

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

1 **Study protocol for the Multimodal Approach to Preventing Suicide in Schools (MAPSS)**  
2 **project: A regionally based feasibility trial of an integrated response to suicide risk**  
3 **among UK secondary school pupils**

4  
5 Emma Ashworth<sup>1\*</sup>, Molly McCarthy<sup>1</sup>, Sio Wynne<sup>1</sup>, Jo Robinson<sup>2</sup>, Samuel McKay<sup>2</sup>, Steven  
6 Lane<sup>3</sup>, Gerry Richardson<sup>4</sup>, Neil Boardman<sup>5</sup>, Kate Henderson<sup>6</sup>, Vivienne Crosbie<sup>7</sup>, Neil  
7 Humphrey<sup>8</sup>, Sian York<sup>9</sup>, Maria Michail<sup>10</sup>, Damian Hart<sup>11</sup>, David Clacy<sup>12</sup>, Mani Jalota<sup>12</sup> &  
8 Pooja Saini<sup>1</sup>

9  
10 *<sup>1</sup>School of Psychology, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK*

11 *<sup>2</sup>Orygen Youth Health Research Centre, Centre for Youth Mental Health, University of*  
12 *Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*

13 *<sup>3</sup>Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK*

14 *<sup>4</sup>Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, UK*

15 *<sup>5</sup>Champs Public Health Collaborative, Cheshire and Merseyside, UK*

16 *<sup>6</sup>Growth Mindset Therapy & Solutions, UK*

17 *<sup>7</sup>Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services, Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust,*  
18 *Liverpool, UK*

19 *<sup>8</sup>Manchester Institute of Education, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK*

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

20 <sup>9</sup> *Calderstones School, Liverpool, UK*

21 <sup>10</sup> *School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK*

22 <sup>11</sup> *Merseyside Youth Association, Liverpool, UK*

23 <sup>12</sup> *Public advisors*

24

25 \*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Emma Ashworth, Byrom

26 Street, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, L3 3AF, UK. Contact:

27 e.l.ashworth@ljmu.ac.uk. Telephone: +44(0)151 904 1052.

28

29 **Metadata**

30 ***Funding***

31 This research is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR),

32 Public Health Research Programme, UK (NIHR156862).

33 ***Competing Interests***

34 The authors have no competing interests to declare.

35 ***Data Availability***

36 Data will be available from the authors upon request at study completion.

38

**Abstract**

39 **Background:** Suicide is the leading cause of death of children and young people under 35 in  
40 the UK, and suicide rates are rising in this age group. Schools are considered an appropriate  
41 and logical setting for youth suicide prevention activities, with universal, selective, and  
42 indicated approaches all demonstrating efficacy. Given that international best practice  
43 recommends suicide prevention programmes combine these approaches, and that to date this  
44 has not been done in school settings in the UK, this study aims to evaluate the feasibility of  
45 delivering a suicide prevention programme incorporating universal, selective, and indicated  
46 components in UK schools.

47 **Methods:** This study is a feasibility cluster-randomised controlled trial (RCT) of an adapted  
48 version of the Multimodal Approach to Preventing Suicide in Schools (MAPSS) programme.  
49 The programme, initially developed in Australia, involves delivering universal  
50 psychoeducation to all pupils, screening them for suicide risk, and delivering Internet-based  
51 Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (Reframe IT-UK) to those students identified as being at  
52 high-risk for suicide. The programme will be trialled in six secondary schools in Northwest  
53 England and will target Year 10 students (14- and 15-year-olds). The primary aims are to  
54 assess: 1) the acceptability and safety of delivering MAPSS in a school setting in the UK; 2)  
55 the social validity of the MAPSS programme; and 3) the feasibility of delivering a large-  
56 scale, appropriately powered, cluster-RCT and economic evaluation of this intervention in the

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

57 future. Secondary aims are to assess changes over time in mental health and wellbeing

58 outcomes.

59 **Discussion:** This study is the first to evaluate a suicide prevention programme comprising

60 universal, selective, and indicated components in UK schools. If the programme is found to

61 be feasible, it could be more widely tested in schools and may ultimately lead to reduced

62 rates of suicide and suicidal behaviour in young people.

63

## **Introduction**

64 Rates of suicidal crisis among children and young people (CYP) are on the rise, with  
65 suicide rates per 100,000 adolescents having increased by 7-9% per year since 2010 (1), and  
66 suicide now being the leading cause of death of young people under 35 (2). In Northwest  
67 England, there has been an increase in attendances to Emergency Departments for CYP in  
68 suicidal crisis and/or for self-harm (3), and the number of CYP presenting is significantly  
69 worse than the UK average (4). Suicidal ideation and behaviour are associated with a host of  
70 negative outcomes including risk of future suicide (5). The impact of suicide on a young  
71 person's family, friends, and wider community can also be devastating, and increases their  
72 own risk of suicide (6). There is, therefore, an urgent need to develop and test acceptable and  
73 effective approaches to preventing suicide in this population.

74 Schools are an appropriate setting for the delivery of mental health prevention  
75 programmes, offering a 'universal access point' to many CYP, and have been identified as  
76 important locations for suicide prevention and early intervention activities. Although school  
77 wellbeing staff may be able to provide support to pupils, CYP are often reluctant to seek help  
78 from professionals, preferring informal sources of support (7). School-based prevention  
79 efforts must therefore not only target school staff, but also fellow pupils. Historically, there  
80 has been a reluctance to deliver suicide prevention efforts to pupils, due to concerns about  
81 potentially iatrogenic impacts. However, increasing evidence suggests that it is safe to do  
82 (8,9). According to international best practice, suicide prevention programmes should

83 incorporate universal, selective, and indicated approaches. Such approaches have shown  
84 promise in both community and school settings (10) but, to date, only one study (11) is  
85 applying rigorous methodology to evaluate short- and longer-term cost-effectiveness of an  
86 intervention comprising universal, selective, and indicated elements in schools.

87         The Multimodal Approach to Preventing Suicide in Schools (MAPSS) project, a  
88 suicide prevention intervention in Australia, has demonstrated feasibility and acceptability  
89 and is currently undergoing a randomised controlled trial (RCT) in Melbourne (11). The  
90 MAPSS intervention consists of three parts: suicide prevention lesson for all pupils, risk  
91 screening, and online cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT; ‘Reframe-IT’) for those deemed  
92 to be at high risk for suicide ideation. Further details for each element are provided below.  
93 Training is also provided for school staff and parents. Suicide prevention lessons, such as  
94 those included in MAPSS, have been evaluated in youth populations (8,9), and ‘Reframe-IT’  
95 has also been found to be associated with reduced suicidal ideation, depression, and  
96 hopelessness in Australian CYP (8,12). However, cultural transferability of interventions  
97 cannot be assumed (13); interventions that have worked in one setting or context too often do  
98 not work across other settings, particularly in school contexts (14), given the wide ranging  
99 contextual and cultural factors influencing implementation (15). Further to this, if an  
100 intervention does not have high social validity, meaning that it is not viewed as acceptable,  
101 useful, and feasible by intervention deliverers (e.g., school staff) and/or recipients (e.g.,  
102 pupils), then it is likely to fail (16,17). Therefore, before any suicide prevention interventions

103 are delivered at-scale in UK schools, the social validity of such interventions should be  
104 established, along with any necessary cultural or contextual adaptations, to ensure success.

105 A recent scoping study of MAPSS for UK schools (18,19) interviewed CYP, school  
106 staff, parents, and health professionals. All participants advocated the importance of school-  
107 based suicide prevention and gave feedback on the changes needed to adapt the MAPSS  
108 intervention for the UK. An adapted version of MAPSS has since been co-developed with  
109 CYP and professionals, and examined in a pilot study in two schools. Findings showed it was  
110 feasible to recruit schools, have suicide prevention training delivered to school staff and  
111 suicide awareness sessions to parents, for researchers to conduct surveys within the school  
112 setting at study timepoints, to identify pupils who may be at risk of suicide, to deliver suicide  
113 prevention lessons with Year 10 pupils, and to recruit pupils to test the online CBT therapy  
114 programme, Reframe IT-UK.

### 115 **Aims and Hypotheses**

116 The proposed study aims to build on the aforementioned work, employing a  
117 feasibility RCT design of an adapted version of MAPSS across six schools in Northwest  
118 England to assess: 1) the acceptability and safety of delivering MAPSS in a school setting in  
119 England; 2) the social validity (feasibility, utility, and acceptability) of the MAPSS  
120 intervention; and 3) the feasibility of delivering a large-scale, appropriately powered, cluster-  
121 RCT and economic evaluation of this intervention in the future. Secondary aims are to assess

122 changes over time in mental health and wellbeing outcomes for pupils taking part in MAPSS.

123 As this is a feasibility study, no formal hypothesis testing will be undertaken.

124

## 125 **Materials and Methods**

### 126 **Study Design**

127 The study is led by researchers at Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU), UK,

128 and will involve schools across Cheshire and Merseyside in Northwest England. This

129 feasibility study is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR)

130 Public Health Research Programme (NIHR156862), and delivery of the MAPSS

131 interventions is commissioned by Cheshire and Merseyside Public Health Collaborative

132 (CHAMPS). It will be conducted over a two-year period (Feb 2024-Feb 2026), with three

133 months for set up, 18 months feasibility, and three months consolidation. This study adopts a

134 multiphase feasibility cluster-RCT design (ISRCTN: 41891301; see SPIRIT and CONSORT

135 diagrams, Figures 1 and 2), consisting of a treatment as usual (TAU) arm and an intervention

136 (MAPSS) arm. Schools allocated to the TAU arm will be offered MAPSS at the end of the

137 trial, if it is considered safe and acceptable for use.

138 [Figure 1. SPIRIT schedule of enrollment, interventions, and assessments]

139 [Figure 2. MAPSS anticipated CONSORT diagram]

140



141 The study consists of three work packages (WP):

142 **WP1:** A three-month set-up stage to: i) make any adjustments to the interventions as  
143 determined from the pilot study, ii) recruit staff, and iii) spend dedicated time recruiting schools  
144 from a diverse range of backgrounds, with three schools recruited in the first three months and  
145 the remaining three schools within nine months, to enable alignment with school academic  
146 terms.

147 **WP2:** An 18-month feasibility cluster-RCT evaluating MAPSS in six schools. Four schools  
148 will be randomised to receive MAPSS (intervention arm), and two schools will be randomised  
149 to continue with usual practice (TAU control arm). Surveys will be completed by both arms at  
150 all timepoints. This will include i) baseline surveys, ii) universal suicide prevention lesson  
151 ('Breaking the Silence' – see further details below) in the intervention arm, iii) survey and  
152 screening two weeks after the suicide prevention lesson, iv) an indicated Reframe IT-UK CBT  
153 programme in the intervention arm for pupils identified as high suicide risk, and usual care in  
154 control arm, v) surveys two-weeks after Reframe IT-UK, and vi) follow-up surveys 12-months  
155 post-baseline.

156 **WP3.** A parallel process evaluation, to establish perceptions of social validity of the  
157 programme for use in the UK, and the appropriateness of the research design for effectiveness  
158 trials.

159 **Participants and Recruitment**

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

160 Participant recruitment will begin in February 2024. Expressions of interest will be  
161 sought from schools across Cheshire and Merseyside via Local Authority contacts. To ensure  
162 recruitment of a diverse range of schools and CYP, purposeful maximum variation sampling  
163 will be used if more than six schools express an interest in taking part. This is widely used in  
164 research to pragmatically identify and select participants that are effective in addressing the  
165 research aims, while also maximising diversity and limiting bias (20). The key characteristics  
166 we will seek variation on include: rural/urban status, proportion of ethnic minority pupils,  
167 schools' deprivation levels (IDACI), schools' academic achievement (proportion of pupils  
168 achieving benchmarks GCSE grades).

169 Selected schools will be provided with a gatekeeper information sheet and opt-in  
170 consent form to sign and return to the research team, along with a memorandum of  
171 understanding (MoU). Schools will be randomised once these documents are received.  
172 Information sheet and opt-out consent forms will then be sent to parents/carers of pupils in  
173 the participating schools. Finally, assent will be sought from young people during baseline  
174 survey completion.

175 The sample will consist of approximately 810 adolescent pupils in Year 10 (aged 14-  
176 15), recruited from six mainstream secondary schools across Cheshire and Merseyside. The  
177 six schools will be randomly assigned to one of two arms as part of the cluster-RCT:  
178 intervention (n=4) or control (TAU) arm (n=2). Year 10 pupils in the intervention schools  
179 will receive: 1) a suicide prevention psychoeducation lesson (n~540 pupils); and 2) pupils

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

180 scoring 21 or above on the Suicide Ideation Attributes Scale (SIDAS)<sup>33</sup> or indicating past  
181 suicide ideation will also be offered Reframe IT-UK plus TAU (n~54 pupils). Those in the  
182 control arm will receive TAU only (n~27 pupils).

183         As this is a feasibility study, a sample size calculation is not needed. In line with  
184 similar work (21), we will recruit six schools to provide sufficient variation of schools and  
185 pupil numbers in which to test recruitment, retention, acceptability of the intervention, and  
186 feasibility of the research design for evaluation. This is based on the assumption of a potential  
187 attrition rate of 50% at T3 (the primary outcome point for Reframe IT-UK). This is common  
188 for feasibility trials, realistic in terms of recruitment, and allows adequate precision in  
189 estimating rates (e.g., attrition, adverse events) relevant to trial outcomes (21). This would  
190 allow an overall attrition rate of 50% to be estimated with 95% confidence intervals of +/-  
191 12%, or 16% for a single arm. This sample size is also adequate for estimating relevant  
192 analysis parameters such as the standard deviation of effects, which are needed for  
193 determining the feasibility of a later efficacy trial. Based on findings from the pilot study, we  
194 anticipate that 10% of pupils will score in the at-risk range in the screening and will thus be  
195 eligible for Reframe IT-UK. Recruitment rates will be monitored by collecting data on:

- 196         1.       The proportion of eligible young people who consented,
- 197         2.       The number of participants recruited during the recruitment stage of feasibility  
198                 compared with the target,
- 199         3.       Assessment of contamination of MAPSS programme in control schools,

200 4. Assessment of CYP satisfaction with intervention and outcome measures.

201 This will provide evidence on recruiting to trials in school settings, as well as informing the  
202 full trial design.

203 ***Inclusion Criteria***

204 Pupils are eligible to take part if:

- 205 1. They are in Year 10 at school, aged 14+ years,
- 206 2. They attend a mainstream secondary school or pupil referral unit in Cheshire or  
207 Merseyside,
- 208 3. Their parents do not withdraw consent,
- 209 4. They provide assent,
- 210 5. Their school is willing to deliver MAPSS (if allocated), facilitate data collection,  
211 and completes a gatekeeper consent form and MoU,
- 212 6. For Reframe IT-UK only: they score 21 or above on the SIDAS or indicate thoughts  
213 of suicide in the past month at T2 data collection.

214 **Randomisation**

215 The unit of randomisation is the schools. Six schools will be randomised to one of two  
216 study groups after they have returned the appropriate documentation to secure their place in  
217 the trial. We will be comparing both arms to test which, if any, is better. To create balance in

## SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

218 terms of deprivation, ethnicity, rurality and educational outcomes, a minimisation algorithm  
219 will be used at an intervention-to-control ratio of 2:1 across Cheshire and Merseyside. Two  
220 schools will be allocated to the control arm and four schools will be allocated to the  
221 intervention arm by a university statistician, who is independent of the study and blind to  
222 school identities (blinding of schools and participants themselves is not possible due to  
223 obvious differences in intervention delivery). Methods of allocation concealment and  
224 randomisation processes will follow CONSORT (22). Schools will be randomised to receive  
225 a suicide prevention lesson and Reframe IT-UK and TAU, or TAU only, via a random  
226 sequence generation computer algorithm. Researchers completing study assessments will be  
227 masked to intervention allocation. The trial will follow an Intent-To-Treat (ITT) protocol.

### 228 **Withdrawal Criteria**

229 Schools or pupils can withdraw from the trial at any time. If an individual pupil  
230 withdraws, no further action will be taken and their data will be deleted. If a school  
231 withdraws prior to intervention delivery beginning, we will seek to replace the school. If a  
232 school withdraws after this point, we will not seek to replace the school and the trial will  
233 continue. We will aim to complete exit interviews with any schools that withdraw, to  
234 ascertain their reasons for withdrawal. The trial may be prematurely stopped if a significant  
235 adverse event occurs as a result of the trial procedures.

### 236 **Procedure**

## SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

237           Following recruitment, all participants will complete a suite of quantitative measures  
238 online in school at four time-points: baseline (T1); 2-4 weeks post-baseline (after suicide  
239 prevention lesson; T2); 12 weeks post-baseline (after Reframe IT-UK; T3); and 1-year post-  
240 baseline (T4). Schools will be asked to provide IT access for pupils to complete the surveys and  
241 will be provided with a detailed support pack for completing the measures with pupils, including  
242 links to the surveys, age-appropriate lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, and glossary. A member of  
243 the research team will visit the school at T1 to explain the study to the participants and ensure  
244 they are fully informed about the study and their rights before they assent. Surveys will not be  
245 anonymous as pupils will need to be monitored for risk and screened for potential participation  
246 in Reframe IT-UK.

247           At T1, a minimum of six staff from each school (intervention and control) will receive  
248 training from Papyrus Prevention of Young Suicide (a national charity), known as ‘Suicide  
249 Prevention – Overview Tutorial’ (SP-OT), to ensure staff are equipped to manage any risk  
250 identified from the screening. SP-OT is delivered in a single session over 1.5 hours online.  
251 Papyrus will also provide an online information session, ‘Suicide Prevention - Awareness,  
252 Resource, Knowledge’ (SP-ARK), along with support packs, for parents of all children in  
253 Year 10 at each participating school. #MyGPGuide; a guide for CYP with lived experience of  
254 self-harm and suicidality will be shared with schools and families (23).

255           Between T1 and T2 data collection, intervention schools will receive the suicide  
256 prevention lesson. At T2, pupils will complete the SIDAS and a single-item question relating

257 to suicide ideation in the past month. The survey system will flag participants who score in  
258 the at-risk range for suicidal ideation and the research team will then contact the school about  
259 these pupils to determine eligibility for participation in the Reframe IT-UK in intervention  
260 schools. The details of at-risk pupils will be passed on to schools the same day as survey  
261 completion, and they will be asked to follow up with these pupils (within 24 hours for high-  
262 risk and five working days for medium-risk) and adhere to their usual safeguarding  
263 procedures. At-risk pupils will then be offered the intervention and TAU in intervention  
264 schools, or TAU only in control schools. Pupils receiving the Reframe IT-UK intervention  
265 will complete the eight modules in the 10 weeks between T2 and T3 (i.e., approximately one  
266 module per week, while allowing an additional two additional weeks to account for  
267 disruptions such as school holidays). Completion of Reframe IT-UK takes place during  
268 school time, and a pastoral member of staff will sit with and support the young people while  
269 they complete the programme and provide any immediate support if they report suicide risk  
270 either directly to the staff member or via the Reframe IT-UK mood check-ins.

## 271 **Intervention**

272 1) A **suicide alertness training workshop**, ‘Breaking the Silence’, developed for and tested  
273 with young people, will be delivered. This psychoeducation lesson comprises a single 3-  
274 hour face-to-face workshop, designed to help participants understand suicide warning  
275 signs in themselves and others, gain knowledge about sources of support, and signpost  
276 others. Suicide prevention lessons will be delivered by trained facilitators from Grassroots

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

277 Suicide Prevention (a national charity) to classroom-sized groups of pupils (maximum 30  
278 pupils per session with at least one teacher present). A researcher will also attend where  
279 possible, to complete field notes.

280 2) The **screening** will take the form of self-report measures embedded into the questionnaires  
281 at each timepoint (excluding baseline). Researchers will inform schools after each  
282 timepoint of any pupils who are assessed to be at risk. Pupils who report suicidal ideation  
283 within the past four weeks (SIDAS score of 21 or higher) or any level of current suicidal  
284 ideation (single multiple-choice item) will be flagged by the research team and followed  
285 up by the school safeguarding lead.

286 3) **Reframe IT-UK** has been adapted from the Reframe-IT intervention developed in  
287 Australia (8,12). It comprises eight 20-minute online self-guided CBT modules. It follows  
288 the stories of two young people who make video diaries about their day-to-day life and  
289 their experiences of feeling suicidal. An adult “host” character guides the user through the  
290 module and activities. Each module contains two “activities” based on standard CBT  
291 exercises. Users progress sequentially through the content, with modules automatically  
292 unlocking when the preceding module is complete. There is also a message board through  
293 which the participant can communicate with a moderator, a mood diary function, and a  
294 series of factsheets and information on local and national helplines and services.

295 Adaptations from the Australian version included surface-level changes, such as using  
296 British actors for the video diaries, modernising content (e.g., discussions of the COVID-



297 19 pandemic), providing UK sources of support, and making completion of the safety plan  
298 compulsory prior to the first module unlocking.

299 Participants in schools randomised to the control group will receive TAU (e.g., from  
300 the school nurse or external mental health services), based on the typical provision at each  
301 school. The pastoral staff will be asked to record what TAU comprises in each school through  
302 the completion of a ‘usual practice’ survey prior to randomisation and at T4, to establish  
303 programme differentiation, any changes over time, and to control for any compensatory  
304 rivalry that may occur over the course of the trial. To ensure safety and appropriate support in  
305 the event of pupils being flagged as at-risk in the control group, schools who do not engage  
306 with the SP-OT teacher training will be unable to progress through the trial.

### 307 **Assessment of Outcomes**

308 Primary outcome measures for CYP are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1. Description of primary outcome measures**

<b>Primary Outcome</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptability	Operationalised in terms of the acceptability and safety of the intervention. The proportion of pupils who complete all agreed sessions will be recorded (>60% excellent. 40%-60% acceptable; <40% not acceptable) on the Reframe IT-UK website. Acceptability of the suicide prevention lesson,

including whether or not participants thought it was “useful”, “interesting”, or “upsetting”, will be assessed at T2 only using purpose designed items. Participant views on the Reframe IT-UK intervention will similarly be assessed at T3.

Social validity

This will be tested through the use of bespoke quantitative surveys adapted from the Australian trial, assessing pupils’ perceptions of acceptability, feasibility, and utility, following the delivery of each component of the MAPSS programme at T2 and T3. We will also conduct qualitative interviews with staff and focus groups with pupils across the study period.

Feasibility of an efficacy trial

Data will be collected on: 1) the level of missing data on completed assessment; 2) change or variability on outcome measures (e.g., suicide ideation, depressive or hopelessness symptoms); and, 3) whether schools implemented and supported provision of the MAPSS intervention.

310 Secondary outcome measures include:

- 311 1. Change in **past four-week suicidal ideation** at T3 and T4, compared to T2 and T1,  
312 will be assessed via the SIDAS (24). The SIDAS is a self-report measure designed to  
313 screen individuals in the community for presence of suicidal thoughts and assess the  
314 severity of these thoughts. It comprises five items, each targeting an attribute of  
315 suicidal thoughts: frequency, controllability, closeness to attempt, level of distress  
316 associated with the thoughts, and impact on daily functioning. Responses are  
317 measured on a 10-point scale. Total SIDAS scores are calculated as the sum of the  
318 five items, with controllability reverse scored, with total scale scores ranging from 0  
319 to 50. Items are coded so that a higher total score reflects more severe suicidal  
320 thoughts. Scores over 21 (the clinically significant threshold for suicide ideation) will  
321 determine eligibility for Reframe IT-UK (Or TAU).
- 322 2. Change in **symptoms of depression** at T3 and T4, compared to T2 and T1, will be  
323 assessed using the Patient Health Questionnaire – 9-item (PHQ-9) version (25).  
324 Participants will be asked to indicate how often they have been bothered by nine  
325 problems over the past two weeks. Each item is rated on a four-point Likert scale  
326 ranging from 0 (“not at all”) to 3 (“nearly every day”). Scores are summed such that  
327 the potential range is 0–27, with higher scores indicative of greater distress. The final  
328 question of the PHQ-9 asks participants to indicate the number of days they have had  
329 thoughts that they would be better off dead, or hurting themselves in some way. If

330 they indicate any suicidal thoughts, participants will be presented with a purpose-  
331 designed item, asking them to indicate which of the following describes the level of  
332 suicidal ideation they are experiencing: “Mild suicidal thoughts with no plan or intent  
333 to act”; “Moderate suicidal thoughts with a rough plan and some intent”; “Severe  
334 suicidal thoughts with a specific plan and intent to act”. Responses on this item will  
335 be used to determine eligibility for Reframe IT-UK (Or TAU).

336 3. Changes in **hopelessness** at T3 and T4, compared to T2 and T1, will be assessed  
337 using the Brief-H-Pos, a two-item positively worded measure of hopelessness (26).  
338 Respondents indicate agreement on a five-point scale (range 2–10), with higher scores  
339 indicating higher hopelessness.

340 4. Differences in **health service use** and other resource use (education and local  
341 authority) will be assessed at T1, T2, T3, and T4, using the Resource Use  
342 Questionnaire (RUQ), a bespoke questionnaire adapted from the Young Mind Matters  
343 Service Use questionnaire (27). The RUQ assesses use of mental health professionals  
344 and services, mental health-related hospitalisations, medication use for mental health  
345 reasons, and school-based mental health services. These data will be used for the  
346 economic evaluation.

347 5. Changes in **intentions to seek help** at T3 and T4, compared to T2 and T1, will be  
348 assessed using part two of the General Help Seeking Questionnaire (GHSQ; 26). The  
349 GHSQ presents participants with a list of potential sources of help and asks them to

350 indicate the likelihood that they would approach that source if they were experiencing  
351 suicidal thoughts on a five-point scale (very unlikely-very likely). Higher scores  
352 indicate greater levels of intended help-seeking.

353 6. Change in **health-related quality of life** during the trial (T1, T2, T3, T4) will be  
354 assessed using the Child Health Utility–9 (CHU9D; 27). The CHU9D can be used to  
355 derive quality-adjusted life years (QALYs). These data will be used in combination  
356 with data from the health service use measure to assess the feasibility of the full  
357 economic evaluation. The CHU9D is a multi-attribute utility instrument suitable for  
358 young people aged seven–17 years. It comprises a short questionnaire alongside a set  
359 of preference weights using general population values. The questionnaire has nine  
360 items with five response levels per item.

361 7. Change in **suicide literacy** at T2, T3 and T4, compared to T1, will be assessed using  
362 an adapted version of the Literacy of Suicide Scale (LOSS) – short form (30). This  
363 contains 12 statements rated on a “true/false/don’t know” scale. The correct response  
364 for items 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 is “false” while items 2, 6, 9, 11, and 12 are correctly  
365 answered “true”. The scale provides a total literacy score (percent correct), where  
366 higher scores indicate greater suicide literacy.

367 8. School staff (key contact or safeguarding lead) will complete a purpose-designed  
368 **usual practice** survey at T1 and T4, to ascertain current provision (i.e., establish a

369 clear counterfactual), identify the level of programme differentiation, and to account  
370 for any potential compensatory rivalry or contamination in control schools.

### 371 **Implementation and Process Evaluation**

372 A parallel qualitative implementation and process evaluation (IPE) will be conducted  
373 alongside the RCT. Longitudinal case studies will be conducted of the four schools  
374 randomised to receive MAPSS. The case studies will explore inter-related issues of 1) social  
375 validity of MAPSS and 2) *how* MAPSS was implemented and *why* it was implemented in this  
376 way. In terms of social validity, Wolf's framework (17) will be utilised, focusing on key  
377 tenets of acceptability, feasibility, and utility (e.g., does the intervention meet schools'  
378 perceived needs? How well received is the intervention among staff and pupils? Can the  
379 intervention be delivered successfully?). Relevant studies of school-based interventions (e.g.,  
380 (31)) will be drawn up and existing rubrics from the implementation literature adapted (e.g.,  
381 (32)) to inform data generation.

382 In terms of how MAPSS was implemented, the IPE will focus on the following  
383 dimensions: fidelity (e.g., to what extent teachers adhered to MAPSS guidance), dosage (e.g.,  
384 how much of MAPSS pupils accessed), quality (e.g., how well MAPSS was delivered),  
385 participant responsiveness (e.g., the extent to which pupils engaged), reach (e.g., the rate and  
386 scope of participation), programme differentiation (e.g., to what extent MAPSS can be  
387 distinguished from other, existing mental health programmes), and adaptations (e.g., the  
388 nature and extent of changes made during implementation). A range of factors that may have

389 affected implementation at the different domains/levels consistently will also be explored:  
390 preplanning and foundations (e.g. buy-in), implementation support system (e.g. ongoing  
391 external support), implementation environment (e.g. time constraints), implementer factors  
392 (e.g. experiences, skills and confidence in delivery), and programme characteristics (e.g.  
393 flexibility; (33–35)).

394           Longitudinal case study fieldwork visits will be conducted at T2 (after suicide  
395 prevention lesson) and T3 (after Reframe IT-UK). Semi-structured interviews will be used  
396 with school staff and intervention deliverers (N=3 per school x 1 visit = 12 interviews), and  
397 interviews (for Reframe IT-UK) and focus groups (for suicide prevention lesson) with pupils  
398 (N=1 per school x 1 visit = 4 focus groups; N=2 per school x 1 visit = 8 interviews), as well  
399 as observations and document analysis of intervention delivery.

400           Class teachers and members of the school senior leadership team (e.g., safeguarding  
401 leads) will be interviewed individually at each case study visit. Small groups (n=4-6) of  
402 pupils will participate in semi-structured focus groups regarding the suicide prevention  
403 lessons (to reduce power imbalances and ease nerves), and one-to-one interviews (with a  
404 teacher present if requested) will be conducted with pupils who have taken part in Reframe  
405 IT-UK (due to the sensitive and personal nature of intervention participation). Bespoke semi-  
406 structured interview schedules have been developed for each key stakeholder group. All  
407 interviews/focus groups will cover trial feasibility and acceptability, and factors affecting  
408 implementation; overarching this will be a social validity framework (17). However, each

409 schedule will be tailored to the relevant time point and stakeholder group. Prompts and  
410 probes will be utilised where necessary to clarify unclear responses and elicit further detail.  
411 Interviews and focus groups will be conducted in private and quiet parts of the school, and  
412 fully informed consent/assent will be ensured.

413 Professionals who deliver the interventions in the case study schools will also be  
414 invited to be interviewed, to ascertain fidelity, quality, and dosage, and gain their  
415 perspectives on participant engagement and reach, as well as the feasibility of an efficacy  
416 trial. Interviews will be conducted at a time and place to suit them (face-to-face or online).  
417 Observations and document analysis will be arranged where possible with the intervention  
418 deliverers for additional context. All interviews/focus groups will be audio recorded and  
419 transcribed verbatim.

#### 420 **Data Management**

421 Source data for this trial will consist of paper copies of the consent form, data from  
422 online questionnaires (collected via QuestionPro), and audio recordings of interviews and focus  
423 groups.

424 When a participant consents to take part in the trial, they will be provided with a  
425 unique participant identification number which will be used to link survey data across  
426 timepoints. Personal data entered via the survey platform (QuestionPro) will be anonymised  
427 and stored on a password-protected database, housed on LJMU's secure systems, and will



## SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

428 only be accessible to members of the core research team. Consent forms and letters with  
429 personal identifiable data will be stored separately in a locked filing cabinet. Participant  
430 details will be anonymised in any publications that result from the trial.

431 Encrypted Dictaphones (or Microsoft Teams' recording function if online) will be  
432 used to record interviews and focus groups. Audio files will be immediately transferred to  
433 LJMU's secure servers after the interviews are complete and will subsequently be deleted  
434 from the Dictaphone or software platform. Once transcribed, audio files will also be deleted  
435 from LJMU's systems. Transcripts will be anonymised, with any identifiable information  
436 removed, and pseudonyms used. Only the research team will have access to the transcripts.  
437 Direct access to data will be granted to authorised representatives from the Sponsor, host  
438 institution and the regulatory authorities to permit trial-related monitoring, audits and  
439 inspections - in line with participant consent.

440 This trial will be sponsored by LJMU, who are also the data custodian. All research  
441 data will be retained in a secure location during the conduct of the trial and for five years  
442 after the end of the trial, when all paper records will be destroyed by confidential means. An  
443 archiving plan will be developed for all trial materials in accordance with the LJMU  
444 archiving policy.

### 445 **Safety Considerations**

446           The organisational structure of the trial is as follows. The trial steering committee  
447 (TSC) is responsible for investigator oversight of MAPSS and is comprised of the Co-  
448 Principal Investigators (Co-PIs; EA and PS), trial manager, clinical supervisor, and  
449 independent experts in the field. The TSC will meet on a six-monthly basis. The MAPSS  
450 Data Safety and Management Committee (DMEC) is the main vehicle for safety  
451 management, data monitoring, endpoint adjudication, and data management strategy. The  
452 committee is comprised of the Co-PIs and independent experts in the field. The composition  
453 of the group was designed to ensure transparency, so that no one set of competing interests  
454 could unduly influence other stakeholders, and is appropriate for this non-commercially  
455 funded or sponsored study. This committee has a dual safety role: it incorporates a risk-  
456 appropriate safety, endpoint adjudication, and data management strategy which is responsive  
457 to study issues as they eventuate. The committee will meet annually, and on an ad hoc basis  
458 when deemed necessary by the steering committee.

459           A comprehensive safety protocol has been developed, which will be activated if: 1)  
460 participants return a score of 21 or higher on the SIDAS at any timepoint (the established cut-  
461 off indicating a high level of suicidal ideation in the past month); 2) participants report  
462 current suicidal ideation at any timepoint; or 3) participants report suicide risk via the  
463 Reframe IT-UK platform. The school will be responsible for checking in with the participant  
464 and managing any risk. The response will depend on the level of risk, and ranges from  
465 providing the participant with contact information for helplines (in the case of low risk) to

466 calling the participant's emergency contact or emergency services (in the case of high-severe  
467 risk). Ultimately, all risk information will be communicated to the school, who will be  
468 responsible for ongoing management. Supervision will be provided to the researchers and  
469 school staff administering Reframe IT-UK from the study's therapist. Adverse events (AEs)  
470 or serious adverse events (SAEs) that arise during the trial will be recorded in the study  
471 database.

#### 472 *Assessment of Unanticipated Outcomes*

473 An AE is the development of an untoward effect, undesirable clinical occurrence or  
474 medical condition, or the deterioration of a pre-existing medical condition following or  
475 during exposure to a study intervention, whether or not considered causally related to the  
476 study intervention. For the purposes of safety reporting, any research activity is considered to  
477 be part of the "study intervention". An AE can therefore be any unfavourable and unintended  
478 clinical sign, symptom, observation, or disease temporally associated with the use of an  
479 intervention, whether or not related to the intervention. An SAE is any untoward medical  
480 occurrence that: results in death or is life-threatening ('life-threatening' in the definition of  
481 SAE refers to an event in which the participant was at risk of death at the time of the event, it  
482 does not refer to an event which hypothetically might have caused death if it were more  
483 severe); requires inpatient hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation; results  
484 in a persistent or significant disability/incapacity; is an important medical event that although  
485 not immediately life-threatening or results in death/hospitalisation, based upon appropriate

486 medical and scientific judgment, may jeopardise the participant and/or require intervention to  
487 prevent one of the outcomes listed above. Outpatient treatment in an emergency department  
488 is not in itself an SAE, although the reasons for it may be (e.g., suicide attempt). Hospital  
489 admissions and/or surgical procedures planned before or during a study are not considered  
490 SAEs, if the illness or disease existed (or the surgery was planned) before the participant was  
491 enrolled in the study, provided that it did not deteriorate in an unexpected way during the  
492 study.

493 All AEs and SAEs that arise during the trial will be recorded in the study database.  
494 Schools will be required to inform the research team of any AEs or SAEs that occur during  
495 the course of the trial. The causality of AEs and SAEs (i.e., their relationship to intervention  
496 treatment) will be assessed by a suitably qualified study team member. Any SAE will be  
497 reported to the Sponsor and to the relevant ethics committees within 24 hours of the research  
498 team becoming aware of its occurrence.

#### 499 **Analytic Strategy**

##### 500 ***Quantitative Data***

501 As this is a feasibility study no formal hypothesis testing will be undertaken. Data will  
502 be initially cleaned and checked for missing values; where possible missing values will be  
503 obtained from source or infilled using standard techniques, regression, or hot deck  
504 imputation, once all data have been collected. Demographics and other baseline variables will

505 be reported using summary statistics, mean, medians, counts, or percentages depending on  
506 the nature (categorical or continuous) and distribution (parametric or non-parametric) of the  
507 data, along with corresponding measures of variability. Key outcomes from the study, for  
508 example recruitment and retention rates, will be reported using counts and percentages, along  
509 with 95% confidence intervals. If a 50% retention rate is assumed from an initial sample size  
510 of 810, it will be possible to estimate the true retention rate (95%) with an accuracy of +/-6%.  
511 Clinical outcomes, for example depression scores on a continuous scale, will be reported  
512 using means or medians depending on the distribution and corresponding confidence  
513 intervals. These clinical measures will also be reported at the three subsequent follow-up  
514 timepoints. Graphical methods will be used to identify trends across time. Differences  
515 between the intervention and the control groups in key outcome variables will also be  
516 calculated and reported graphically, along with 95% confidence intervals. All analysis will be  
517 carried out on an ITT basis, and some sensitivity analysis maybe undertaken including only  
518 per-protocol participants. Secondary outcomes will be reported and assessed in a similar  
519 manner to the primary outcomes using summary statistics and confidence intervals.

## 520 *Qualitative Data*

521 Qualitative data will be treated in two ways. First, detailed case profiles of each  
522 school will be produced that document their implementation, paying attention to how  
523 individual context and circumstances have influenced progress in each. Secondly, interview  
524 and focus group transcripts will be analysed via thematic analysis using the framework

525 approach. (36). A hybrid approach will be taken, which will be informed by conceptual  
526 models of implementation in school settings (37) and our primary orienting concepts (social  
527 validity, acceptability, feasibility), while allowing for unanticipated themes specific to this  
528 project/context. Normalisation Process Theory (NPT; 35) will also be adopted as a broad  
529 framework through which to make sense of the qualitative data and draw conclusions relating  
530 to how readily MAPSS might be implemented amongst schools and embedded into school  
531 systems.

532         The qualitative framework analysis approach was developed to meet information  
533 needs and to provide outcomes or recommendations (39). It offers a highly visible and  
534 systematic approach to data analysis, showing very clearly how findings are derived from the  
535 data. This approach also facilitates analysis of specific concepts and issues that are  
536 particularly important to address, and so facilitates the use of NPT in interpreting the data.  
537 Analysis will follow the five suggested stages of framework analysis (Familiarisation with  
538 the data; Identifying a thematic framework; Indexing the data; Charting the data; Mapping  
539 and interpretation; 37).

540         NPT provides a framework for understanding the barriers and facilitating processes  
541 that underlie the implementation and integration of complex interventions into systems. The  
542 theory has been developed from qualitative research and identifies four key processes that  
543 underlie the adoption of new interventions (coherence of intervention; cognitive participation;  
544 collective action; reflexive monitoring). Previous research has shown that NPT can be

545 applied effectively to qualitative data in healthcare contexts and, more recently, in school-  
 546 based research (38,41,42). NPT will be drawn upon as a putative framework within the  
 547 qualitative analysis, and an attempt will be made to map the links between qualitative themes  
 548 arising from the data and the core processes outlined in NPT. This process will be aided  
 549 through use of the NPT toolkit (<http://www.normalizationprocess.org/>) and application of the  
 550 NPT statements generated by May et al. (38,42). In order to further promote integrity and  
 551 rigor during the data analysis process, field notes will be written immediately after the  
 552 interview and a reflective diary maintained.

553 ***Progression Criteria***

554 A set of eight provisional stop/go progression criteria for the MAPSS programme  
 555 have been established to determine whether a full RCT is warranted, and will be further  
 556 developed in collaboration with the TSC (see Table 2). All progression criteria will need to  
 557 be met for the MAPSS programme to be seen as acceptable and feasible, and to progress to a  
 558 full efficacy trial.

**Table 2. Trial progression criteria**

<b>Progression criteria</b>	<b>Red</b>  <b>(stop)</b>	<b>Amber</b>  <b>(discuss and amend)</b>	<b>Green</b>  <b>(go)</b>
-----------------------------	---------------------------------	--	---------------------------------

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

School recruitment (targeting n=6)	1-2 schools recruited	3-4 schools recruited	6 schools recruited
Pupil participant recruitment (targeting n~810)	<20% of eligible pupils	20-74% of eligible pupils	≥75% of eligible pupils
School staff training recruitment	≤2 teachers per school	3-6 teachers per school	≥6 teachers per school
Suicide Prevention workshop	<80% of scheduled workshops delivered	80-99% of scheduled workshops delivered	100% of scheduled workshops delivered
Pupils screening at high-risk of suicide	<5 pupils per school	5-10 pupils per school	10-15 pupils per school
Reframe IT-UK Online CBT	<40% of eligible pupils engage with ≥75% of modules	40-69% of eligible pupils engage with ≥75% of modules	≥70% of eligible pupils engage with ≥75% of modules
Acceptability of intervention	<50% of pupils found MAPSS acceptable	50-79% of pupils found MAPSS acceptable	≥80% of pupils found MAPSS acceptable



Outcome data collected at baseline	Data collected from <50% of pupils	Data collected from 50-79% of pupils	Data collected from ≥80% of pupils
Follow-up outcome data attrition at T3	>40% data attrition at T3	21-40% data attrition at T13	≤20% data attrition at T3

559

560 **Ethical Considerations**

561 Ethical approval has been obtained from the university’s research ethics committee  
 562 (REC; 23/PSY/003). The study will be undertaken in compliance with the research protocol.  
 563 All participants will be given a participant information sheet and consent form prior to taking  
 564 part. Personal data will be documented on password protected and encrypted servers housed  
 565 at the research team’s institution. No identifiable patient data will be extracted.

566 As delivery of the intervention is being arranged by local Public Health bodies,  
 567 consent will only be sought for completion of the measures. While opt-in gatekeeper consent  
 568 will be sought from the participating schools, written opt-out consent will be sought from  
 569 parents of CYP. Findings from both the scoping and pilot study consistently showed that opt-  
 570 out consent is feasible and desirable for this project. Given the potentially sensitive nature of  
 571 the measures, parents/carers will be informed of the project on two separate occasions (via  
 572 the schools’ usual communication channels), to help ensure information is not missed.  
 573 Schools will also be asked to advise parents/carers of the date scheduled for survey

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

574 completion, so they are aware. All parents will be provided with detailed information sheets  
575 (alternative format/easy-read will also be developed), outlining the importance of the study  
576 and any risk of harm (and procedures put in place to reduce this), and will be provided with  
577 detailed signposting. Parents will be able to view the items in the survey and attend an online  
578 information session about suicide prevention in CYP. Parents and carers who are Co-  
579 Investigators and Public and Patient Involvement (PPI) advisory members will be consulted  
580 to ensure 1) attendance at the parent information sessions, and 2) that parents/carers are  
581 effectively informed about any young people who may be at risk of suicide and equipped  
582 with appropriate resources and support.

583           Schools will be provided with a detailed support pack for completing the measures  
584 with pupils, including age-appropriate lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, and glossary. The  
585 slides inform the CYP of the nature of the study and their rights as a participant (including  
586 being able to withdraw) and can be delivered by the teacher supporting survey completion.  
587 CYP will then be able to indicate if they are happy to proceed by ticking a box at the  
588 beginning of the survey. This method has been used successfully in previous trials by the  
589 Principal Investigators, in the pilot study, and is recommended in good practice guidance.<sup>38</sup>  
590 For pupils eligible for Reframe IT-UK, they will be provided with an information  
591 document/leaflet/video (co-developed with our young person's advisory group), advising  
592 them about the content of Reframe IT-UK, and the voluntary nature of participation. The

593 school's guidance pack will also remind staff to ensure that pupils are provided information  
594 discretely and are made aware that they do not have to take part.

595 Fully informed written/verbal opt-in consent will be sought for participation in the  
596 qualitative strand of the IPE. Participants will be verbally reminded of their rights prior to the  
597 interviews/focus groups beginning. In case of distress to teachers during MAPSS, the school  
598 guidance packs will provide information on promoting staff wellbeing, including details of  
599 24-hour helplines (one specifically for educators, and local NHS crisis lines). In case of  
600 distress to parents/carers during MAPSS, the parent/carer participant information sheets will  
601 provide details of charities e.g., Papyrus and NHS services including 24-hour crisis helplines.

## 602 **Public and Patient Involvement (PPI)**

603 To ensure the research meets the needs of, and is sensitive to, pupils and teachers in a  
604 school community, the proposed work has been developed as part of the Suicide and Self-  
605 Harm Research Group (SSHRG) at LJMU and with PPI co-applicants including parents and  
606 youth worker leads. PPI members have advised on overall study design, research questions,  
607 recruitment, and have helped write the plain English summary. The following approaches  
608 were taken towards involving the public in the development of this study:

- 609 • Liverpool NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) commissioned a qualitative  
610 scoping study to gain views from key stakeholders, including young people, parents of  
611 children with a history of suicidal behaviours, teachers, mental health professionals and

612 General Practitioners. Data indicated strong support for MAPSS to bridge the current  
613 gap in clinical service provision and to support schools in managing/signposting the  
614 increasing number of young people communicating suicidal ideation. The scoping study  
615 informed the development of the trial design (e.g., trial recruitment procedures) and the  
616 adaptations required to MAPSS to ensure it meets the cultural needs of the UK  
617 population.

618 • Six parents were active members in the development of the feasibility study, with two as  
619 named co-applicants.

620 • A young person's advisory group has been established via Merseyside Youth  
621 Association, who are co-designing information documents/leaflets/videos to empower  
622 young people, helping them to understand what both MAPSS and the CBT element will  
623 entail, and fully understand their rights throughout the process.

624 • The original Reframe IT intervention was developed with input from young people in  
625 Australia.

626 Moving forward in the feasibility trial, the research team will develop two advisory  
627 groups: one for adults (n=6) with lived experience of parenting/caring/working with young  
628 people with suicidal ideation (Public Advisory Group; PAG) and one for young people (n=6)  
629 with lived experience of suicidal ideation or with an interest in MAPSS (YPAG). The PPI  
630 Co-Is and PS will co-lead and co-ordinate the PAG. EA will co-lead and co-ordinate the  
631 YPAG, in collaboration with Merseyside Youth Association. The team will work with

## SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

632 existing community links to ensure members from under-served communities (e.g., ethnic  
633 minority groups) are members. Involvement will be flexible and will use multiple methods to  
634 ensure members can engage according to their abilities and preferences. Members will have  
635 an induction and a discussion of working practices, delivered by the research team, who have  
636 extensive experience in involving CYP and adults as advisors in research. The team will  
637 invest time building trust with and develop safeguarding protocols for engagement. Members  
638 will advise the team on all elements of study conduct and dissemination, to ensure that  
639 findings are appropriately translated and are culturally sensitive and accessible. Funds (using  
640 NIHR rates) are included to ensure that all members may continue to support the research  
641 throughout the project.

642 Training will be available throughout the programme for PPI members and an  
643 induction to the project will be delivered. This will include an overview of the MAPSS  
644 programme and the methodology being used to evaluate the intervention, to enable the groups  
645 to be better informed about the project and their role in advising the research team. The  
646 ADAPT guidance (43) and Health Inequalities Assessment Toolkit (<https://forequity.uk/hiat/>)  
647 are being used to address the adaptation of this intervention in a different population and to  
648 review health inequalities and access for young people communicating/displaying suicidal  
649 behaviours.

650 For capturing, evaluating, and reporting the impact of PPI activities, the team will  
651 record minutes from all meetings. Focus groups will also be conducted with the PAG and

652 YPAG to explore their experience of being part of the programme and use these findings to  
653 inform the effectiveness trial funding application.

#### 654 **Study Status and Timelines**

655 Recruitment of schools and participants commenced 14<sup>th</sup> February 2024 and will  
656 close when six schools have been recruited. The last participants will be followed-up at T4 in  
657 December 2025. Recruitment for the qualitative process evaluation will be ongoing through  
658 the course of the trial.

#### 659 **Discussion**

660 This study responds to the rising rates of suicide among young people in Northwest  
661 England but also, as noted above, a lack of high-quality evidence in youth suicide prevention  
662 research. In line with international best practice, this study will evaluate the feasibility and  
663 potential cost-effectiveness of a suicide prevention programme comprising universal,  
664 selective, and indicated components delivered in secondary school settings in the UK.

#### 665 **Dissemination**

666 Data arising from the trial is owned by the research team. On completion of the trial,  
667 the data will be analysed and tabulated, and a final trial report prepared, which will be  
668 available via the trial funder's website.

669 Project findings will be shared through reports developed in close consultation with  
670 schools, NHS professionals, public health and third sector organisations, and those affected

SHORT TITLE: MAPSS UK TRIAL PROTOCOL

671 by suicide. Findings will be of interest to various stakeholder groups, and so bespoke reports  
672 will be developed for education, health and social care organisations, and researchers in the  
673 field. Outputs will include publications in high impact peer-reviewed journals;  
674 presentations/symposia at national and/or international conferences; summary briefs for  
675 different audiences; policy evidence briefings; a public-facing website, including short  
676 videos/animations, infographics; and blogs/vlogs to highlight the work.

677           A one-day national conference will be hosted, funded jointly (by organisations  
678 working on this project), focusing on dissemination and discussion of the project findings.  
679 Academics, researchers, schools, third sector organisations, social and clinical service staff,  
680 and the public will be invited, ensuring a range of voices and perspectives are present on the  
681 day. The one-day conference will be used as a platform to gain initial interest from NHS  
682 England Public Health Suicide Prevention Leads, through which future engagement can then  
683 be supported. Within the conference, individuals and carers affected by suicidal behaviours  
684 will be supported to participate, and their voices will be actively encouraged and listened to  
685 in considering the development and implementation of the subsequent trial.

686           Press releases at key project milestones will be disseminated via an ongoing social  
687 media campaign, designed to further disseminate project progress and findings. Summary and  
688 guidance documents will be created and made available to schools managing pupils with  
689 suicidal behaviours via the study website page. The next step of the research (efficacy RCT)  
690 will be supported by a pro-active engagement with schools across the region via NHS

691 England Public Health Suicide Prevention Leads and the NIHR Clinical Research Network  
692 (CRN).

693 Study participants will be asked if they would like to be updated on forthcoming  
694 publications, and a note will be made of their responses.

### 695 **Study Amendments**

696 Study procedures will not be changed without the mutual agreement of the Co-PIs, the  
697 trial funder, and the trial sponsor. If it is necessary for the study protocol to be amended, the  
698 amendment or a new version of the study protocol must be notified to or approved by the  
699 NIHR and REC before implementation, unless the safety of participants is at risk. The trial  
700 registry and the journal in which the protocol is published will be notified of any protocol  
701 updates.

### 702 **Acknowledgements**

703 The present trial is funded by NIHR PHR programme. The previous scoping and pilot  
704 studies were funded by Liverpool NHS Clinical Commissioning Group and CHAMPS  
705 respectively. Papyrus Prevention of Young Suicide and Grassroots Suicide Prevention are  
706 delivering the MAPSS intervention in schools. We would like to thank all organisations for  
707 their contributions and ongoing collaborations. Finally, we would like to thank the public  
708 advisors who have contributed to the study design to date, including the ‘3 dads walking’ and  
709 Merseyside Youth Association.





711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733

**References**

1. Bould H, Mars B, Moran P, Biddle L, Gunnell D. Rising suicide rates among adolescents in England and Wales. *Lancet*. 2019 Jul;394(10193):116–7.
2. Hughes JL, Horowitz LM, Ackerman JP, Adrian MC, Campo J V., Bridge JA. Suicide in young people: Screening, risk assessment, and intervention. *BMJ*. 2023;381:e070630.
3. Ashworth E, Provazza S, McCarthy M, Saini P. Children and young people presenting in a pediatric emergency department in North-West England in suicidal crisis: An exploratory case series study. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022;13:1–12.
4. Lewis C, Ubido J, Timpson H. Case for Change: Self-harm in Children and Young People [Internet]. 2017. Available from: [www.ljmu.ac.uk/phi](http://www.ljmu.ac.uk/phi)
5. Beghi M, Rosenbaum JF, Cerri C, Cornaggia CM. Risk factors for fatal and nonfatal repetition of suicide attempts: A literature review. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat* [Internet]. 2013;9:1725–36. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S40213>
6. Castellví P, Lucas-Romero E, Miranda-Mendizábal A, Parés-Badell O, Almenara J, Alonso I, et al. Longitudinal association between self-injurious thoughts and behaviors and suicidal behavior in adolescents and young adults: A systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* [Internet]. 2017;215:37–48. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.03.035>
7. Radez J, Reardon T, Creswell C, Lawrence PJ, Evdoka-Burton G, Waite P. Why do children and adolescents (not) seek and access professional help for their mental health problems? A systematic review of quantitative and qualitative studies. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* [Internet]. 2020;30(2):183–211. Available from:

734 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-019-01469-4>

735 8. Robinson J, Hetrick S, Cox G, Bendall S, Yuen HP, Yung A, et al. Can an Internet-  
736 based intervention reduce suicidal ideation, depression and hopelessness among  
737 secondary school students: Results from a pilot study. *Early Interv Psychiatry*.  
738 2016;10(1):28–35.

739 9. Bailey E, Spittal MJ, Pirkis J, Gould M, Robinson J. Universal suicide prevention in  
740 young people: An evaluation of the safe TALK program in Australian high schools.  
741 *Crisis*. 2017;38(5):300–8.

742 10. Robinson J, Bailey E, Witt K, Stefanac N, Milner A, Currier D, et al. What works in  
743 youth suicide prevention? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*  
744 [Internet]. 2018;4(5):52–91. Available from:  
745 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2018.10.004>

746 11. Byrne S, Bailey E, Hetrick S, Boland A. Study protocol for the Multimodal Approach  
747 to Preventing Suicide in Schools (MAPSS) project: A regionally-based trial of an  
748 integrated response to suicide risk among secondary school students. *Trials*.  
749 2022;23(186).

750 12. Hetrick SE, Yuen HP, Bailey E, Cox GR, Templer K, Rice SM, et al. Internet-based  
751 cognitive behavioural therapy for young people with suicide-related behaviour  
752 (Reframe-IT): A randomised controlled trial. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2017;20(3):76–  
753 85.

754 13. Wigelsworth M, Lendrum A, Oldfield J, Scott A, ten Bokkel I, Tate K, et al. The  
755 impact of trial stage, developer involvement and international transferability on  
756 universal social and emotional learning programme outcomes: A meta-analysis.  
757 *Cambridge J Educ* [Internet]. 2016;46(3):347–76. Available from:

- 758 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/0305764X.2016.1195791>
- 759 14. Joyce KE, Cartwright N. Bridging the gap between research and practice: Predicting  
760 what will work locally. *Am Educ Res J.* 2020;57(3):1045–82.
- 761 15. Chiodo D, Kolpin H. Both promising and problematic: Reviewing the evidence for  
762 implementation science. In: *Handbook of School-Based Mental Health Promotion.*  
763 Springer; 2018. p. 11–31.
- 764 16. Lendrum A, Humphrey N. The importance of studying the implementation of  
765 interventions in school settings. *Oxford Rev Educ.* 2012;38(5):635–652.
- 766 17. Wolf M. Social validity: the case for subjective measurement or how applied behavior  
767 analysis is finding its heart. *J Appl Behav Anal [Internet].* 1978;11(2):1311293.  
768 Available from: <http://www.pubmedcentral.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1311293>
- 769 18. Ashworth E, Thompson J, York S, Henderson K, Jalota MP, Shelton J, et al. Assessing  
770 the social validity of a multi-modal school-based suicide prevention intervention: A  
771 scoping study. 2022.
- 772 19. Ashworth E, Thompson J, Saini P. “It’s like an epidemic, we don’t know what to do”:  
773 The perceived need for and benefits of a suicide prevention programme in UK schools.  
774 *Br J Educ Psychol.* 2024;00:1–15.
- 775 20. Onwuegbuzie A, Collins K. A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social  
776 science research. *Qual Rep.* 2007;12(2):281–316.
- 777 21. Billingham SA, Whitehead AL, Julious SA. An audit of sample sizes for pilot and  
778 feasibility trials being undertaken in the United Kingdom registered in the United  
779 Kingdom Clinical Research Network database. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2013;13.
- 780 22. Altman D, Schulz K, Moher D, Egger M, Davidoff F, Elbourne D, et al. The revised

- 781 CONSORT statement for reporting randomized trials: Explanation and elaboration.  
782 Ann Intern Med. 2001;134(8):663–94.
- 783 23. Michail M, Hunter R, Mitchell L, James M, Imaan R, Reid K, et al. Visiting your  
784 General Practitioner: A guide for young people with lived experience of self-harm and  
785 suicidality. 2021.
- 786 24. van Spijker BA, Batterham PJ, Calex AL, Farrer L, Christensen H, Reynolds J, et al.  
787 The Suicidal Ideation Attributes Scale (SIDAS): Community-based validation study of  
788 a new scale for the measurement of suicidal ideation. Suicide Life-Threatening Behav.  
789 2014;44(4):408–19.
- 790 25. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams J. The PHQ-9: Validity of a brief depression severity  
791 measure. J Gen Intern Med. 2001;16(9):606–13.
- 792 26. Fraser L, Burnell M, Salter LC, Fourkala EO, Kalsi J, Ryan A, et al. Identifying  
793 hopelessness in population research: A validation study of two brief measures of  
794 hopelessness. BMJ Open. 2014;4(5).
- 795 27. Johnson SE, Lawrence D, Hafekost J, Saw S, Buckingham WJ, Sawyer M, et al.  
796 Service use by Australian children for emotional and behavioural problems: Findings  
797 from the second Australian Child and Adolescent Survey of Mental Health and  
798 Wellbeing. Aust New Zeal J Psychiatry. 2016;50(9):887–98.
- 799 28. Wilson C, Deane F, Ciarrochi J, Rickwood D. Measuring help seeking intentions:  
800 Properties of the General Help Seeking Questionnaire. Can J Couns. 2005;39(1):15–  
801 28.
- 802 29. Stevens K, Ratcliffe J. Measuring and valuing health benefits for economic evaluation  
803 in adolescence: an assessment of the practicality and validity of the child health utility

- 804 9D in the Australian adolescent population. *Value Heal.* 2012;15(8):1092–9.
- 805 30. Callear AL, Batterham PJ, Christensen H. Literacy of Suicide Scale: Psychometric  
806 properties and correlates of suicide literacy. *Unpubl Manuscr.* 2012;
- 807 31. Kendal S, Callery P, Keeley P. The feasibility and acceptability of an approach to  
808 emotional wellbeing support for high school students. *Child Adolesc Ment Health.*  
809 2011;16(4):193–200.
- 810 32. Bird VJ, Le Boutillier C, Leamy M, Williams J, Bradstreet S, Slade M. Evaluating the  
811 feasibility of complex interventions in mental health services: Standardised measure  
812 and reporting guidelines. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2014;204(4):316–21.
- 813 33. Durlak J, DuPre E. Implementation matters: A review of research on the influence of  
814 implementation on program outcomes and the factors affecting implementation. *Am J*  
815 *Community Psychol.* 2008;41(3–4):327–50.
- 816 34. Greenberg M, Domitrovich C, Graczyk P, Zins J. The study of implementation in  
817 school-based preventive interventions: Theory, research, and practice. *Promot Ment*  
818 *Heal Prev Ment Behav Disord 2005 Ser V3.* 2005;
- 819 35. Humphrey N, Lendrum A, Ashworth E, Frearson K, Buck R, Kerr K. Implementation  
820 and process evaluation (IPE) for interventions in educational settings: An introductory  
821 handbook. *EEF.* 2016.
- 822 36. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.*  
823 2006;3:77–101.
- 824 37. Domitrovich C, Bradshaw C, Poduska J, Hoagwood K, Buckley J, Olin S, et al.  
825 Maximizing the implementation quality of evidence-based preventive interventions in  
826 schools: A conceptual framework. *Adv Sch Ment Health Promot.* 2008;1(3):6–28.

- 827 38. May C, May CM, Murray E, Myall M, Cummings A, Girling M, et al. Using  
828 Normalization Process Theory in feasibility studies and process evaluations of  
829 complex healthcare interventions: A systematic review. *Implement Sci.* 2018;13(1):1–  
830 42.
- 831 39. Gale N, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method  
832 for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. *BMC Med Res*  
833 *Methodol.* 2013;13(117).
- 834 40. Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In: Bryman  
835 B, Burgess R, editors. *Analyzing qualitative data.* Routledge, London and New York;  
836 1994. p. 173–194.
- 837 41. Murray E, Treweek S, Pope C, Macfarlane A, Ballini L, Dowrick C, et al.  
838 Normalisation process theory: A framework for developing evaluating and  
839 implementing complex interventions. *BMC Med.* 2010;8(63):1–11.
- 840 42. May C, Finch T. Implementing, embedding, and integrating practices: An outline of  
841 normalization process theory. *Sociology.* 2009;43(3):535–54.
- 842 43. Moore G, Campbell M, Copeland L, Craig P, Movsisyan A, Hodinott P, et al.  
843 Adapting interventions to new contexts-the ADAPT guidance. *BMJ.* 2021;374(fig 1).  
844

Figure 1. MAPSS anticipated CONSORT diagram




Figure 2



**Fig 1. SPIRIT schedule of enrollment, interventions, and assessments**

	<b>Enrolment</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Post- Allocation</b>			
<b>TIMEPOINT:</b>			<b>T1: Baseline</b>	<b>T2: 2- Weeks Post Baseline</b>	<b>T3: 12- Weeks Post Baseline</b>	<b>T4: 54- Weeks Post Baseline</b>
<b>ENROLMENT:</b>						
Eligibility	X					
MoU and Gatekeeper Consent	X					
Allocation		X				
<b>INTERVENTIONS:</b>						
Teacher and Parent Suicide Prevention Training			←————→			
Suicide Prevention Workshop: 'Breaking the Silence'			←————→			
Screening with SIDAS				X	X	X
Reframe IT-UK				←————→		
<b>Assessments:</b>						
Usual Practice Survey	←————→					
ID Code			X	X	X	X
Demographics			X			
PHQ-9			X	X	X	X
CHU9D			X	X	X	X
LOSS			X	X	X	X
RUQ			X	X	X	X
GHSQ			X	X	X	X
Brief H-Poss			X	X	X	X
Breaking the Silence acceptability				X		
Reframe IT-UK acceptability					X	

Figure 1