

Effectiveness, acceptability and potential harms of peer support for self-harm in non-clinical settings: A systematic review

Nada Abou Seif¹, Rayanne John-Baptiste Bastien¹, Belinda Wang¹, Jessica Davies², Mette Isaken³, Ellie Ball³, Alexandra Pitman^{1,4}, Sarah Rowe¹

¹Division of Psychiatry, University College London

²St Andrews, Birmingham

³Samaritans, Surrey

⁴Camden and Islington NHS Foundation Trust

Abstract

Background

Many people who have self-harmed prefer informal sources of support, or support from those with lived experience. However, little is known about whether peer support improves outcomes for people who have self-harmed, and what might be the risks of peer support interventions in non-clinical settings.

Objectives

The aims of this review are to examine the effectiveness, acceptability and potential risks of peer support for self-harm, and how these risks might be mitigated.

Methods

We searched two bibliographic databases and grey literature for papers published since 2000. We included peer support for self-harm that occurred in voluntary sector organisations, providing one-to-one or group support, or via moderated online peer support forums. We excluded peer support within clinical settings, peer support provided by relatives or friends who self-harm, or peer support from unmoderated online forums. Quality appraisal was conducted on included papers, and study findings were summarised using a narrative synthesis.

Results

Ten papers met the inclusion criteria for this review, and most (n=8) were conducted in the United Kingdom. Eight of the papers focused on peer support that was delivered through online

mediums and two examined face-to-face self-harm recovery/support groups. Limited conclusions about the effectiveness of peer support interventions for self-harm can be made, as we found no studies comparing this to other treatments or a control group. Peer support for self-harm was found to be acceptable and was viewed as having a range of benefits including a reduction of loneliness, a sense of community and empowerment, improvements in interpersonal skills, and access to information and support. The most commonly perceived risk associated with peer support for self-harm was the potential for triggering self-harm. Other potential risks identified were being re-traumatised by listening to other people's stories, not having the knowledge or skills to help others, and misunderstandings or disagreements with other peers/group members.

Conclusions

Our findings highlighted a range of benefits of being part of a group with very specific shared experiences. This justifies investment in the provision of such resources, supported by safeguards to mitigate the potential risks from peer support interventions. Suggestions include organisations using professional facilitators for groups, including trigger warnings for online forums, and providing regular supervision and training so that peers are prepared and feel confident to support vulnerable people whilst maintaining their own emotional health.

Key words

Self-harm, self-injury, peer support, online forums, social support, literature review

Introduction

Self-harm is an act in which an individual initiates behaviour (such as self-cutting or ingesting a toxic substance or object), with the intention of causing harm to themselves with a non-fatal outcome [1]. Definitions of self-harm vary according to the degree of suicidal intent, and it is important to note that not all people who practise self-harm feel suicidal when they self-harm [2]. Self-harm is common, particularly in young people, and its prevalence is increasing in many countries around the world [3-5]. Among British 17-year-olds, an estimated 20% of males and 28% of females report self-harm, with white and sexual minority adolescents identified as at particular risk [6]. Self-harm is associated with distress and is the strongest risk factor for suicide [7]. Many young people who self-harm prefer informal sources of support [8], or support from those with lived experience available through voluntary sector organisations and online forums.

Peer support interventions are becoming increasingly adopted worldwide within mental health services and third sector organisations (voluntary organisations, community organisations and charities) [9]. Although studies of peer support for mental health problems suggest it is associated with positive effects on hope, recovery and quality of life, the effects on other outcomes such as symptoms, hospitalisation and satisfaction are inconclusive [10]. Peer support may have different benefits and harms depending on the population and setting in which it is used. Peer-reviewed research on peer support for people that self-harm is lacking, and little is known about the provision, quality, effectiveness and acceptability of these resources for young people or adults, or the potential harms. This hampers the planning of appropriate service provision for people who have self-harmed.

In this systematic review of the quantitative and qualitative literature, we aimed to address the following research questions:

1. What evidence exists for the availability and effectiveness of peer support for self-harm?
2. What evidence exists on the risks of peer support for self-harm where risk, safety or normalisation may present concerns?
3. What evidence exists on how the risks identified through the review could be mitigated?

Methods

Our systematic review followed PRISMA guidelines and was registered on the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews (CRD42021235441).

For the purpose of this review and in consultation with Samaritans, we used the term 'self-harm' to describe self-harm behaviour where there was no suicidal intent, 'suicide attempts' where there was suicidal intent, and 'self-harm/suicide attempts' where both applied or where this was unspecified or unclear. This was because we wanted to define the client group of interest very tightly, recognising that the provision, effectiveness, acceptability and potential harms of peer support for suicidal self-harm is likely to differ from that provided for non-suicidal self-harm. We also defined 'peer support' for self-harm as any support provided in non-clinical settings by individuals with lived experience of self-harm. We excluded peer support within clinical settings, as recommendations from a recent parliamentary inquiry were to invest

in community-based preventative services, including low level preventative support based on peer support models [11]. We also excluded peer support provided by relatives or friends who self-harm, or peer support from people posting content about self-harm on the internet solely in a personal capacity as these models would not benefit from funding.

Our definition therefore included: peer support provided by individuals working for voluntary sector organisations (but not formal healthcare services) providing one-to-one or group support, or via moderated online peer support forums.

Searches

Searches were conducted on MEDLINE® (Ovid) <1946 to February 15, 2021> and PsycINFO (Ovid) <1806 to February Week 2 2021>. Search terms were developed with the input of a lived experience researcher (JD) and in collaboration with the Samaritans team (EB and MI). Search terms covered keywords relevant to self-harm and both online and face-to-face peer support. These were combined into a single search string using the appropriate Boolean operators (Supplementary material 1).

We also conducted searches for grey literature on both Open Grey and Google using the approach suggested in recent scoping reviews (Pham et al 2014 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4491356/>). For the Google searches, we made an *a priori* decision to screen only the first 100 results to reflect a balance of relevance and time taken to screen each hit [12].

We searched websites for UK charity organisations such as Mind and Harmless and contacted each organisation to request any relevant publications on peer support. The list of organisations was comprised from suggestions by Samaritans and our team's lived experience researcher (Supplementary material 2).

Studies were included if they:

1. described the provision, quality, effectiveness, and acceptability of peer support for self-harm
2. related specifically to self-harm, regardless of suicidal intent
3. were published in English
4. were published from the year 2000 onwards
5. used quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods

We did not set any restrictions on age group, population, study design, or whether publications were peer reviewed. We also included studies with or without a comparator group, as we felt this was particularly important in capturing acceptability of the peer support intervention.

We excluded studies that:

1. focused on suicide prevention without investigating self-harm specifically
2. described peer support in clinical settings
3. described peer support provided by relatives or friends

4. described peer support from people posting content on the internet solely in a personal capacity
5. peer support taking place on unmoderated online mediums (eg, unmoderated forums)

Data extraction

Screening and selection of studies:

We used Covidence systematic review online software (www.covidence.org) to import references from our search engines for screening titles and abstracts, and deduplicate. Two reviewers screened all titles and abstracts independently. Four reviewers screened the full-text articles independently to determine their suitability for inclusion and a randomly selected 10% of these were second screened by an independent reviewer. Reference lists of included papers and relevant systematic reviews were checked for relevant papers. Any disagreement between the reviewers over the eligibility of studies was reviewed by a third and fourth reviewer (SR and AP) and resolved through discussion. We calculated inter-rater agreement at each stage of the review screening process to assess the consistency of raters' decisions. We used the accepted value of 0.8 as the threshold for good inter-rater agreement [13], resolving screening disagreements where values fell below 0.8 resolved through discussions with a third and fourth reviewer.

Data extraction

Information on the following variables were extracted from all of the papers: study titles, authors, study type, country of origin, year of publication, population, demographics (including age, sex,

ethnicity), type of self-harm (suicidal, non-suicidal, both or not specified) details of peer support intervention (nature, description, duration, source of provision), outcome measures, change scores or themes relevant to peer support intervention, risks or harmful effects, and mitigation of risks or harmful effects. A second reviewer independently checked data extraction.

The outcome measures in relation to each of our review questions were:

1: Mean reduction in self-harm behaviours post peer support intervention

2: Changes in mean questionnaire scores, or themes relevant to risk/harmful effects of self-harm peer support interventions as derived from qualitative research

3: Ways in which the risks identified in research question 2 might be mitigated, as established using the results and discussions sections of all included papers

Quality appraisal

One reviewer independently assessed the quality of each included paper, and a randomly selected sub-sample of 10% of included papers was independently assessed for study quality by a second researcher.

For quantitative peer-reviewed published papers we used the Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), which rates papers on five domains: risk of bias, imprecision, inconsistency, indirectness, and publication bias. A certainty/quality rating is assigned to the evidence ranging from very low (the true effect is likely to be substantially

different from the estimated effect) to high (we are confident that the effect of the study reflects the actual effect) [14].

For qualitative studies we used the Critical Appraisals Skill Programme (CASP) Qualitative Checklist, which examines whether there is sufficient description and justification of the chosen methods of data collection, sampling, and analytical approach, as well as whether sufficient attention was given to ethics and the role of the researchers involved [15].

For studies using a mixed method design we used the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 [16], which includes a checklist to appraise the methodological quality for qualitative, quantitative and specifically mixed methods studies. MMAT examines whether the rationale of using a mixed methods design is appropriate and whether the different components of the study are incorporated constructively to answer the research question.

For non-academic papers (including grey literature), we used the NESTA's Standard of Evidence model to assess the quality of each source of information [17]. This considers criteria such as "Have others proved the same?" and "Can this be replicated elsewhere?" to judge whether the innovation described has evidence of benefits or harms.

Data synthesis


Anticipating a heterogeneous range of papers, we used a narrative synthesis to summarise themes relevant to our review questions. In team discussions, including Samaritans team

members and our lived experience researcher, we explored reflexivity in our interpretation of the findings to ensure that our inferences regarding recommendations for practice were appropriate, acceptable and relevant.

Results

Our MEDLINE and PsycINFO searches identified 31,667 records, with an additional 35 records identified through OpenGrey and Google searches (Figure 1). After the removal of duplicates, a total of 26,523 titles and abstracts were screened. Of those, 28 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, from which a total of nine studies were identified as eligible for inclusion in our final synthesis. A further 35 records were identified from non-profit organisations, which we reduced to seven following deduplication and title and abstract screening. After full-text screening, one of these records was judged to meet eligibility criteria for inclusion in our final analysis based on its specific focus on online peer support for young people self-harming [18]. Other records from non-profit organisations were excluded due to peer support being offered for difficulties not limited to self-harm and not fitting our description of a peer support intervention. Inter-rater agreement was high for screening titles and abstracts (99%) but went down to 75% for the full-text screening. One paper required discussion with a third reviewer before a consensus could be reached on its inclusion in the review and inter-rater agreement over 0.8 could be achieved.

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram



Description of studies

Of the ten studies included in our narrative synthesis, eight were conducted in the UK, one in the US, and one paper combined data from a range of mental health organisations in the UK, Italy, Slovenia, and Denmark [18]. Of the included studies, eight were of qualitative design and two used mixed methods (Tables 1A and 1B). Notably, no randomised controlled trials or other trials investigating effectiveness met our inclusion criteria. In eight of the studies, peer support was delivered through online mediums, such as self-harm forums or message boards (n=5), online recovery groups (n=1), social media (n=1), or a variety of platforms, including group chats, online group discussions and Facebook groups (n=1). The remaining two studies examined face-to-face self-harm recovery/support groups.

As per our inclusion criteria and research focus, all studies focused on individuals who self-harm, with five studies focusing specifically on young people and/or young adults who self-harm [18-22]. Studies included a wide range of sample sizes, ranging from n=7 [23] to n=102 [24] participants. However, the UTRIP (2012) report was an outlier, as they included a range of samples sizes, and it wasn't clear if they used the same participants for different stages of their surveys (Table 1B). Although most studies did not report ethnicity, where ethnicity was reported (n=3), individuals self-defining as White constituted 100% of the sample in two studies [23, 25], and 70% of one other [19]. Females made up at least 80% of the samples across all studies. The majority of studies investigating online peer support sampled individuals within a young age range (16 to 25 years), apart from Haberstroh & Moyer (2012), in which the sample

had a mean age of 36 years. The two studies investigating face-to-face peer support had a sample with a mean age of 36 and 46 years, respectively [23, 26].

Quality of included studies

All eight qualitative studies included were judged to be of high quality, scoring 8 or above out of 10 on the CASP (Supplementary material 3A). However, studies tended to be unclear on how they addressed the relationship between the researchers and participants. Nevertheless, the other domains of CASP were judged to be addressed adequately in most studies. Of the two mixed methods studies, one [27] was scored as 11 out of 15 on the MMAT (as used for mixed methods research), with the domains for qualitative design judged as well addressed, but less so for the quantitative design (Supplementary material 3B). The other mixed methods study [18] was appraised using NESTA (as used for grey literature) and only rated as level 2, as the lack of comparator groups meant that the effects of the intervention could not be separated from other influences (Supplementary material 3C).

Findings

The ten included studies identified a range of views on the acceptability and perceived value of peer support for self-harm, both from the perspective of those using the service and those providing it, along with descriptions of the mode of provision (Table 1A and 1B). We did not identify any studies reporting the effectiveness of peer support for self-harm, nor studies

presenting an overview of the provision of peer support for self-harm nationally or internationally.

Q1. Mode of peer support, acceptability, and effectiveness

Face-to-face peer support: Both the studies evaluating face-to-face peer support focused on self-harm support groups, and both reported on the experiences of members of more than one support group. Participants in the Boyce et al. (2018) study discussed how members' experiences prior to joining the group had been primarily negative and characterised by isolation, stigma, and shame [26]. Conversely, participants in both studies viewed their self-harm support groups as a safe space, where they felt accepted and understood (Table 2). Their shared experiences with other members of the group made participants feel that the support they were receiving in this setting was more "genuine" than that on offer from professionals or family/friends. Many of the group members in both studies reported a reduction in self-harm following group membership. Participants described other positive changes that they attributed to group membership, such as friendship and decreased isolation, improvements in self-awareness, mood, and interpersonal skills. They also reported that they derived a sense of empowerment and self-worth through witnessing and supporting each other's struggles and successes. Peer support group leaders reported positive experiences in relation to their sense of autonomy in running the group [23]. These findings suggest that self-harm support groups are perceived by members as valuable peer support in helping to manage self-harm and are also acceptable to its members.

Online peer support: Most studies of online moderated peer support investigated self-injury message boards or forums (n=5/8; [19, 21, 24, 27, 28]). Of the remaining three studies, one explored an online recovery group, which consisted of individuals referred to the group by self-injury professionals [25], one investigated young people's engagement with self-harm content on social media, such as Reddit, Instagram and Twitter [20], and one investigated online peer support services for young people who have self-harmed provided by a range of organisations across Denmark, Italy, Slovenia, and the UK [18].

Similar to the findings for face-to-face peer support, users of online peer support reported that their previous experiences of conventional (ie, professional or non-peer) support were characterised by poor treatment and stigma, which drove them to seek alternative options [25] [20]. The key advantages perceived by participants in these online mediums included providing and receiving support from those with similar lived experiences [20, 24, 25, 27]. Advantages were also perceived in gaining access to useful information on self-harm [18, 20, 27], such as how to self-harm safely [20], how to conceal self-harm (ie, methods of concealing cuts and scars, how to seek treatment [18, 27], and less anxiety around people finding out about their self-harming behaviour [27]. In one study, the online group was also viewed as a useful supplement to counselling [25]. However, a small proportion of participants (n=12/74; 16%) in the study published by Murray & Fox (2006) reported that they used the forum with the intention of being triggered to self-harm [24]. These participants described feeling competitive about their self-harm when reading posts, with some viewing their self-harm as "inadequate" and some deliberately reading discussions when they felt the urge to self-harm [24].

As no trials of online peer support met our inclusion criteria, effectiveness could not be established. In studies where participants were asked about the perceived effectiveness of online peer support in reducing their self-harm behaviours, 41-50% reported a decrease in self-harm, which they attributed to group membership [19, 24]. In the Murray & Fox (2006) study, 46% reported no change in their self-harm, and 10% reported an increase [24]. The sense of safety and community stemming from online peer support made users feel supported by people who understand their experiences of self-harm, and less alone [18, 19, 24, 25]. Added perceived benefits included the sense that online peer support increased participants' motivation to recover [19], prompted help-seeking for professional (ie, formal) support [19, 25], and was accessed quickly and easily as a source of information [18].

Q2. Risks and mitigation

Face-to-face peer support. Risks discussed in the Corcoran et al. (2007) study included the potential for members to be re-traumatized through listening to each other's stories, as well as the risk of triggering self-injury through learning new methods within the group [23]. The article included suggestions as to ways in which this could be mitigated, including the use of a professional facilitator who could establish clear and healthy boundaries within the group, as well as supplementing the group intervention with individual support.

Online peer support. Included articles identified three main risks perceived with online peer support interventions. First, the most frequently documented perceived risk identified from online peer support for self-harm was the risk of triggering self-harm behaviour [18-20, 25]. This could arise through: 1) unmoderated sharing of triggering content, such as graphic

images, distressing stories, or new methods of self-harm or self-harm concealment methods [25, 27], 2) having to prove continuously a need for help by posting more extreme content or images in order to sustain online peer support [20], 3) a desire to belong [27], or 4) the normalisation and reinforcement (sometimes seen as an encouragement) of self-injurious behaviour [27]. The second most common potential risk identified was that the use of these mediums could isolate members from the “offline” world and hinder them from seeking professional and/or offline help [20, 27]. The third most common potential risk identified was that online peer support might negatively impact the wellbeing of peer supporters due to the distress and burden associated with hearing others’ stories and attempting to help [18, 20] as well as feeling ignored [21], misunderstood or being involved in a disagreement with other members [18]. Additionally, there was the potential for young people to feel overwhelmed while supporting others, as they may lack the skills or knowledge of how best to help [18].

One way to mitigate these risks is to have an online moderator who enforces boundaries between members and overt “no triggering” rules [18, 21, 25]. However, moderators are sometimes individuals who self-harm or who have self-harmed, and there is a risk of this involvement in being triggering for them too [25]. Where moderators have lived experience of self-harm, it was suggested that they should be individuals who have established recovery and are well-supported outside the online group [18, 25]. Some studies also highlighted the potential for clinicians to play an important adjunctive role in peer support for self-harm in two ways: clinicians may act as moderators where peer support is offered in clinical settings but should also inquire about patients’ engagement with peer support for self-harm offered online [18, 19], so that they can support them in using forums constructively. It was

also suggested that online mediums should also signpost to offline resources to provide a safety net should other support be needed [20]. One study also alluded to the potential benefits of smaller group size in online forums, which meant users were less likely to feel ignored [21].

Table 2: Summary of the main benefits and risks identified in included studies

Main Benefits	Strength of evidence *	Papers reporting this finding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feeling accepted and understood Providing a safe space Feeling supported Giving support Providing a safe sense of community 	10	Boyce et al. (2018) Brow (2015) Corcoran et al. (2017) Haberstroh & Moyer (2012) Lavis & Winter (2020) Murray & Fox (2006) Sharkey et al. (2012) Smithson et al. (2011) UTRIP (2012) Whitlock et al. (2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased isolation, stigma, and shame 	4	Boyce et al. (2018) Corcoran et al. (2017) Haberstroh & Moyer (2012) Lavis & Winter (2020)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source of information on professional treatment 	4	Brow (2015) Haberstroh & Moyer (2012) UTRIP (2012) Whitlock et al. (2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced self-harm 	4	Boyce et al. (2018) Brow (2015) Corcoran et al. (2017) Murray & Fox (2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source of information on self-harm 	3	Lavis & Winter (2020) UTRIP (2012) Whitlock et al. (2006)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sense of empowerment Increasing self-worth 	2	Boyce et al. (2018) Corcoran et al. (2017)

• Increasing autonomy		
• Reducing the risks of self-harm (harm-minimisation)	1	Lavis & Winter (2020)
• Source of motivation for recovery	1	Brow (2015)
Perceived Risks	Strength of evidence *	Papers reporting this finding
• Triggering self-harm (eg, after viewing graphic images)	6	Brow (2015) Corcoran et al. (2007) Haberstroh & Moyer (2012) Lavis & Winter (2020) Murray & Fox (2006) UTRIP (2012)
• Distress and burden from providing peer support to others	2	Lavis & Winter (2020) Smithson et al. (2011) UTRIP (2012)
• Pressure to post extreme content or images to demonstrate a continued need for support from peers • Disincentive to seeking “offline” professional help	2	Lavis & Winter (2020) Whitlock et al. (2006)
• Retraumatization by triggers (eg, stories)	1	Corcoran et al. (2007)
• Learning new methods of self-harm	1	Whitlock et al. (2006)
• Self-harm being normalised • Reinforcement of self-harm to feel a sense of belonging	1	Whitlock et al. (2006)
• Feelings or concerns ignored or invalidated	1	Smithson et al. (2011)

*The number of included papers (out of ten) that reported this result

Discussion

The main findings of this systematic review were that only a few studies have investigated the provision, quality, acceptability, effectiveness or potential harms of peer interventions for self-harm, whether in the published or grey literature. Of the studies available, none have evaluated the effectiveness of peer support for self-harm, which limits conclusions about its impact on

key outcomes such as distress, stigma, depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation, suicide attempt, and suicide, as well as objective measurement of the risk of potential adverse effects.

However, we did identify useful literature describing the perceptions of those who use peer support for self-harm in relation to its acceptability and potential harms. These studies described a range of perceived social benefits, including a reduction in loneliness and the gaining of a sense of community and interpersonal skills, and also described a range of emotional benefits such as the sense of being able to help others, an opportunity to vent frustrations, and the provision of access to information and support. Additionally, these studies described perceived clinical benefits, including a reduction in the frequency and severity of self-harm, improvements in mood, and an increase in the practice of safer methods of self-harm. No participants described feeling less suicidal as a consequence of using peer support for self-harm. However, this question would better addressed quantitatively using validated measures of suicidality. Many participants described how stigmatised and ashamed they had been made to feel when using more conventional sources of support for self-harm, contrasting this with their positive experiences of the community they had encountered through peer support.

Some important risks were also identified, including the potential for peer support to cause vicarious trauma or trigger self-harm behaviour in those listening to others' stories or viewing others' scars, as well as the potential for psychological processes such as reinforcement of self-harm, imitating others' self-harming behaviours, comparing extent of injuries, or self-harming in order to fit in with peers. There were also concerns expressed about the burden on those participating in peer support in having to support others despite not having appropriate training. Specific potential risks of online peer support were the difficulties of monitoring

whether participants felt safe, and the potential for participants to rely on online support over formal sources of support, where this might otherwise be indicated. However, a number of valuable suggestions were made as to how these identified risks might be mitigated, including providing professional facilitators for groups and trigger warnings, and ensuring that peers who take on moderating roles feel well-supported themselves.

Strengths and limitations

Our systematic review had a number of key strengths, reinforcing the confidence of practitioners and policymakers when applying our findings to practice. We gained the input of a researcher with lived experience, a mental health professional, a health psychologist and of Samaritans when identifying search terms for this review and used these professional networks to contact key voluntary sector organisations and self-harm groups in order to identify grey literature. We also used Twitter for suggestions on published and unpublished literature on potential harms, in order to balance our study and counter potential publication bias. Our quality assessment of included studies used standardised tools and were judged to be of high quality. Our summary of the potential benefits and harms of peer support for self-harm presented a balanced account of the key considerations described in this published and unpublished literature when implementing peer support for self-harm, including key risks and mitigation recommendations.

In only searching two databases we may have missed studies published in other journals, but our use of MEDLINE and PsycINFO was intended to focus our review on clinical findings. Our focus on non-clinical settings may have limited the lessons to be learned about other benefits

of peer support for self-harm, but this specific focus was intended to address a research and policy gap in relation to non-clinical settings. We acknowledge that although our search of the published literature included international studies, our exclusion of non-English language studies will have biased our report to reflect primarily the experiences of high-income countries. We also acknowledge that our search for grey literature reflected primarily UK-based organisations, given the location of the research team and funder, and this report might therefore be of less relevance to non-UK settings. We did not identify any trials, despite our comprehensive search terms, which meant that we could not present evidence of effectiveness. We also noted that the samples in included studies tended to underrepresent the experiences of people from minority ethnic groups and this may reflect sampling biases within those studies. We acknowledge that we may not have contacted the full range of experts in the field, who may have unpublished data not represented in this review and did not contact authors to clarify any queries over the presentation of data.

In this review, our exclusive focus on peer support for self-harm may have neglected a wider perspective in which peer support is compared directly to other forms of support for self-harm in terms of their relative acceptability. The findings of an Australian survey of young people who have self-harmed is particularly striking in this respect [29]. This study aimed to explore the attitudes of young people who have self-harmed towards the use of online help for self-injury, as a means of informing future service delivery. Survey responses from 457 young people who have self-injured identified preferences for future online help-seeking, the rationale for which included gaining information and guidance, reducing isolation, a preference for an online culture, facilitation of help-seeking, easy access to support, and advantages of

privacy. Of all sources of online support listed (eg, texting, gaming, direct links to professionals, self-help, and peer support) the most popular option was contact with a professional via instant messaging. Professional help therefore appeared to be preferred to peer support within the online context, highlighting the importance of considering hybrid sources of support.

Future research

The main gaps in research that we identified were studies describing the effectiveness or cost-effectiveness of peer support for self-harm, as we did not identify any trials or economic analyses. The published and unpublished studies we found suggested that peer support for self-harm is an acceptable approach to a specific sub-set of people who have self-harmed and that they, and the professionals who support them, show a strong awareness of the potential risks and mitigations in order to provide a safe service. Although this review identified the triggering of self-harm as being the most common potential risk attached to peer support, no studies evaluated whether the benefits of peer support interventions for self-harm outweigh the risks. Clinical trials and large-scale observational studies are required to measure both positive and adverse effects so we can build on our subjective understanding of peer support for self-harm. We also need cost-effectiveness analyses that take a wide societal perspective, taking into account the potential for clinical benefits and adverse effects, the costs and benefits to carers, the health service, and emergency services, as well as use of other support and treatment options.

We identified no studies describing the geographical provision of peer support for self-harm, nor an overview of current online provision. This is needed to ascertain whether there are

disparities in provision for certain geographical areas or for certain digitally excluded groups. In particular, we hope that future studies explore the acceptability of peer support for people from ethnic minorities who self-harm, and that the lack of trial evidence might be addressed through the conduct and publication of controlled trials. We would recommend that regular updates of this review will inform updated recommendations on the provision, quality, acceptability, effectiveness and potential harms of peer support for self-harm.

Policy implications

These findings suggest that the provision of peer support for self-harm is acceptable and valued by some people who have self-harmed, but that participants also perceived specific risks and ways to mitigate these. The range of benefits described suggest that there would be value in implementing further peer support services for people who have self-harmed, provided that service planning included a careful consideration of risk management. The generally young age of the samples described in this review, typically aged 16 to 25 years, suggests that this would be welcomed by adolescents who self-harm, given their general preference for peer support over formal support [8]. The stigma and shame experienced when accessing professional support was contrasted with the more accepting experience of using peer support. This has important policy implications, given that stigma has been identified as a key barrier to seeking professional support for mental health problems among young people [30]. Online peer support was viewed positively as a way of promoting help-seeking for professional support and may be a critical stage in the process of recognising a need for support and identifying the most acceptable routes into professional support.

The suggestions made around risk mitigation processes suggest a key role for training and supporting group facilitators and online group moderators, both in relation to the processes they follow when providing peer support (policies on triggering content, ground rules about expectations in showing respect in interactions) but also in relation to supporting their emotional needs. The provision of regular supervision may well be welcomed by those providing support, as well as risk management procedures should they feel overwhelmed by responsibilities and clinical risk scenarios. All those who take part in a peer support group may at times feel overwhelmed, and it may be important to consider ground rules on taking a break from the group or accessing alternative sources of support. Improving the confidence of people who have self-harmed to support vulnerable others might be achieved through interventions such as Mental Health First Aid Training to improve mental health literacy [31]. Peer support services might also consider providing a set of guidelines on how peers can best support others, including how to maintain one's own emotional health in order to be in the best place to help others. More generally it will also be important when implementing peer support to provide clear signposting to other sources of support, should these be indicated alongside engagement with a peer community.

The important role that peer support plays in the lives of some people who have self-harmed suggests that this is an important dimension of a clinical assessment, and that clinicians should inquire routinely about peer support when taking a clinical history from a person who self-harms, particularly that gained online [32]. Given the acceptability of peer support to people who have self-harmed, clinicians should also gain a familiarity with the services available and discuss these as part of care planning alongside a consideration of the potential risks described.

This is particularly important during a period of pandemic restrictions, when access to a full range of support sources may be severely limited. There may also be a role for clinicians in supporting the moderators or facilitators of peer support, given the importance of risk protocols and risk management when offering this type of help to a vulnerable group.

Conclusions

Our review of the literature suggests that peer support for self-harm plays an important therapeutic role in the lives of some people who have self-harmed, who describe social, emotional and clinical benefits, but who are also able to recognise the potential for harms. This literature provides valuable suggestions for how to best implement peer support for self-harm, whether face-to-face or online, and the risk issues that that need to be considered in order to provide this safely. In view of the preferences of young people for self-harm support outside formal healthcare settings, peer support for self-harm could be a very valuable means of containing some of the distress and loneliness associated with self-harm and promoting a sense of autonomy and community.

Lived Experience Commentary

The significance of providing peer support for those who self-harm is evidential; the current review summarises that, although not without its risks, both face-to-face and online mediums of peer support can help some young people manage self-injurious thoughts and behaviours. Through inviting open discussions around self-harm via in-person or virtual support groups, young people have reported a decrease in perceived stigma and shame compared

to interventions lead by professionals or loved ones. This may be attributed to a sense of solidarity, whereby those who self-harm are provided with a safe space to share their narratives and support each others' struggles and goals, during times where they may feel isolated and misunderstood by those who do not share similar experiences.

From my perspective, this review has brought to light how society has altered the way young people choose to obtain informal support. Although face-to-face groups hold their advantages, it is interesting to note that online platforms are an increasingly popular means for seeking help, due to giving/receiving support from a range of like-minded people, and the instant access to useful information. These findings strongly resonate with my own lived experience as an adolescent; I found solace in the mutual benefits of sharing emotional distress and self-harm ideation with others, whilst maintaining anonymity behind a mobile screen. However, the associated risks of using online mediums should not go unnoticed; including exposure to graphic images of extreme self-harm and feeling overwhelmed with a perceived responsibility to support others.

Although I understand the high-risk nature of peer support in increasing some self-harm behaviours, I view the benefits to outweigh the cons in terms of accessing support and generating a sense of self-empowerment and online community presence for young people. Given these potential benefits, and in light of the few studies investigating its effectiveness of peer interventions, there is an urgent need to determine its efficacy as an active intervention. Only through clinical trials can risk issues concerning both group members and

facilitators/moderators be fully addressed, and peer interventions could start to be considered with the same necessity for managing self-harm as professional support services.

Conflicts of Interest

This project was commissioned by two of the authors (MI and EB) on behalf of Samaritans and the paper is based on a tendered bid for the Samaritans project. MI and EB took an active part in devising the search strategy and commenting on manuscript drafts.

Abbreviations

PRISMA

UK – United Kingdom

GRADE - Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation

CASP - Critical Appraisals Skill Programme

MMAT - Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool

NESTA - NESTA's Standard of Evidence model

US – United States

References

1. Madge, N., et al., *Deliberate self-harm within an international community sample of young people: comparative findings from the Child & Adolescent Self-harm in Europe (CASE) Study*. Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, and allied disciplines, 2008. **49**(6): p. 667-77.
2. Muehlenkamp, J.J. and P.M. Gutierrez, *An Investigation of Differences Between Self-Injurious Behavior and Suicide Attempts in a Sample of Adolescents*. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 2004. **34**(1): p. 12-23.
3. Hiscock, H., et al., *Paediatric mental and physical health presentations to emergency departments, Victoria, 2008-15*. Med J Aust, 2018. **208**(8): p. 343-348.
4. McManus, S., et al., *Prevalence of non-suicidal self-harm and service contact in England, 2000-14: repeated cross-sectional surveys of the general population*. The lancet. Psychiatry, 2019. **6**(7): p. 573-581.
5. Tormoen, A.J., et al., *Change in prevalence of self-harm from 2002 to 2018 among Norwegian adolescents*. Eur J Public Health, 2020. **30**(4): p. 688-692.
6. Patalay, P., & Fitzsimons, E., *Psychological distress, self-harm and attempted suicide in UK 17-year olds: prevalence and sociodemographic inequalities*. The British Journal of Psychiatry, 2021: p. 1-3.
7. Hawton, K., et al., *Deliberate self-harm in Oxford, 1990-2000: a time of change in patient characteristics*. Psychological medicine, 2003. **33**(6): p. 987-95.
8. Rowe, S.L., et al., *Help-seeking behaviour and adolescent self-harm: a systematic review*. The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry, 2014. **48**(12): p. 1083-95.
9. Basset, T., Faulkner, A., Repper, J. and Stamou, E., *Lived experience leading the way: peer support in mental health*. 2010.
10. Shalaby, R.A.H. and V.I.O. Agyapong, *Peer Support in Mental Health: Literature Review*. JMIR Ment Health, 2020. **7**(6): p. e15572.
11. Self-Harm., A.-P.P.G.o.S.a., *Inquiry into the support available for young people who self-harm*. 2020.

12. Stevinson, C., Lawlor, DA., *Searching multiple databases for systematic reviews: added value or diminishing returns?* Complement Ther Med, 2004. **12**(4): p. 228-32.
13. McHugh, M.L., *Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic.* Biochem Med (Zagreb), 2012. **22**(3): p. 276-282.
14. Schünemann H, B.J., Guyatt G, Oxman A., *GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.* Updated October 2013.
15. UK., C. *Critical Appraisal Skills Programme. CASP (Qualitative Checklist) . [online].* 2018 March 2021]; Available from: https://casp-uk.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/CASP-Systematic-Review-Checklist_2018.pdf.
16. Hong, Q.N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M. P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M. C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P., *The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers.* Education for Information, 2018. **34**(4): p. 285-291.
17. Puttick, R.L., J. , *Standards of evidence: an approach that balances the need for evidence with innovation.* 2013.
18. (UTRIP), I.f.R.a.D.U., *The role of online and online peer support for young people who self-harm.* 2012.
19. Brow, L.K., *Online self-injury message boards: The role of social support for young adults.* Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 2016. **76**(10-B(E)): p. No-Specified.
20. Lavis, A. and R. Winter, *#Online harms or benefits? An ethnographic analysis of the positives and negatives of peer-support around self-harm on social media.* Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 2020. **61**(8): p. 842-854.
21. Smithson, J., et al., *Membership and boundary maintenance on an online self-harm forum.* Qualitative health research, 2011. **21**(11): p. 1567-75.
22. Sharkey, S., et al., *Supportive interchanges and face-work as 'protective talk' in an online self-harm support forum.* Commun Med, 2012. **9**(1): p. 71-82.

23. Corcoran, J., A. Mewse, and G. Babiker, *The Role of Women's Self-injury Support-Groups: A Grounded Theory*. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 2007. **17**(1): p. 35-52.
24. Murray, C.D. and J. Fox, *Do Internet self-harm discussion groups alleviate or exacerbate self-harming behaviour?* AeJAMH (Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health), 2006. **5**(3): p. 1-9.
25. Haberstroh, S. and M. Moyer, *Exploring an online self-injury support group: Perspectives from group members*. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 2012. **37**(2): p. 113-132.
26. Boyce, M., C. Munn-Giddings, and J. Secker, *"It is a safe space': Self-harm self-help groups"*. Mental Health Review Journal, 2018. **23**(1): p. 54-63.
27. Whitlock, J.L., J.L. Powers, and J. Eckenrode, *The virtual cutting edge: the internet and adolescent self-injury*. Developmental psychology, 2006. **42**(3): p. 407-17.
28. Sharkey, S., et al., *Supportive interchanges and face-work as 'protective talk' in an online self-harm support forum*. Communication & medicine, 2012. **9**(1): p. 71-82.
29. Frost, M., L. Casey, and N. Rando, *Self-Injury, Help-Seeking, and the Internet: Informing Online Service Provision for Young People*. Crisis, 2016. **37**(1): p. 68-76.
30. Aguirre Velasco, A., et al., *What are the barriers, facilitators and interventions targeting help-seeking behaviours for common mental health problems in adolescents? A systematic review*. BMC psychiatry, 2020. **20**(1): p. 293.
31. Kitchener, B., Jorm, AF, *Mental health first aid training for the public: evaluation of effects on knowledge, attitudes and helping behavior*. BMC Psychiatry, 2002. **2**(10).
32. Aref-Adib, G., McCloud, T., Ross, J., O'Hanlon, P., Appleton, V., Rowe, S., Murray, E., Johnson, S., Lobban, F., *Factors affecting implementation of digital health interventions for people with psychosis or bipolar disorder, and their family and friends: a systematic review*. The Lancet Psychiatry, 2019. **6**(3): p. 257-266.

3. Studies and reports included in the main results.

Table 1A: Qualitative studies and reports included in main results

QUALITATIVE STUDIES							
Study	Country	Population	Sample size and characteristics	Type of self-harm	Type of peer support	Key findings/themes	Perceived risks and mitigation
Boyce, Munn-Giddings & Seckler (2018)	UK	Members of self-harm self-help groups; in-depth semi-structured interviews	<p>N=8</p> <p>Mean age: 46 years</p> <p>Gender: 7 female, 1 male</p> <p>Majority started self-harming as teenagers, with two members starting in late 20s/early 30s</p> <p>4 members were previously inpatients (2 "heard voices", 2 treated for alcohol and drug dependence)</p> <p>1 member said they all suffered from depression in the first group, but the other</p>	Not specified	<p>Type: face to face, group</p> <p>Description: 2 Self-harm self-help group. One of the groups also had a 24-hour crisis support mobile telephone line and held a number of social activities.</p> <p>Sources & recipients of peer support: other members</p>	<p>Five themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members' experiences prior to joining the groups (negative experiences of isolation, stigma and shame) 2. A safe space (view the group as a safe space, shared experiential understanding, peer support felt more heartfelt and genuine) 3. A different approach (group A rejected stigmatising labels, group B resisted completing monitoring outcomes, neither group was focusing on the cessation of self-harm, but more so on "managing a bit better") 4. Alleviation of isolation 5. Learning from others 	None identified

			members didn't explicitly state this				
Brow (2015)	USA	Young adult users of self-injury message boards analysis of text in online injury message boards	N=10 Age: 18-24 years Gender: 8 female, 1 male, 1 genderqueer Ethnicity: 7 White, 2 Latina, 1 African-American Participants began self-harming between the ages of 10 and 20 -9 (90%) participants had seen a counsellor or therapist -5 (50% had seen a therapist -4 (40%) were currently seeing a therapist	NSSI	Type: online Description: self-injury message board (11 of the 13 were moderated) Sources & recipients of peer support: users of the message board	Five themes identified: 1. Feeling less alone 2. Support from people who understand self-injury 3. Access to a community 4. Broads prompting seeking in-person support 5. Increased motivation to recover Perceived effect on self-injury - 0 participants felt their self-injury was made worse (more frequent or severe) -1 (10%) participant reported being triggered to self-harm once (on an unmoderated board) -9 participants (90%) noted positive effects on their level of self-injury, relating to feeling increased support from board members -5 participants (50%) recalled specific instances when their board use prevented self-harm	Risk: Risk of triggering board members Mitigation: Clinicians should check with their clients whether they use these online boards, and if so, whether they have ever been triggered
Corcoran, Mewse &	UK	Women in self-injury	N=7	Not specified	Type: face to face, group	Four themes:	Risks:

Babiker (2007)		support groups; semi-structured interviews	Age: 21-44 years (mean = 36 years) Gender: 100% female Ethnicity: 100% White "All had current contact with professional services regarding self-injury and/or associated difficulties"		Description: 3 city-based support groups Sources & recipients of peer support: group members	1. Belonging 1A) Acceptance 1B) Safety 2. Sharing (sharing experiences) 2A) Perspective 2B) Giving/receiving support 3. Autonomy (a sense of autonomy from leading and running the group themselves) 3A) Direction 3B) Control 4. Positive feeling ("anticipation about the group, improved mood and light-heartedness, particularly in relation to their self-injury") 4A) Friendship 4B) Inspiration (empowerment and self-worth through witnessing and supporting others' struggles and successes)	Members being re-traumatized by others' past experiences or encouraged to self-injure following exposure to alternative methods of self-injury Mitigation: 1. Having a facilitator for the group, particularly a professional "in the background" to help mediate difficult situations (eg, leader burnout, critical/dominant members) 2. Establishment of clear and consistent boundaries 3. Supplementing with additional individual support
----------------	--	---	---	--	---	--	--

						<p>5. Change (participants associated group-membership with change/development)</p> <p>5A) Individual change</p> <p>5B) Interpersonal change</p>	
Haberstroh & Moyer (2012)	USA	<p>Members of an online self-injury recovery group;</p> <p>analysis of free text responses to an online survey</p>	<p>N=17</p> <p>Mean age: 36 years</p> <p>Gender: 17 female, 3 male</p> <p>Ethnicity: 100% White</p> <p>Average duration of self-injuring: 20 years (SD=8)</p>	Not specified	<p>Type: online</p> <p>Description: moderated online self-harm recovery group</p> <p>Sources & recipients of peer support: members of the group</p>	<p>Themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Self-injury as a relationship (self-injury viewed as a friend and a constant companion) 2. Self-injury as emotional expression and comfort (self-injury provided an outlet to express painful feelings) 3. The online group supplemented counselling (participants viewed it as an additional source of support, and referred to poor treatment and stigma from traditional providers) 4. Online group support, connection, and feedback (therapeutic aspects of the group included feeling understood, giving and receiving feedback, and feeling less alone and isolated) <p>Subthemes: Supportive understanding, relational connections, supportive feedback</p> <p>5. Safety and frustration with the no triggering norm (members were asked to refrain from sharing</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1A. The content of the group discussions may be triggering for members 1B. Unmoderated groups may be triggering 2. Potentially triggering for moderators who would have to implement the "no triggering norm". <p>Mitigation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1A. Establishing overt "no triggering norms" (members aren't allowed to share explicitly triggering content such as pictures) to provide structure and safety to the group to avoid triggering members. 1B. Moderating groups 2. Moderators should be people with established

						<p>triggering material, which increased safety in the group but the limitation on communication also caused some members frustration)</p> <p>6. Asynchronous group limitations (delays in communication due to the use of moderated email communication - members felt chat rooms were and could be helpful)</p>	recovery and social support
Lavis & Winter (2020)	UK	Young people, aged who use or have used social media (Twitter, Reddit, Instagram) to engage with self-harm content; analysis of online content	<p>Ethnography: N= N/A</p> <p>Age: estimated to be 10-24 years</p> <p>Gender: not stated</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews: N=10</p> <p>Age: 18+ years</p> <p>Gender: 100% female</p>	Not specified	<p>Type: Online</p> <p>Description: engagement with self-harm content on social media (Instagram, Twitter & Reddit all moderated in different ways)</p> <p>Sources & recipients of peer support: users of the social media platforms</p>	<p>1. From offline to online: motivations for seeking self-harm content on social media</p> <p>-Included content relating to parents and professional support being seen as 'threats', the desire for professional support but lack of accessibility, support from other users on how to get help. A clear motivation is gaining support of other young people with shared experiences.</p> <p>2. Online interactions: giving and receiving peer support</p> <p>3. From online to offline: the value, impact and ambivalence of peer support</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <p>1. Can hinder offline help-seeking</p> <p>2. Users may feel the need to post "increasingly graphic textual or visual content" to sustain peer-support (competitive element, but out of a "desperate dynamic of need")</p> <p>3. Can be burdensome for those listening to others' distress + potentially triggering</p> <p>4. -Can be potentially triggering to those listening to another's distress, and negatively impacts their mental health</p>

						<p>-Very valuable to young people, can potentially save a young person's life during crises.</p> <p>-Can feel like you need to keep showing that you need help</p> <p>-Content on 'how to self-harm safely'</p> <p>-Congratulations when someone resists self-harm</p>	<p>5. Can isolate people and make them think they're the only people who can understand (barrier to seeking offline support)</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <p>1. Online peer-support should include signposting to offline resources.</p>
Murray & Fox (2006)	UK	Members of an online self-harm discussion group; analysis of free text responses to an online survey	<p>N=102</p> <p>Age: 12-47 years (mean = 21.4 years)</p> <p>Gender: 95 female, 6 male, 1 declined to mention</p> <p>Mean age at which they began self-harm = 13.6 years</p>	Not specified	<p>Type: Online, self-harm discussion group</p> <p>Description: moderated self-harm discussion group</p> <p>Sources & recipients of peer support: group members</p>	<p>Responses to closed questions:</p> <p>-42% reported feeling less alone</p> <p>-33% reported feeling understood</p> <p>-31% could not imagine a time when they would not need to use the discussion</p> <p>-41% reported a decrease in self-harm</p> <p>-46% reported no change in self-harm</p> <p>-10% reported an increase in self-harm</p> <p>-48% report being triggered to self-harm by content of posts</p> <p>-47% report never being triggered to self-harm by content of posts</p>	<p>Risks:</p> <p>1. The impact on self-harm may be dependent on the "culture" of the group/forum</p> <p>Mitigation: none identified</p>

						<p>Open ended questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -37% chose to talk online about self-harm to receive support from like-minded people (n=99) -44% believed a decline in self-harm would result in a decrease in discussion group use (n=79) -20% would want to continue membership in order to help others (n=79) -48% believed being a member has reduced their self-harm (n=79) -10% believed being a member has had other positive effects (eg, more self-understanding) (n=79) -32% felt there were no posts that triggered their self-harm (n=74) -11% reported wanting to be triggered (n=74) -45% reported 'friendship' as the reason for using private e-mail rather than the discussion group. 	
Sharkey et al. (2012)	UK	Members of an online self-harm support forum; analysis of online content	N= 77 young people who self-harm; 18 NHS professionals and healthcare students	Not specified	Type: online Description: moderated Self-harm support forum (SharpTalk) developed	Use of mitigation devices/strategies when giving advice online: -Disclaimers/statement of incompetence (eg, "if I'm not wrong"; "unless I'm mistaken")	Risks: none identified Mitigation: Use of mitigation devices as face-work may help

			<p>Age: 16-25 years 61% (n=47) aged <20 years</p> <p>Gender: not stated</p>		<p>with input from young people who have self-harmed</p> <p>Sources of peer support: Other members of SharpTalk (including young people who have self-harmed and professionals)</p> <p>Recipients of peer support: members of SharpTalk</p>	<p>-Hedges (eg, maybe, soft of, somewhat etc.)</p> <p>-Tag questions as indirect advice-giving (eg, ~do you think...?)</p> <p>-Protective line (ie, being polite to avoid conflict)</p>	<p>young people 'do relationships' within the context of the online support group to help to build rapport, minimize imposition and stay online</p>
Smithson et al. (2011)	UK	Members of an online self-harm support forum ; analysis of online forum content	<p>N= 77 young people who have self-harmed; 6 moderators</p> <p>Age & gender: not stated</p>	Not specified	<p>Type: online</p> <p>Description: moderated Self-harm support forum (SharpTalk) developed with input from young people who have self-harmed</p> <p>Sources of peer support: other members of SharpTalk (including young people who have self-</p>	<p>Themes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Becoming members by displaying expectations about ways of discussing self-harm, and about responses and advice 2. Sustaining membership and setting boundaries of membership by shaping site in line with their expectation of how it should operate 3. Boundaries of membership: perceived deviance in posting behaviour and giving of health care advice were most commonly addressed by other users rather moderators 	<p>Risks:</p> <p>Some posters struggled to maintain appropriate boundaries and avoid triggering or responding to triggers from other young people who have self-harmed</p> <p>Mitigation:</p> <p>Understanding the ways of posting and being accepted on a site, how young people achieve membership of an online support forum and feel</p>

					harmed and professionals) Recipients of peer support: members of SharpTalk	4. Feeling accepted and 'belonging' on the forum compared to bigger sites	'belonging' may enable moderators to identify and support vulnerable participants who struggle to display appropriate member behaviour
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

Table 1B: Mixed methods studies and reports included in main results

MIXED METHODS STUDIES								
Study	Country	Population	Sample size and characteristics	Type of self-harm	Types of Peer support	Outcome measures	Key findings	Risks and mitigation
Institute for Research and Development (UTRIP) (2012)	UK, Italy, Slovenia, Denmark	Young people who have self-harmed; online surveys of users of peer support, and professional s involved in self-harm support; analysis of online content; face-to-face interviews, phone interviews, interviews	YouthNet, UK: N=429 Age: 16-25 years Gender: 299 females, 126 males Photofficine, Italy: -Content feedback survey: N=43 -Pre counselling survey: N=94 -Post counselling survey: N=70 -Ongoing group support survey: N=22 -Post group support survey: N=12 Age:12-25 years Gender: -Content feedback survey: 38 females, 5 males	Not specified	Type: online Group chats, online group discussions, Facebook groups Sources & recipients of peer support: other users	N/A	1. Easy and quick access to info -UK: 53% of young people recognised the ease and speed of finding info as a benefit of online services, and 49% recognised the opportunity to access info whenever needed -Italy: 66% of surveyed users recognised that when they had issues they needed help with they received timely assistance, advice and info online 2. Connecting with others Percentage of young people feeling connected to others: -YouthNet (UK): 88% -Photofficine (Italy): 73% -Cyberhus (Denmark): 67%	Risks: 1. Triggering arguments 2. Being asked to help could be overwhelming 3. Young people don't always know how to help Mitigation: 1. Be aware of the potential of triggering, and moderate appropriately 2. Important that the young person offering help/being asked to help is in a safe and emotionally

		<p>by email and by online chats; analysis of search terms used for self-harm support</p>	<p>-Pre counselling survey: 88 females, 12 males -Post counselling survey: 67 females, 3 males -Ongoing group support survey: 21 females, 11 males -Post group support survey: 11 females, 1 male</p> <p>Cyberhus, Denmark: -Content feedback survey: N=40 -Pre group chat survey: N=24 -Post group chat survey: N=24 Age: 12-21 years</p> <p>UTRIP, Slovenia: -Survey for doctors in primary care for CYP: N=129 -Survey for school counsellors, P.E. teachers, social workers, doctors and nurses: N=294 -Survey for young people who have self-harmed and their peers: N=92 Age: 16-25 years Gender: UTRIP, Slovenia: -Survey for doctors in primary care for CYP: N/A -Survey for school counsellors, P.E. teachers, social workers, doctors</p>			<p>Percentage of young people feeling supported by services offered:</p> <p>A) People behind the service listened, took me seriously and cared about my problem: -YouthNet (UK): 75% -Photofficine (Italy): 60% -Cyberhus (Denmark): 60%</p> <p>B) People using the service listened, took me seriously and cared about my problem: -YouthNet (UK): 72% -Photofficine (Italy): N/A -Cyberhus (Denmark): 65%</p> <p>3. Safe anonymous space Percentage of young people feeling the organisation is a place to share their experiences: -YouthNet (UK): 89% -Photofficine (Italy): 71% -Cyberhus (Denmark): 66%</p>	<p>strong space themselves 3. In some cases, there is a need for professional input</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	---	--

			and nurses: 256 females, 38 males -Survey for young people who have self-harmed and their peers: 76 females, 16 males					
Whitlock et al. (2006)	USA	Users of an online self-harm message board ; analysis of online content on message boards	N = not stated Age: Site A: 18.7 (12-44) years; Site B: 18.3 (13-54) years; Site C: 19.4 (14-47) years; Site D: 17.6 (12-37) years; Site E: 17.5 (14-22) years; Site F: 19.6 (14-36) years; Site G: 20.5 (16-47) years; Site H: 18.1 (14-28) years; Site I: 23.9 (15-46) years; Site J: 16.4 (13-26) years	Not specified	Type: online Description: moderated message boards and individual posts. Message boards varied in moderated from high (content blocked if triggering or graphic) to medium moderation (labelled as trigger). Focused on low to medium moderation Sources & recipients of peer support: other users	Message board analysis: date of establishment, number of active and inactive members, percentage of posters with blogs, co-listing with message boards of other behaviours	Quantitative -Discouraging disclosure correlated with sharing techniques and seeking advice on stopping. -Seeking advice on stopping correlated with offers of informal support Suggesting formal treatment correlated with offering informal support and encouraging disclosure Qualitative: 11 themes identified: informal support and exchange, motivation for self-injury, concealment of self-injury behaviour eg, anxiety about exposure, methods for concealment of cuts and scars, addiction language (eg, days of self-injury free, difficulty stopping), formal help-seeking and treatment , sharing techniques, links to other mental health or behavioural conditions known to be associated with self-injurious behaviour, references to popular	Risks: -There was a positive correlation between discussion of technique sharing with negative attitudes towards disclosure. -Negative attitudes towards formal and informal help-seeking may reduce the use of alternative ways of coping Participation in self-injury message boards may expose adolescents to a culture where self-injury is normalised and encouraged such as concealing self-injurious behaviours and sharing of techniques.

							culture, perceptions of non-self-injurers reactions to self-injurious behaviour, perception of self and behaviour (eg, self-worth, lovability, dissociation) and venting or apologising.	-Adolescents' drive to belong a group may lead to self-injurious behaviours.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Supplementary material

1. Search Strategies

1A. MEDLINE

1. self-injurious behavior/ or self mutilation/ (11249)
2. (parasuicide or "suicidal self-injur" or "suicidal self?injur*" or SSI or "self-injurious behavi*" or "self?injurious behavi*" or "suicidal behavi*" or automutilation or auto-mutilation or "auto?mutilation" or self-mutilation or "self?mutilation" or "self-inflicted wound*" or "self?inflicted wound*" or "self-inflicted injur*" or "self?inflicted injur*" or "non-suicidal self-injur*" or "non-suicidal self? injur*" or NSSI).tw. (21766)
3. (self-harm* or "self?harm*" or self-injur* or "self?injur*" or self-destruct* or "self?destruct*" or self-poison* or "self?poison*" or self-immolat* or "self?immolat*" or self-inflict* or "self?inflict*" or auto-destruct* or "auto?destruct*" or (self adj2 cut*) or cut*).tw. (439664)
4. 1 or 2 or 3 (459740)
5. peer group/ or Social support/ or Self-help groups/ or Education, Nonprofessional/ or Psychosocial support systems/ or Community networks/ (105183)
6. (((peer* or support* or volunteer* or "lived experience" or "service user*" or community or lay or mutual) adj2 (group* or network* or communit* or relation* or support* or listen* or help* or visit* or aid*)) or ((social or community) adj3 (support or network* or group*)) or ((peer* or lay or volunteer *) adj (based or counsel* or deliver* or interact* or led or mediat* or operat* or provid* or run*)) or "peer support" or peer-to-peer or "peer?to?peer" or peer* or "social interaction program*" or befriend*).tw. (2147753)
7. (((lay or peer) adj2 (advisor* or consultant* or educator* or expert* or facilitator* or instructor* or leader* or person* or tutor* or worker* or advice* or advise* or counsel* or mentor*)) or "expert patient").tw. (6624)
8. 5 or 6 or 7 (2181210)
9. ("facebook" or e-mail or e-support or "e-bulletin board" or e-society or e-community or forum or "discussion group" or "message board" or "internet relay" or "instant?messaging" or "chat technology" or "chat room" or chatroom or chatgroup or "chat group" or ((virtual or internet or online or web-based or "web?based" or internet-based or "internet?based") adj2 (support or network or group or society or community or interaction or "bulletin board"))).tw. (30668)
10. (helpline or "help?line" or ((phone* or telephone*) adj3 (help* or instruct* or interact* or mediat* or program* or rehab* or strateg* or support* or teach* or train* or workshop* or based or assist* or driven or led))).tw. (11366)
11. 9 or 10 (41824)
12. 1 ("peer?support" or peer-support or "self?help" or self-help or "social support" or "support group" or "support network" or "support system").tw. (62443)
13. 11 and 12 (2371)
14. 8 or 13 (2181336)
15. 4 and 14 (36840)
16. limit 15 to (english language and humans and yr="2000 -Current") (19899)

1B. PsycINFO

1. self-injurious behavior/ or self mutilation/

2. (parasuicide or "suicidal self-injur" or "suicidal self?injur*" or SSI or "self-injurious behavi*" or "self?injurious behavi*" or "suicidal behavi*" or automutilation or auto-mutilation or "auto?mutilation" or self-mutilation or "self?mutilation" or "self-inflicted wound*" or "self?inflicted wound*" or "self-inflicted injur*" or "self?inflicted injur*" or "non-suicidal self-injur*" or "non-suicidal self? injur*" or NSSI).tw. (17882)
3. (self-harm* or "self?harm*" or self-injur* or "self?injur*" or self-destruct* or "self?destruct*" or self-poison* or "self?poison*" or self-immolat* or "self?immolat*" or self-inflict* or "self?inflict*" or auto-destruct* or "auto?destruct*" or (self adj2 cut*) or cut*).tw. (58008)
4. 1 or 2 or 3 (69788)
5. peer group/ or Social support/ or Self-help groups/ or Education, Nonprofessional/ or Psychosocial support systems/ or Community networks/ (37486)
6. (((peer* or support* or volunteer* or "lived experience" or "service user*" or community or lay or mutual) adj2 (group* or network* or communit* or relation* or support* or listen* or help* or visit* or aid*)) or ((social or community) adj3 (support or network* or group*)) or ((peer* or lay or volunteer *) adj (based or counsel* or deliver* or interact* or led or mediat* or operat* or provid* or run*)) or "peer support" or peer-to-peer or "peer?to?peer" or peer* or "social interaction program*" or befriend*).tw. (998301)
7. (((lay or peer) adj2 (advisor* or consultant* or educator* or expert* or facilitator* or instructor* or leader* or person* or tutor* or worker* or advice* or advise* or counsel* or mentor*)) or "expert patient*").tw. (7396)
8. 5 or 6 or 7 (1000384)
9. ("facebook" or e-mail or e-support or "e-bulletin board" or e-society or e-community or forum or "discussion group" or "message board" or "internet relay" or "instant?messaging" or "chat technology" or "chat room" or chatroom or chatgroup or "chat group" or ((virtual or internet or online or web-based or "web?based" or internet-based or "internet?based") adj2 (support or network or group or society or community or interaction or "bulletin board"))).tw. (24369)
10. (helpline or "help?line" or ((phone* or telephone*) adj3 (help* or instruct* or interact* or mediat* or program* or rehab* or strateg* or support* or teach* or train* or workshop* or based or assist* or driven or led))).tw. (6334)
11. 9 or 10 (30591)
12. ("peer?support" or peer-support or "self?help" or self-help or "social support" or "support group" or "support network" or "support system").tw. (71602)
13. 11 and 12 (2310)
14. 8 or 13 (1000529)
15. 4 and 14 (15315)
16. limit 15 to (human and english language and yr="2000 -Current") (11768)

1C. Open Grey

- Self injury and social support
- self injury and self help groups
- self injury and psychosocial support
- self injury and community networks

- self harm AND peer group
- self harm AND social support
- Self harm and self help group
- Self harm and lived experience
- self harm and volunteer
- Self harm and lay expert
- suicidal self injury and peer support
- suicidal self injury and social support
- non- suicidal self injury and social support
- non- suicidal self injury and peer support
- NSSI and social support
- NSSI and peer support
- parasuicide and support group
- parasuicide and peer group
- parasuicide and peer support
- self injury and volunteer
- self injury and lay expert
- Self mutilation and peer group
- Self injurious and 'peer group'

2. Websites searched and organisations contacted for grey literature search

- We Are with You (formerly known as Addaction)
- Mind
- Mental Health Foundation
- Rethink Mental Illness
- Time to Change
- Together for Mental Wellbeing
- Harmless
- Young Minds
- Agenda
- Beat
- Anorexia, Bulimia and Care (ABC)
- Overeaters Anonymous
- Alcoholics Anonymous
- Narcotics Anonymous
- Frank

3. Quality Appraisal

Table 3A: Quality appraisal of qualitative studies using the Critical Appraisals Skill Programme (CASP) Qualitative Checklist

Study	Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?	Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?	Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?	Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?	Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?	Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?	Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?	Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?	Is there a clear statement of findings?	How valuable is the research?	Score out of 10
Boyce, Munn-Giddings & Seckler (2018)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Valuable	8
Brow (2015)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	9
Corcoran, Mewse & Babiker (2007)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	9
Haberstroh & Moyer (2012)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	9
Lavis & Winter (2020)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Valuable	8
Murray & Fox (2006)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	8
Sharkey et al. (2012)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	9
Smithson et al. (2011)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Valuable	9

Table 3B: Quality appraisal of mixed methods studies using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)

Study	Qualitative					Quantitative					Mixed Methods					Score out of 15
	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.5	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.5	5.1	5.2	5.3	5.4	5.5	
Whitlock et al. (2006)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	Can't tell	Can't tell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Can't tell	11

Table 3C: Quality appraisal of reports not presented as primary research studies using NESTA's Standards of Evidence

Study	Level 1: Have they described what positive difference this innovation is going to make?	Level 2: Is there data that shows the positive difference can be measured?	Level 3: Have they proved that the positive difference is because of the innovation (by testing with comparison groups)?	Level 4: Have other people proved the same thing?	Level 5: Can this innovation be replicated elsewhere?	Levels achieved
Institute for Research and Development "UTRIP" (2012)	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	2

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2-3
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	7-9
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	6
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	47-50
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	8
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	8-9
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	9
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	8-9
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	9-10
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	9-10
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	9-10
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	n/a

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	n/a
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	n/a
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	12
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	34-45
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	51-52
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	n/a
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	14-18
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	n/a
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	n/a
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	n/a
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	n/a
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	19-20
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	22-24
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	22-24
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	24-26

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	5
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	30
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	30
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	