer review process to evaluate scientific quality, methodological rigor, originality, and relevance to the journal scope.

Editorial Process

Initial Submission → Editorial Screening → Peer Review → Editorial Decision → Copyediting and Publication

Manuscript Submission

Authors are encouraged to review the journal guidelines and complete manuscript submissions through the online journal management system:

<https://journal.appliedtherapeutics.in/index.php/jat/index>

For detailed author guidelines, publication policies, and submission instructions, please visit the journal website.



Journal of Applied Therapeutics (JAT)

Volume 1, Issue 1 (2026)

Published by: Institute of Applied Therapeutics (IAT), Chennai



The **Journal of Applied Therapeutics (JAT)** is an interdisciplinary, practice-oriented journal that focuses on translating scientific knowledge into meaningful, real-world healthcare applications. The inaugural issue reflects this philosophy through articles exploring the multidimensional impact of head injury and barriers to rehabilitation, an integrated neurobehavioral outpatient model aimed at improving treatment acceptance, the complexity of suicide and its legal, social, and clinical determinants, the importance of multidisciplinary pain management as a core component of modern medicine, and a case report highlighting atypical Alzheimer-spectrum disease presenting with language impairment, depression, and suicidal behaviour. Collectively, these articles emphasize that effective healthcare requires the integration of biological, psychological, social, ethical, and practical factors to address complex human problems in real-world settings.