

Modeling suicide mortality in US counties using population socioeconomic indicators

Sasikiran Kandula*¹, Gonzalo Martinez-Alés²⁻⁵, Caroline Rutherford², Catherine Gimbrone², Mark Olfson^{2,6}, Madelyn S. Gould^{2,6}, Katherine M. Keyes², Jeffrey Shaman¹

¹ Department of Environmental Health Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY. 10032.

² Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University, New York, NY. 10032.

³ CAUSALab, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA. 02115.

⁴ Mental Health Network Biomedical Research Center (CIBERSAM), Madrid, Spain

⁵ Mental Health Research Group, Hospital La Paz Institute for Health Research (IdiPAZ), Madrid, Spain

⁶ Department of Psychiatry, Columbia University, New York, NY. 10032.

Corresponding author:

S. Kandula

722 West 168th Street, 1104,

Environmental Health Sciences/MSPH,

New York, NY. 10032.

Email: sk3542@cumc.columbia.edu

Keywords: mental health; suicide; public health surveillance; socioeconomic determinants; spatiotemporal models;

1 **Abstract**

2 Background: Suicide is one of the leading causes of death in the United States and population risk
3 prediction models can inform the type, location, and timing of public health interventions. Here, we
4 report the development of a prediction model of suicide risk using population characteristics.

5 Methods: All suicide deaths reported to the Nation Vital Statistics System between 2005-2019 were
6 identified, and age, sex, race, and county-of-residence of the decedents were extracted to calculate
7 baseline risk. County-wise annual measures of socioeconomic predictors of suicide risk —
8 unemployment, weekly wage, poverty prevalence, median household income, and population density
9 — along with two state-wise measures of prevalence of major depressive disorder and firearm
10 ownership were compiled from public sources. Conditional autoregressive (CAR) models, which
11 account for spatiotemporal autocorrelation in response and predictors, were used to estimate
12 county-level risk.

13 Results: Estimates derived from CAR models were more accurate than from models not adjusted for
14 spatiotemporal autocorrelation. Inclusion of suicide risk/protective covariates further reduced
15 errors. Suicide risk was estimated to increase with each standard deviation increase in firearm
16 ownership (2.8%), prevalence of major depressive episode (1%) and unemployment (2.8%).
17 Conversely, risk was estimated to decrease by 4.3% for each standard deviation increase in both
18 median household income and population density. Increased heterogeneity of risk across counties
19 was also noted.

20 Conclusions: Area-level characteristics and the CAR model structure can estimate population-level
21 suicide risk and thus inform decisions on resource allocation and focused interventions during
22 outbreaks.

23 **Introduction**

24 Suicide rates in the United States have increased by over 30% during the last two decades, with
25 suicide ranking among the ten most common causes of death for this period (1, 2). Along with drug
26 overdoses and alcohol use related mortality, which have also seen large concurrent increases,
27 suicides are responsible for the recent decrease in overall life expectancy in the US (3). Reducing
28 suicide deaths is therefore an urgent public health challenge, and methods to predict suicide risk can
29 be vital for determining optimal allocation of suicide prevention resources.

30 To date, models to predict suicide risk have largely been at the individual-level, using patient
31 demographic characteristics and clinical history to estimate patient risk (4). Some of these models
32 have been deployed operationally to screen patients (5), with evidence suggesting their wider
33 adoption can be hastened through improvements in predictive ability (6-8). In contrast to individual-
34 level models, population-level risk models have been less frequently attempted despite strong
35 motivating factors in their favor including evidence of efficacy of population-level suicide prevention
36 interventions, such as restrictions on access to lethal means (9-12). Population-level models can
37 complement individual-level models as they can inform decisions on the type, location and timing of
38 public health interventions, and provide valuable counterparts to clinical case management. In
39 addition, when variables providing situational awareness, such as calls to crisis hotline services or
40 posts to social media sites are also included in these models, near real-time changes in population
41 risk can be detected, thus aiding the deployment of timely and responsive interventions. Similarly,
42 geographically well-resolved risk estimates, can support deployment of more targeted interventions.

43 Risk factors for suicide have been extensively studied and include demographic characteristics such
44 as age, race/ethnicity, sex, socioeconomic status (SES)(13-18) and mental health history (19, 20).
45 Studies assessing the effect sizes of a combination of these characteristics, however, are relatively
46 fewer. Meta-analyses of reported effect sizes have found considerable heterogeneity (21).
47 Differences also exist in population-level association studies of suicide rates and risk factors (22, 23).
48 While understanding the direction and magnitude of effects is essential, here our focus is to build on
49 known associations to predict future suicide risk.

50 In this report, we describe the development of a predictive model for county level suicide risk in the
51 US using area-level characteristics. A critical consideration when building such population-level
52 models is the presence of spatiotemporal autocorrelation in the outcome and predictors. Inadequate
53 accounting for this phenomenon, whereby proximate areal units during close time periods are likely

54 to have similar observations compared to those more distant in space and time, can lead to incorrect
55 assumptions of independence and thereby to erroneous interpretations of effects.

56 With deaths by suicide, spatial autocorrelation can indicate an underlying spatially correlated risk
57 factor or a form of neighborhood effect, whereas temporal autocorrelation can be due to the same
58 population being observed in adjacent periods, subject to the same long-term socioeconomic (SES)
59 and environmental stressors. Furthermore, suicidal behavior has been described with contagion
60 hypotheses and theories (24, 25). For example, acts of intentional self-harm that are directly and
61 causally related to each other in suicide clusters, outbreaks immediately following sensationalistic
62 media reporting of high-profile deaths by suicide (26-28), or fictional depictions of suicide (29, 30)
63 can be seen as a contagious process (31) and lead to spatial and temporal autocorrelation (32).

64 Here, we model area-level risk of suicides with spatiotemporal extensions of conditional
65 autoregressive (CAR) models, a family of Bayesian inference models commonly used in case of
66 unmeasured spatial autocorrelation (33, 34). Comprehensive reviews of these methods are available
67 elsewhere (35, 36). The CAR model form used in this study is an ANOVA-style decomposition of the
68 variation in disease risk into separate sets of spatial random effects, temporal random effects and
69 independent space-time interactions (henceforth CAR-ANOVA).

70 Our overall objective was to develop and evaluate the feasibility of a model for suicide risk in US
71 counties while accounting for spatiotemporal autocorrelation in predictors and outcome. The model
72 thus built was used to:

- 73 • Quantify the effect estimates of SES covariates on suicide risk;
- 74 • Quantify annual national suicide risk in the US and changes in heterogeneity of county-level
75 risk during years 2005-2016; and
- 76 • Assess the accuracy in predicting yearly county-level suicide mortality risk and measure
77 improvements relative to commonsense baseline risk estimates.

78

79 **Materials and Methods**

80 We used a variety of public data sources for estimates of area-level suicide mortality risk factors.
 81 Detailed mortality records were obtained through a request to the National Center for Health
 82 Statistics. The explanatory variables are briefly described here and in Table 1 (see Appendix Text 1
 83 for additional details).

- 84 • *Proportion of population living in poverty and median household Income:* Annual county-level
 85 measures of poverty prevalence and median household income as estimated by the US Census
 86 Bureau's Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates (SAIPE) program (37).
- 87 • *State prevalence of major depressive episodes:* Estimates of the proportion of population in a
 88 state with at least one major depressive episode during the previous year as available in the
 89 National Surveys on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) dataset (38). As data at county resolution
 90 were not available, prevalence was assumed to be the same in all counties in a state.
- 91 • *State prevalence of firearm-owning households:* Annual estimates of the proportion of adults
 92 who live in a household with firearms for each state in the US, provided by the RAND's
 93 Household Firearm Ownership Database(39). Ownership rates were assumed to be the same
 94 in all counties in a state.
- 95 • *Average weekly wage:* County-level estimates of annual average weekly wage across all
 96 industries as reported to the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages program (40) of
 97 the US Bureau of Labor.
- 98 • *Unemployment rate:* County-level estimates of unemployment estimated from standard
 99 surveys state unemployment insurance systems by the Labor and Unemployment
 100 Statistics(41) program of the US Bureau of Labor.
- 101 • *Population Density:* Annual county-level population density estimated from intercensal and
 102 postcensal population estimates and county land area (42).

103 *Suicide Mortality (outcome)*

104 Records of all-cause deaths were obtained from the US National Vital Statistics System (43). Deaths
 105 resulting from suicide were identified using *International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision*
 106 underlying cause-of-death codes X60-X84, Y87.0, and U03(44). County estimates for total population
 107 and population stratified by age and gender were obtained from the Bridged-Race Intercensal (2005-
 108 2009)(45) and Postcensal (2011-2019) (46) datasets and used to calculate annual, county-level
 109 suicide mortality risk.

110 *Conditional Autoregressive (CAR) Models*

111 A CAR model under Poisson distribution assumption is specified as:

112
$$y_{ct} \sim \text{Poisson}(\mu_{ct}\theta_{ct})$$

113
$$\ln(\theta_{ct}) = \beta_0 + \mathbf{x}_{ct}^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \psi_{ct}$$

114
$$\boldsymbol{\beta} \sim N(\mu_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

115 where y_{ct} denotes observed count of suicide deaths in county c during year t , μ_{ct} is the expected
 116 suicide deaths in county c in year t and θ_{ct} is the risk relative to μ_{ct} (see Appendix Text 2). $\mathbf{x}_{ct} =$
 117 $(x_{ct1} \dots x_{ctp})$ is a vector of p covariates for county c during year t , with $c = 1, \dots, C$ for the C counties
 118 in the US and $t = 1, \dots, N$, for N years in the study period; $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1 \dots \beta_p)$ is the vector of covariate
 119 regression parameters whose Gaussian prior is defined by mean $\mu_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and diagonal variance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.
 120 ψ_{ct} a latent component encompassing one or more sets of spatiotemporally autocorrelated random
 121 effects. The CAR-ANOVA(47) model decomposes spatiotemporal variation, ψ_{ct} , into an overall spatial
 122 effect across the study period ($\boldsymbol{\phi}$), an overall temporal trend over the study area ($\boldsymbol{\delta}$), and a set of
 123 independent space-time interactions ($\boldsymbol{\gamma}$); $\boldsymbol{\phi} = (\phi_1 \dots \phi_C)$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1 \dots \delta_N)$ are modeled by the
 124 CAR prior proposed by Leroux and others (34).

125
$$\psi_{ct} = \phi_c + \delta_t + \gamma_{ct}$$

126
$$\gamma_{ct} \sim N(0, \tau_I^2)$$

127
$$\phi_c | \boldsymbol{\phi}_{-c}, \mathbf{W} \sim N\left(\frac{\rho_S \sum_{j=1}^C w_{cj} \phi_j}{\rho_S \sum_{j=1}^C w_{cj} + 1 - \rho_S}, \frac{\tau_S^2}{\rho_S \sum_{j=1}^C w_{cj} + 1 - \rho_S}\right)$$

128
$$\delta_t | \boldsymbol{\delta}_{-t}, \mathbf{D} \sim N\left(\frac{\rho_T \sum_{j=1}^N d_{tj} \delta_j}{\rho_T \sum_{j=1}^N d_{tj} + 1 - \rho_T}, \frac{\tau_T^2}{\rho_T \sum_{j=1}^N d_{tj} + 1 - \rho_T}\right)$$

129
$$\tau_S^2, \tau_T^2, \tau_I^2 \sim \text{Inverse - Gamma}(a, b)$$

130
$$\rho_S, \rho_T \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$$

131 Here, \mathbf{W} is the $C \times C$ spatial adjacency matrix, with $w_{cd} = 1$ if counties c and d are adjacent to each other
 132 and 0 otherwise (counties are adjacent if they share at least one boundary point in the shape file; a
 133 county is not adjacent to itself). Analogously, \mathbf{D} is the $N \times N$ temporal adjacency matrix, with $d_{ij} = 1$ if
 134 $|t - j| = 1$ (i.e. consecutive years) and 0 otherwise. The priors for the spatial (τ_S^2), temporal (τ_T^2) and
 135 space-time interaction (τ_I^2) random effects variances are specified by an Inverse-Gamma distribution
 136 with $a=1$ and $b=0.01$; spatial (ρ_S) and temporal (ρ_T) dependence parameters have uniform priors in
 137 the unit interval (1 indicates strong dependence; 0 independence).

138 The models were fit in a Bayesian setting using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations. Parameters
139 whose full conditional distributions have a closed form distribution are Gibbs sampled and the rest
140 are updated using the Metropolis adjusted Langevin algorithm (48). For each model, three Markov
141 chains each 110,000 in length with a burn-in of 10,000 were generated and a thinning factor of 1,000
142 was applied to remove correlation among the samples (49-51). Convergence was verified with the
143 Geweke diagnostic statistic (52). Implementations of the methods are per CARBayesST package (53,
144 54) in R (55).

145 *Statistical Analysis and Evaluation*

146 To ascertain that methods that explicitly accommodate spatiotemporal autocorrelation are
147 necessary, we initially built Poisson log-linear models and verified the presence of autocorrelation in
148 their residuals using the Moran's I statistic (56). Further, in the interest of model parsimony, to
149 identify variables with marginal contribution to model quality, we built log-linear models with all
150 possible combinations of predictors considered ($2^7 - 1$) and compared their goodness-of-fit (Akaike
151 Information Criterion (AIC)) against that of a model built using all available predictors. A model with
152 a subset of 5 predictors (excluding weekly wage, unemployment rate, and depression prevalence
153 variables) was found to have an AIC very close to the full model.

154 Subsequently, we built CAR-ANOVA models with: i) the *full* set of predictors; ii) the *select* subset of
155 predictors; and iii) no covariates i.e. a *null* model, to measure the predictive skill from accounting for
156 autocorrelation alone. In addition, a *reference* model, with the expected deaths in a county estimated
157 from differential risk by age, race, and sex of the county's population was also used (see Appendix
158 Text 2). This model did not capture spatial patterns or temporal trends in suicide mortality and
159 provides a benchmark estimate to assess improvements from CAR models. The *select* model is our
160 primary model in this study and all reported findings, unless otherwise stated, are based on its
161 estimates.

162 To estimate yearly risk over the study period, we computed average risk across all counties for each
163 MCMC sample, and report median and 95% interval ranges over all samples. Estimates of yearly
164 county-specific risk are median over all samples' estimates for the specific year and county.

165 Outcome and predictor data overlap for the years 2005-2016. We defined this as our study period,
166 and all models were trained on data for these years. As mortality outcome data and most of the
167 predictors are available for three additional years (2017-2019), we use these surplus years' data to
168 calculate the out-of-sample (OOS) predictive model skill, by assuming unavailable predictors remain
169 unchanged since their last known values. For temporal OOS validation, risk for a given year is

170 predicted with models fit using data up to, but not including, the given year. For spatial OOS validation
 171 we used 10-fold cross validation: partitioned the counties into ten roughly equal folds, trained the
 172 models 10 times with one partition of the counties withheld in each iteration, and used the fit models
 173 to predict risk in holdout counties. We compared the model errors over the fit period (2005-2016)
 174 and under the two OOS settings, temporal (2017-2019) and spatial.

175 Errors were calculated using the symmetric proportional error (SPE), $spe_{ct} = \frac{y_{ct} - \hat{y}_{ct}}{y_{ct} + \hat{y}_{ct}}$, where y_{ct} and
 176 \hat{y}_{ct} denote observed and predicted deaths, respectively. SPE has a well-defined range and indicates
 177 the direction of the error. A division-by-zero issue was avoided by imposing a small lower bound on
 178 \hat{y} . An aggregate measure of SPE, the Mean SPE (MSPE), was used to compare model accuracy on both
 179 in-sample and OOS predictions. The mean in-sample error for a model was calculated as
 180 $\frac{1}{|T_1|C} \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{t \in T_1} |spe_{ct}|$, $T_1 = \{2005, \dots, 2016\}$, the mean temporal OOS error as
 181 $\frac{1}{|T_2|C} \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{t \in T_2} |spe_{ct}|$, $T_2 = \{2017, \dots, 2019\}$, and spatial OOS error as
 182 $\frac{1}{|T_1 \cup T_2|C} \sum_{h=1}^{10} \sum_{c \in C_h} \sum_{t \in T_1 \cup T_2} |spe_{ct}|$, where C_h denotes counties held out in fold h . Wilcoxon signed
 183 rank test was used to assess statistical significance in the difference of errors for each pair of model
 184 forms (57).

185 Results

186 Figure 1 shows the median and 95% credible interval of the posterior effect estimates for each
 187 standard deviation change in predictor value (see Appendix Table 1 for values). Suicide mortality
 188 risk is 2.8% higher for each 11% increase in state's firearm ownership rate and by 1% for each 0.7%
 189 increase in prevalence of major depressive disorder in the state. Conversely, risk was lower by 4.3%
 190 for each \$12,000 increase in annual median household income in the county, and by 4.3% for each
 191 5.8 increase in population per square mile in the county (see Appendix Table 2 for effect estimates
 192 per unit change in predictor value). A not statistically significant decrease of 0.3% for each \$162 of
 193 weekly wage was also estimated.

194 The protective effect of poverty seen in the *full* model (lower by 3.4% for each 6.4% increase in
 195 poverty prevalence in the county) needs more careful examination and interpretation, ideally in
 196 conjunction with measures of rurality, societal fragmentation and poverty persistence (58, 59) and
 197 interactions with other predictors in the model. The findings are not anomalous however, as previous
 198 studies have reported mixed associations between poverty prevalence and suicide rates at the
 199 population-level, with results varying by study design including geographical resolution and

200 population strata analyzed (22). At the individual-level, however, the negative impact of poverty on
 201 suicide rates is more consistent across studies (60, 61).

202 Overall, the effect estimates of the variables in the *select* model remained largely unchanged when
 203 additional covariates were introduced i.e. in the *full* model (Figure 1A). Both the *select* and *full* models
 204 also detected strong spatial dependence ($\rho_S = 0.97$) and temporal dependence ($\rho_T = 0.91$)
 205 (Appendix Table 2).

206 ***Heterogeneity in suicide risk***

207 The model's estimate of annual average suicide risk nationally showed a clear increasing trend from
 208 1 in 2005 to 1.27 in 2016, with smaller increases in 2009, immediately after the onset of the 2008
 209 recession, and in 2013 (Figure 1B). This trend is consistent with increases in mortality rates reported
 210 by multiple studies for the US overall and in almost all demographic groups (1).

211 Results also showed an increase in the heterogeneity in county-specific suicide risk during the study
 212 period (Figure 1C), indicative of a widening gap between low-risk counties and high-risk counties.
 213 Neither trend estimate was found to be sensitive to the set of covariates included in the model
 214 (Appendix Figure 2). Although beyond the scope of our current analysis, these county-specific risk
 215 estimates can help categorize counties — for example, counties with relatively stable risk especially
 216 those that remained in the highest or lowest deciles, or counties that experienced the largest year-
 217 to-year changes — and hence help identify areas in greater need of preventive resources, or
 218 conversely identify areas where interventions appear to be effective.

219 ***Comparison of model errors***

220 Figure 2 shows that the *select* model's predictive ability was comparable to that of the *full* model,
 221 with in-sample errors of *select* smaller than *full*, spatial OOS errors larger and temporal OOS not
 222 significantly different ($p = 0.46$). This finding implies that two of the covariates did not contribute to
 223 model quality in the presence of the other predictors, possibly due to collinearities, yielding a more
 224 parsimonious model dependent on fewer data sources.

225 Both the *select* and *full* models had lower error than the *null* model in all three settings (fit, temporal
 226 and spatial OOS) and the differences were statistically significant ($p < .05$), indicating that the
 227 inclusion of covariates improves the model over what is gained by accounting for spatiotemporal
 228 autocorrelation in suicide mortality alone. Furthermore, all three CAR-ANOVA models had lower
 229 errors than the *reference* model, indicating an improved predictive ability from including
 230 spatiotemporal associations. Errors from the *reference* model were 7%-14% larger than errors from

231 the *null* model (Appendix Figure 3), suggesting that the CAR-ANOVA models could be of value even
232 in settings where SES predictors of suicide mortality are not available.

233 Geweke and Gelman-Rubin diagnostic tests (Appendix Table 3) and visual inspection of trace plots
234 (Appendix Figure 4) indicated model convergence. Scatter plot of predicted suicide deaths against
235 observed deaths in the temporal OOS period, showed possible overprediction at lower counts
236 (Appendix Figure 5) but otherwise reasonable estimates.

237 ***Autocorrelation in residuals***

238 As a primary motivation for the use of the CAR models was to account for spatiotemporal
239 autocorrelation, to test whether the CAR model form was adequate to capture autocorrelation, we
240 looked for autocorrelation in models' residuals. A visual inspection of the spatial distribution of in-
241 sample (Figure 3) and temporal OOS residuals (Figure 4, bottom row) showed no clear spatial
242 structure. Formal Moran's I test found no statistically significant spatial autocorrelation in spatial
243 OOS setting for any year; however, for a majority of the years in both in-sample and temporal OOS
244 settings significant autocorrelation was detected ($p < .05$). Reassuringly however, the magnitude of
245 the autocorrelation with the CAR-ANOVA models, was considerably lower than the *reference*
246 (Appendix Figure 6).

247 This reduction but not elimination of spatial autocorrelation could be indicative of the insufficiency
248 of the specific CAR model form used and/or of the covariates considered. In addition, two of the
249 predictors — prevalence of major depressive episode and firearm ownership — were only available
250 at state-wise resolution, a shortcoming addressed by assuming all counties in a state to have identical
251 values, which may have contributed to an increase in residual spatial autocorrelation.

252 **Discussion**

253 Prediction models of suicide typically only consider clinical characteristics in high-risk clinical
254 population and general population settings, yet suicide risk is also spatially and temporally
255 determined. Our results demonstrate that predictions of suicide death are improved when aspects of
256 the social environment are used to model risk, and thus aid suicide prevention efforts. Absence of
257 evidence of over-fitting in out-of-sample validation lends confidence to future risk estimates with
258 these models.

259 Given that the primary objective of this study was an evaluation of the feasibility of a predictive
260 model, the covariates considered are not exhaustive. A more comprehensive review of domain
261 literature can help identify a more robust set of predictors not collinear with the predictors

262 considered (62). Additional stratifications of the current predictors or other SES indicators, such as
263 measures of social cohesion, access to healthcare, unemployment rates in specific sectors of the
264 economy, as well as prevalence of depression stratified by age, prescription rates for antidepressant
265 and pain management medications and housing quality (crowded living conditions, access to green
266 spaces, ambient vehicular noise) could also be tested. When used at sub-national scales by a state or
267 local public health agency, additional predictors of local relevance that do not have national coverage
268 may also be viable.

269 The predictions from the models presented here are at annual resolution and hence not responsive
270 to real-time changes in risk. While the model structure does not preclude generation of weekly or
271 monthly risk estimates, a barrier to such an operational deployment is the paucity of reliable, timely
272 measures of suicidal activity (thoughts or attempts). Identification of sources for near real-time
273 situational data, and development of nowcast models to translate data feeds into measures of suicidal
274 ideation in the community, could significantly aid the translation of the models discussed here into a
275 surveillance setting.

276 One potentially good source of information on ideation is the volume of calls to crisis hotline centers.
277 With the forthcoming launch of a national suicide prevention number (9-8-8) in mid-2022, a unified
278 system with wide coverage is at hand. Similarly, with the deployment of the National Emergency
279 Medical Services Information System (NEMSIS), timely information on EMS requests is also available
280 (63, 64). Aggregate event data at county resolution from these and/or similar sources, if made
281 publicly available every week, could support the development of nowcast systems. Such models are
282 in use in numerical weather prediction (65, 66), macroeconomic analyses (67, 68) and influenza
283 surveillance (69-71), among other domains.

284 Indicators of suicidal crisis or ideation may also be inferred from posts to thematically-related social
285 media sites (72-76), queries on search engines (77) or access logs to suicide prevention forums and
286 related websites. Sources of ideation among teens and young adults, among whom suicide is in the
287 top 3 common causes of death, could be particularly valuable (78). Coupled with such measures of
288 situational awareness, the CAR models might flag anomalous changes in population-level suicide risk,
289 and thus inform decisions on resource allocation and focused interventions during ongoing
290 outbreaks. Reducing suicide deaths, alongside unintentional drug overdose deaths, may prove
291 critical to public health efforts aimed at reversing declines in life expectancy in the US.

292 Limitations of the study include *ad hoc* independent variable selection, the assumption of
293 geographical homogeneity for predictors lacking county-level data, a potentially simplistic spatial

294 adjacency matrix that did not reflect population mobility and mixing, inflated error estimates in zero-
295 death counties (see Appendix Text 3), and potential underestimates of suicide deaths and risk in
296 certain racial/ethnic groups due to inconsistent suicide certification practices (79).

297 **Acknowledgements**

298 This work is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health (R01-MH121410) to
299 Keyes and Shaman. The funder had no role in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of
300 data; writing the report; and the decision to submit for publication.

301

302 **Financial Competing Interest**

303 Keyes and Rutherford have been compensated for expert witness work in litigation; Shaman and
304 Columbia University declare partial ownership of SK Analytics; Shaman was a consultant for BNI;
305 Kandula was a consultant for SK Analytics. Martinez-Alés, Gimbrone, Gould and Olfson have no
306 disclosures.

307

308 **Data/code sharing statement**

309 All statistical code used to run the models and perform analysis can be shared. Covariates were
310 gathered from public datasets and references to the primary sources have been provided. Mortality
311 data was acquired under a restricted use agreement that does not allow sharing data publicly.

312

313 **Author Contributions**

314 Designed research: Keyes, Shaman, Kandula

315 Performed research: all authors

316 Analyzed data and developed tools: Gimbrone, Rutherford, Kandula

317 Wrote the paper: (initial draft) Martinez-Alés, Kandula; (revision) all authors

318 **References**

- 319 1. Hedegaard H, Curtin SC, Warner M. Increase in suicide mortality in the United States, 1999–2018. 2020.
- 320 2. Centers_for_Disease_Control_and_Prevention. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Web-
- 321 based Injury Statistics Query and Reporting System (WISQARS)2021. Available from:
- 322 www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html.
- 323 3. Woolf SH, Schoemaker H. Life expectancy and mortality rates in the United States, 1959-2017. *JAMA*.
- 324 2019;322(20):1996-2016.
- 325 4. Gradus JL, Rosellini AJ, Horváth-Puhó E, Street AE, Galatzer-Levy I, Jiang T, et al. Prediction of sex-specific
- 326 suicide risk using machine learning and single-payer health care registry data from Denmark. *JAMA Psychiatry*.
- 327 2020;77(1):25-34.
- 328 5. Roaten K, Johnson C, Genzel R, Khan F, North CS. Development and implementation of a universal suicide
- 329 risk screening program in a safety-net hospital system. *The Joint Commission Journal on Quality Patient Safety*.
- 330 2018;44(1):4-11.
- 331 6. Belsher BE, Smolenski DJ, Pruitt LD, Bush NE, Beech EH, Workman DE, et al. Prediction models for suicide
- 332 attempts and deaths: a systematic review and simulation. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(6):642-51.
- 333 7. Bernecker SL, Zuromski KL, Gutierrez PM, Joiner TE, King AJ, Liu H, et al. Predicting suicide attempts among
- 334 soldiers who deny suicidal ideation in the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army
- 335 STARRS). *Behaviour research therapy*. 2019;120:103350.
- 336 8. Gradus JL, Rosellini AJ, Horváth-Puhó E, Jiang T, Street AE, Galatzer-Levy I, et al. Predicting sex-specific
- 337 non-fatal suicide attempt risk using machine learning and data from Danish national registries. *American*
- 338 *journal of epidemiology*. 2021.
- 339 9. Gunnell D, Knipe D, Chang S-S, Pearson M, Konradsen F, Lee WJ, et al. Prevention of suicide with regulations
- 340 aimed at restricting access to highly hazardous pesticides: a systematic review of the international evidence.
- 341 *The Lancet Global Health*. 2017;5(10):e1026-e37.
- 342 10. Miller M, Hemenway D. The relationship between firearms and suicide: a review of the literature.
- 343 *Aggression violent behavior*. 1999;4(1):59-75.
- 344 11. Miller M, Lippmann SJ, Azrael D, Hemenway DJ, JoT, Surgery AC. Household firearm ownership and rates of
- 345 suicide across the 50 United States. *Journal of Trauma Acute Care Surgery*. 2007;62(4):1029-35.
- 346 12. Siegel M, Rothman EF. Firearm ownership and suicide rates among US men and women, 1981–2013.
- 347 *American journal of public health*. 2016;106(7):1316-22.
- 348 13. Blakely TA, Collings SC, Atkinson J. Unemployment and suicide. Evidence for a causal association? *Journal*
- 349 *of Epidemiology Community Health*. 2003;57(8):594-600.
- 350 14. Lewis G, Sloggett A. Suicide, deprivation, and unemployment: record linkage study. *Bmj*.
- 351 1998;317(7168):1283-6.
- 352 15. Kegler SR, Stone DM, Holland KM. Trends in suicide by level of urbanization—United States, 1999–2015.
- 353 *MMWR*. 2017;66(10):270.

- 354 16. Rezaeian M, Dunn G, St Leger S, Appleby L. The ecological association between suicide rates and indices of
 355 deprivation in English local authorities. *Social psychiatry psychiatric epidemiology*. 2005;40(10):785-91.
- 356 17. Canetto SS, Sakinofsky I. The gender paradox in suicide. *Suicide Life-Threatening Behavior*. 1998;28(1):1-
 357 23.
- 358 18. Conwell Y, Van Orden K, Caine ED. Suicide in older adults. *Psychiatric Clinics*. 2011;34(2):451-68.
- 359 19. Rihmer Z. Suicide risk in mood disorders. *Current opinion in psychiatry*. 2007;20(1):17-22.
- 360 20. Sokero TP, Melartin TK, Rytsälä HJ, Leskelä US, Lestelä-Mielonen PS, Isometsä ET. Prospective study of risk
 361 factors for attempted suicide among patients with DSM-IV major depressive disorder. *The British Journal of*
 362 *Psychiatry*. 2005;186(4):314-8.
- 363 21. Franklin JC, Ribeiro JD, Fox KR, Bentley KH, Kleiman EM, Huang X, et al. Risk factors for suicidal thoughts
 364 and behaviors: A meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Psychological bulletin*. 2017;143(2):187.
- 365 22. Rehkopf DH, Buka SL. The association between suicide and the socio-economic characteristics of
 366 geographical areas: a systematic review. *Psychological medicine*. 2006;36(2):145-57.
- 367 23. National_Research_Council. Firearms and violence: a critical review. 2005. Report No.: 0309091241.
- 368 24. Cheng Q, Li H, Silenzio V, Caine ED. Suicide contagion: A systematic review of definitions and research
 369 utility. *PloS one*. 2014;9(9):e108724.
- 370 25. Haw C, Hawton K, Niedzwiedz C, Platt S. Suicide clusters: a review of risk factors and mechanisms. *Suicide*
 371 *and Life-Threatening Behavior*. 2013;43(1):97-108.
- 372 26. Niederkrotenthaler T, Braun M, Pirkis J, Till B, Stack S, Sinyor M, et al. Association between suicide
 373 reporting in the media and suicide: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bmj*. 2020;368.
- 374 27. Niederkrotenthaler T, Fu K-w, Yip PS, Fong DY, Stack S, Cheng Q, et al. Changes in suicide rates following
 375 media reports on celebrity suicide: a meta-analysis. *J epidemiol community health*. 2012;66(11):1037-42.
- 376 28. Sisask M, Värnik A. Media roles in suicide prevention: a systematic review. *International journal of*
 377 *environmental research and public health*. 2012;9(1):123-38.
- 378 29. Bridge JA, Greenhouse JB, Ruch D, Stevens J, Ackerman J, Sheftall AH, et al. Association between the release
 379 of Netflix's 13 Reasons Why and suicide rates in the United States: An interrupted time series analysis. *Journal*
 380 *of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2020;59(2):236-43.
- 381 30. Niederkrotenthaler T, Stack S, Till B, Sinyor M, Pirkis J, Garcia D, et al. Association of increased youth
 382 suicides in the United States with the release of 13 Reasons Why. *JAMA psychiatry*. 2019;76(9):933-40.
- 383 31. Keyes KM, Kandula S, Olfson M, Gould MS, Martínez-Alés G, Rutherford C, et al. Suicide and the agent-host-
 384 environment triad: leveraging surveillance sources to inform prevention. *Psychological medicine*.
 385 2021;51(4):529-37.
- 386 32. Sy KTL, Shaman J, Kandula S, Pei S, Gould M, Keyes KM. Spatiotemporal clustering of suicides in the US from
 387 1999 to 2016: a spatial epidemiological approach. *Social psychiatry psychiatric epidemiology*.
 388 2019;54(12):1471-82.
- 389 33. Besag J, York J, Mollié A. Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial statistics. *Annals of*
 390 *the institute of statistical mathematics*. 1991;43(1):1-20.

- 391 34. Leroux BG, Lei X, Breslow N. Estimation of disease rates in small areas: a new mixed model for spatial
 392 dependence. *Statistical models in epidemiology, the environment, and clinical trials*; Springer; 2000. p. 179-
 393 91.
- 394 35. Lawson A, Lee D. Bayesian disease mapping for public health. *Handbook of statistics*. 36: Elsevier; 2017. p.
 395 443-81.
- 396 36. Lawson AB. Bayesian disease mapping: hierarchical modeling in spatial epidemiology: Chapman and
 397 Hall/CRC; 2018.
- 398 37. US_Census_Bureau. Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates2020; (September 1, 2021). Available from:
 399 <https://www.census.gov/data/datasets/2020/demo/saipe/2020-state-and-county.html>.
- 400 38. 1999 to 2019 National Surveys on Drug Use and Health (NSDUHs) small area estimation dataset: State
 401 small area estimates, by survey year, outcome, state, and age group, NSDUH methodological report [Internet].
 402 Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. . 2021.
- 403 39. Schell TL, Peterson S, Vegetabile BG, Scherling A, Smart R, Morral AR. State-level estimates of household
 404 firearm ownership: RAND Santa Monica, CA; 2020.
- 405 40. Bureau_of_Labor_Statistics. Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages2020 9/12/2021; (September 1,
 406 2021). Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/cew/downloadable-data-files.htm>.
- 407 41. Bureau_of_Labor_Statistics. Local Area Unemployment Statistics2020 9/12/2021. Available from:
 408 <https://www.bls.gov/lau/lauov.htm>.
- 409 42. US_Census_Bureau. Cartographic Boundary Files - Shapefile2018; (1/11/2021). Available from:
 410 <https://www.census.gov/geographies/mapping-files/time-series/geo/carto-boundary-file.html>.
- 411 43. National_Center_for_Health_Statistics. Detailed Mortality, All counties, 1999-2019 as compiled from data
 412 provided by the 57 vital statistics jurisdictions through the Vital Statistics Cooperative Program2019.
- 413 44. World_Health_Organization. The International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Health Related
 414 Problems ICD-10: Tenth Revision. Volume 1: Tabular List: World Health Organization; 2004.
- 415 45. National_Center_for_Health_Statistics. Bridged-race intercensal estimates of the resident population of the
 416 United States for July 1, 2000-July 1, 20092019; (September 1, 2021). Available from:
 417 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/bridged_race.htm.
- 418 46. National_Center_for_Health_Statistics. Vintage 2019 Postcensal estimates of resident population of the
 419 United States for April 1, 2010 - July 1, 20192019; (September 1, 2021). Available from:
 420 https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/bridged_race/data_documentation.htm.
- 421 47. Knorr-Held L. Bayesian modelling of inseparable space-time variation in disease risk. *Statistics in medicine*.
 422 2000;19(17-18):2555-67.
- 423 48. Roberts GO, Rosenthal JS. Optimal scaling of discrete approximations to Langevin diffusions. *Journal of the*
 424 *Royal Statistical Society: Series B*. 1998;60(1):255-68.
- 425 49. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. *Bayesian Data Analysis*: CRC Press; 2013.
- 426 50. Rue H, Held L. *Gaussian Markov random fields: theory and applications*: CRC press; 2005.

- 427 51. Gerber F, Furrer R. Pitfalls in the implementation of Bayesian hierarchical modeling of areal count data: An
 428 illustration using BYM and Leroux models. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2015;63(1):1-32.
- 429 52. Geweke JF. Evaluating the accuracy of sampling-based approaches to the calculation of posterior moments.
 430 Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis; 1991.
- 431 53. Lee D. A tutorial on spatio-temporal disease risk modelling in R using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulation
 432 and the CARBayesST package. *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology*. 2020;34:100353.
- 433 54. Lee D, Rushworth A, Napier G. Spatio-temporal areal unit modeling in R with conditional autoregressive
 434 priors using the CARBayesST package. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2018;84(1):1-39.
- 435 55. Team RC. R: A language environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing;
 436 version 3.5.0. 2018.
- 437 56. Moran PA. Notes on continuous stochastic phenomena. *Biometrika*. 1950;37(1/2):17-23.
- 438 57. Hollander M, Wolfe DA. *Nonparametric statistical methods*. 1999.
- 439 58. Congdon P. The spatial pattern of suicide in the US in relation to deprivation, fragmentation and rurality.
 440 *Urban Studies*. 2011;48(10):2101-22.
- 441 59. Wray M, Colen C, Pescosolido B. The sociology of suicide. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2011;37:505-28.
- 442 60. Hoffmann JA, Farrell CA, Monuteaux MC, Fleegler EW, Lee LK. Association of pediatric suicide with county-
 443 level poverty in the United States, 2007-2016. *JAMA pediatrics*. 2020;174(3):287-94.
- 444 61. Olsson M, Cosgrove C, Altekruuse SF, Wall MM, Blanco C. Deaths Of Despair: Adults At High Risk For Death
 445 By Suicide, Poisoning, Or Chronic Liver Disease In The US: Study examines US adults at highest risk for death
 446 by suicide, drug poisoning, or chronic liver disease. *Health Affairs*. 2021;40(3):505-12.
- 447 62. Kessler RC, Bossarte RM, Luedtke A, Zaslavsky AM, Zubizarreta JR. Suicide prediction models: a critical
 448 review of recent research with recommendations for the way forward. *Molecular psychiatry*. 2020;25(1):168-
 449 79.
- 450 63. Hallowell BD, Chambers LC, Rhodes J, Basta M, Viner-Brown S, Lasher L. Using emergency medical services
 451 data to monitor nonfatal opioid overdoses in real time: development, validation, and use of a case definition,
 452 Rhode Island, 2018. *Public Health Reports*. 2021;136(1_suppl):40S-6S.
- 453 64. Mann NC, Kane L, Dai M, Jacobson K. Description of the 2012 NEMESIS public-release research dataset.
 454 *Prehospital emergency care*. 2015;19(2):232-40.
- 455 65. Shi X, Chen Z, Wang H, Yeung D-Y, Wong W-K, Woo W-c. Convolutional LSTM network: A machine learning
 456 approach for precipitation nowcasting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2015;28.
- 457 66. Wilson JW, Crook NA, Mueller CK, Sun J, Dixon M. Nowcasting thunderstorms: A status report. *Bulletin of*
 458 *the American Meteorological Society*. 1998;79(10):2079-100.
- 459 67. Bańbura M, Giannone D, Modugno M, Reichlin L. Now-casting and the real-time data flow. *Handbook of*
 460 *economic forecasting*. 2: Elsevier; 2013. p. 195-237.
- 461 68. Giannone D, Reichlin L, Small D. Nowcasting: The real-time informational content of macroeconomic data.
 462 *Journal of Monetary Economics*. 2008;55(4):665-76.

- 463 69. Ginsberg J, Mohebbi MH, Patel RS, Brammer L, Smolinski MS, Brilliant L. Detecting influenza epidemics
 464 using search engine query data. *Nature*. 2009;457(7232):1012-4.
- 465 70. Kandula S, Shaman J. Reappraising the utility of Google flu trends. *PLoS computational biology*.
 466 2019;15(8):e1007258.
- 467 71. Osthus D, Daughton AR, Priedhorsky R. Even a good influenza forecasting model can benefit from internet-
 468 based nowcasts, but those benefits are limited. *PLoS computational biology*. 2019;15(2):e1006599.
- 469 72. Cheng Q, Li TM, Kwok C-L, Zhu T, Yip PS. Assessing suicide risk and emotional distress in Chinese social
 470 media: a text mining and machine learning study. *Journal of medical internet research*. 2017;19(7):e7276.
- 471 73. De Choudhury M, Kiciman E, Dredze M, Coppersmith G, Kumar M, editors. Discovering shifts to suicidal
 472 ideation from mental health content in social media. *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI conference on human factors*
 473 *in computing systems*; 2016.
- 474 74. Eichstaedt JC, Smith RJ, Merchant RM, Ungar LH, Crutchley P, Preotiuc-Pietro D, et al. Facebook language
 475 predicts depression in medical records. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
 476 2018;115(44):11203-8.
- 477 75. Jashinsky J, Burton SH, Hanson CL, West J, Giraud-Carrier C, Barnes MD, et al. Tracking suicide risk factors
 478 through Twitter in the US. *Crisis*. 2014.
- 479 76. O'dea B, Wan S, Batterham PJ, Calear AL, Paris C, Christensen H. Detecting suicidality on Twitter. *Internet*
 480 *Intervention*. 2015;2(2):183-8.
- 481 77. Lee J-Y. Search trends preceding increases in suicide: A cross-correlation study of monthly Google search
 482 volume and suicide rate using transfer function models. *Journal of affective disorders*. 2020;262:155-64.
- 483 78. Heron M. Deaths: Leading causes for 2019. Hyattsville, MD; 2021. Contract No.: 9.
- 484 79. Rockett IR, Wang S, Stack S, De Leo D, Frost JL, Ducatman AM, et al. Race/ethnicity and potential suicide
 485 misclassification: window on a minority suicide paradox? *BMC psychiatry*. 2010;10(1):1-8.
- 486

Figures and Tables

Variable	Data Source	Description	Available Period	Geographical resolution	Mean (SD)
<i>y</i>	NVSS	Observed suicide-related deaths	2003 - 2019	County	12.3 (32)
<i>unemp</i>	BLS	Unemployment rate	2003 - 2019	County	.067 (.03)
<i>wage.wk</i>	BLS	Weekly wage, US\$	2003 - 2019	County	.664 (.16)
<i>poverty.percent</i>	SAIPE	Proportion of population living in poverty	2003 - 2019	County	.162 (.06)
<i>median.hh.income</i>	SAIPE	Median household income, US\$	2003 - 2019	County	.044 (.01)
<i>firearm.rate</i>	RAND	Proportion of population living in firearm-owning households	2005 - 2016	State	.412 (.11)
<i>mde</i>	NSDUH	Proportion of population with major depressive episode	2005 - 2018	State	.069 (.01)
<i>pop.density</i>	Census	Population per square mile, log	2005 - 2019	County	3.77 (1.8)

Table 1. Variables used in the study, along with data source, description, available period and geographical resolution. Mean and standard deviations are reported for 2005-2016 for all variables.




Figure 1. (A: top) Posterior median and 95% credible intervals of the effect estimates from CAR-ANOVA models, for one standard deviation change in variable. The variable descriptions are listed in Table 1.; (B: bottom, left) Median and 95% CI for national suicide risk; (C: bottom, right) Interquartile (IQR) range of county-level risk as estimated by the *select* model. Higher IQR indicates greater heterogeneity and an increase in IQR with time indicates a widening gap between low and high-risk counties.





Figure 2. (left) Mean symmetric proportional error for in-sample, temporal out-of-sample and spatial out-of-sample estimates. The vertical dashed line denotes error from the *reference* model; (right) Wilcoxon signed rank test for each pair of models. Significance ($p < .05$) in the ‘two.sided’ column indicates that the difference in errors of Model X and Model Y is not symmetric around 0. $p < .05$ in the ‘lesser’ panel column indicates errors in Model X (x -axis) are lower than Model Y . Actual p -value are shown as text when errors are not significantly different. To interpret this plot, for a pair of models, verify that the difference is significant under the ‘two-sided’ test, and if true, check for significance under the ‘lesser’ or ‘greater’ panel columns.



488

Figure 3. Symmetric proportional in-sample errors for *select* model. Negative error indicates model estimate exceeds observed. Counties with no observed deaths are shown in grey.




Figure 4. Observed suicide deaths (top row), out-of-sample estimates (middle row) and symmetric proportional errors for *select* model. Negative error indicates model estimate exceeds observed. Counties with no observed deaths are show in grey.