Synchronous remote-based interventions for suicidal behaviour prevention: a systematic review and meta-analyses of clinical trials

Laura Comendador[1,2], María P. Jiménez-Villamizar[3], Josep-Maria Losilla[4], Juan P. Sanabria-Mazo[3,5,6], Corel Mateo-Canedo[3], Antoni Sanz[3,7], Ana-Isabel Cebrià[2,8,9], Diego Palao[1,2,8]

[1]Department of Psychiatry and Forensic Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[2]Department of Mental Health, Parc Taulí University Hospital. Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08208 Sabadell, Spain.
[3]Department of Basic, Developmental, and Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[4]Department of Psychobiology and Methodology of Health Sciences, Faculty of Psychology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[5]Teaching, Research & Innovation Unit, Parc Sanitari Sant Joan de Déu. 08830 Sant Boi de Llobregat, Spain.
[6]Centre for Biomedical Research in Epidemiology and Public Health (CIBERESP). 28029 Madrid, Spain
[7]Stress and Health Research Group (GIES). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[8]Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Salud Mental (CIBERSAM), Instituto de Salud Carlos III. 28029 Madrid, Spain.
[9]Department of Clinical and Health Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.

Corresponding author
Antoni Sanz, PhD
Department of Basics, Developmental, and Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
Carrer de la Fortuna, s/n. Campus de Bellaterra, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès (Spain).
E-mail: antonio.sanz@uab.cat

Author's Note
Laura Comendador Vázquez, MSc, PhD student. E-mail: laura.comendador@autonoma.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-5221-4794
María P. Jiménez-Villamizar, MSc, PhD student. E-mail: mariapaola.jimenez@autonoma.cat
ORCID 0000-0003-2264-7422
Josep-Maria Losilla, PhD. E-mail: josepmaria.losilla@uab.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-5140-5847
Juan P. Sanabria-Mazo, PhD. E-mail: juanpablo.sanabria@sjd.es
ORCID 0000-0003-1688-435X
Corel Mateo-Canedo, PhD. E-mail: corel.mateo@uab.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-0620-9257
Antoni Sanz Ruíz, PhD. E-mail: antonio.sanz@uab.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-7952-4477
Ana Isabel Cebrià Meca, PhD. E-mail: acebria@tauli.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-2632-8130
Diego J. Palao Vidal, MD, PhD. E-mail: dpalao@tauli.cat
ORCID 0000-0002-3323-6568

Word count (excluding title page, abstract, tables, acknowledgements, contributions, and references): 7271 words.
Number of tables: 2.
Number of figures: 5.

Synchronous remote-based interventions for suicidal behaviour prevention: a systematic review and meta-analyses of clinical trials

ABSTRACT

Objectives Suicide is a leading cause of preventable death worldwide. Evidence supports the impact of providing active contact for individuals who have attempted suicide. The current systematic review and meta-analyses aim to investigate the effects of suicide prevention strategies implemented through remote and synchronous technology-based interventions.

Design Systematic review, narrative synthesis, and meta-analysis.

Data sources Electronic databases (PubMed, PsycInfo, Scopus, and Web of Science) and grey literature sources (ClinicalTrials.gov and Google Scholar) were searched until December 2024.

Eligibility criteria Eligible articles assessed suicide prevention interventions for participants over 12 years with prior suicidal behaviour. Eligible study design included randomised control trials and non-randomised clinical trials published in English or Spanish.

Data extraction and synthesis Screening, selection process, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment were performed independently by two reviewers. Data on suicide-related factors and adherence to treatment were extracted. Meta-analyses were conducted to determine effect sizes (Hedges' *g*) for suicidal ideation, risk ratios (RR) for suicide attempts, and Peto odds ratios (OR) for suicide. Heterogeneity was assessed using the Cochrane's Q test, tau^2 statistic, and I^2 value. Publication bias was investigated employing funnel plots and Egger's test.

Results A total of 28 studies, comprising 10,015 participants in the intervention group and 10,726 in the comparison group, were included in the systematic review and meta-analyses. Synchronous remote-based interventions were effective in preventing repeated suicide attempts at 1 month (RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.62 to 0.85, I^2=0.0%, Q=0.70, tau^2=0.00), 6 months (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.95, I^2=85.4%, Q=54.92, tau^2=0.36), and 12 months (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.96, I^2=87.6%, Q=72.63, tau^2=0.27). Additionally, these interventions were associated with a reduction in suicide-related deaths at 18 months (Peto OR 0.18, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.44, I^2=0.0%,

Q=0.03, tau^2=0.00). Effects on suicidal ideation were not statistically significant at any time-point (Hedges' *g* -0.07 to -0.28, I^2=0.0 to 69.3%, Q=1.16 to 7.38, tau^2=0.00 to 0.14).

Conclusions Synchronous remote-based interventions demonstrate a potential benefit in preventing suicide attempts and deaths by suicide, and may serve as an adjunct to usual treatment; however, the effect on suicidal ideation appears limited. The observed heterogeneity warrants caution when interpreting these findings. Future research should prioritise methodological enhancements to improve the quality and consistency of evidence, as well as investigate the mediating processes underlying their effectiveness in reducing suicidal behaviour.

PROSPERO registration number CRD42021275044.

Keywords Suicide, Telemedicine, Preventive Medicine.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- The protocol was registered in PROSPERO and published in a peer-reviewed journal, ensuring methodological transparency.
- Data extraction, synthesis, and quality assessment are reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-2020) guidelines.
- The systematic review and meta-analyses used a comprehensive search strategy to avoid missing published articles.
- Heterogeneity in the methods makes it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the effectiveness of interventions.

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organisation (WHO) estimates that over 703,000 people die annually from suicide worldwide [1, 2]. Suicide occurs across the lifespan; although, in 2019, it was the fourth leading cause of death among individuals aged 15 – 29 years worldwide [2, 3]. For each death by suicide, there are twenty suicide attempts [4], which is one of the major disease burden causes in the world [5, 6, 7]. Moreover, a history of suicide attempts is considered a robust predictor of completed suicide, supporting prevention efforts during the acute period following an episode of suicidal behaviour [8–12].

Increasing evidence suggests that post-discharge follow-up contacts can be an effective suicide prevention strategy [13–19]. The eHealth-based treatments could be classified into two categories: (1) real-time synchronous therapy – such as telephone contact or telepsychiatry via videoconferencing – (2) or digital self-help programmes without human guidance, often asynchronous [20, 21]. Synchronous communication technologies, including telemedicine and real-time interactions, have the potential to provide immediate and flexible access to support during critical periods. As opposed to asynchronous methods, these approaches facilitate direct and immediate engagement between patients and healthcare professionals, potentially enhancing the effectiveness of suicide prevention efforts. Accordingly, most post-discharge suicide prevention programmes reinforce early contact with mental health professionals. An essential component of the effectiveness of suicide prevention interventions is treatment adherence [22]. The evaluation of therapeutic adherence in clinical care is critically important since poor adherence results in adverse outcomes, such as relapses and hospitalisations, among people with mental health disorders worldwide [22, 23, 24]. Brief contact interventions have three rationales: firstly, they allow for repeated suicide risk assessments; secondly, they reduce feelings of social isolation and provide emotional support; and thirdly, they improve treatment adherence and reduce dropout from mental health care [25–28].

In recent decades, numerous studies have reported promising results from the implementation of follow-up contact interventions for at-risk individuals as a suicide prevention strategy [29, 30]. Although previous systematic reviews have addressed this topic [31, 32, 33], evidence on the specific impact of synchronous technologies remains limited. In a scoping review, Shin *et al.* [34] identified several trends in information and communication technology (ICT)-based interventions for suicide prevention applied in clinical settings, such as computerised interventions or applications, highlighting the need for future research to strengthen the evidence to improve implementation. This review included 66 ICT-based interventions, targeted at post-discharge follow-up, screening, and safety planning, for any spectrum of suicide-related thoughts and behaviours.

Along these lines, Luxton *et al.* [35] suggest that repeated follow-up contacts may help reduce suicidal behaviour, reporting in their systematic review four studies that showed mixed results with trends towards a preventive effect and two studies that showed no preventive effect. A more recent systematic review and meta-analysis [36] examined 16 studies evaluating the effectiveness of telehealth interventions in suicide prevention, reporting that telepsychiatry is effective in reducing suicide and reattempt rates, with high acceptance and retention rates. Nevertheless, this review did not specifically evaluate suicidal ideation, and moreover, the authors emphasise the need for further research to fully elucidate the potential of telepsychiatry in suicide prevention.

These interventions' distinctive and rapidly evolving nature necessitates a thorough exploration of their implications. Our research intends to expand on previous evidence by updating it with a larger number of studies, a comprehensive analysis of the components of suicidal behaviour, and a more detailed examination of the temporal dynamics of the effects. The current systematic review and meta-analyses aim to explore the evidence on remote suicide prevention strategies implemented through synchronous technology-based interventions (i.e.,

via remote, interactive, real-time communication), considering the effects, barriers, and facilitators to the implementation.

METHODS

Protocol and registration

The protocol of the systematic review and meta-analyses was registered in the Prospective International Registry of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO), with the identification number CRD42021275044. The review was reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [37] (see Supplemental File 1: Table S1). A brief mention of the amendments made to the original protocol article [38] can be found in the Supplemental File 2.

Eligibility criteria

The main inclusion and exclusion criteria are described below. Full details on the eligibility criteria can be found in the protocol article [38].

Participants

Adolescents over 12 years of age and adults with reported suicidal ideation or prior suicide attempts. Individuals with non-suicidal self-injury were excluded.

Interventions

Secondary suicide prevention interventions delivered via synchronous distance communication technologies– i.e., telephone contact, 24-hour telephone hotlines, videoconferencing therapy, immediate text messaging, etc–. Interventions based on asynchronous telecommunication devices were excluded.

125

126 Comparisons

127 The eligible control groups include treatment as usual (e.g., visits to mental health services or
128 pharmacotherapy), enhanced usual care, no treatment, historical control, or geographical
129 control. Non-reporting of a control group was a reason for exclusion. Studies were excluded if
130 both, the intervention and control groups, received synchronous and remote interventions.

131

132 Outcomes

133 Suicidal behaviours– i.e., suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide deaths– were included.
134 Suicidal ideation refers to thoughts about the possibility of ending one's life [39], assessed using
135 validated instruments such as the Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale (CSSRS). A suicide
136 attempt is defined as a self-inflicted, potentially injurious act with a non-fatal outcome and
137 evidence of intent to die [3], measured by the number of reported attempts within a defined
138 follow-up period. Finally, suicide death involves a self-inflicted behaviour performed with the
139 deliberate intention of resulting in death [40], and may be quantified by the number of persons
140 who die by suicide. Outcomes could be assessed at any point following the intervention, with
141 no restriction on the length of follow-up, provided the assessment uses a quantitative approach.
142 Adherence to treatment was also extracted as a secondary outcome.

143

144 Study design

145 Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and non-randomised clinical trials (nRCTs) were eligible for
146 inclusion. The term nRCTs refers to studies with a defined intervention and comparison group,
147 in the absence of random allocation. Observational studies uncontrolled and non-experimental
148 were excluded (i.e., single-arm studies, interrupted time series, case reports, descriptive non-
149 comparative studies) [41, 42].

150

151 **Data collection and analysis**

152 Information sources

153 Bibliographic searches were conducted in PubMed, PsycInfo, Scopus, and Web of Science for
154 studies published before December 2024. ClinicalTrials.gov and Google Scholar were searched
155 for grey literature and unpublished records. Reference lists of previous systematic reviews on
156 the subject and references cited in eligible articles were consulted for data collection.

157

158 Search strategy

159 Details of the search process applied to databases, registers, and websites can be found in
160 Supplemental File 3. The search was unrestricted by year of publication, limited to English or
161 Spanish, and developed adhering to the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) [43].

162

163 Study selection

164 The results of the literature search were imported into Mendeley (version 1.19.8), and Rayyan
165 Systems Inc [44]. Duplicate articles were removed automatically by Rayyan Systems Inc. and
166 manually by the first reviewer (LC). After, two authors (LC and MPJ) blind-screened all articles
167 based on titles, abstracts, and keywords. Then, two reviewers (LC and MPJ) independently
168 evaluated the full-text articles according to the eligibility criteria. Discrepancies were resolved
169 through discussion with a third author (AS) until reaching consensus.

170

171 Data collection

172 Two authors (LC and MPJ) performed the data extraction independently, applying an *ad hoc*
173 extraction form in Microsoft Excel (version 16.65).

174

Data items

Data were extracted on participants and intervention characteristics, along with outcomes related to suicidal behaviour for both intervention and comparison groups– for all measures and time points–. In addition, therapeutic adherence– specifically, the moderating effect of adherence on the effectiveness of the intervention, the description of measures to maximise adherence to treatment, and predictor variables of adherence– were examined.

Risk of bias

Two reviewers (LC and MPJ) performed the risk of bias (RoB) assessment independently, using the Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomised trials (RoB 2) [45] and Risk-of-bias In Non-randomised Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) [46] for the outcome of suicidal behaviours. Disagreements were resolved by consensus with a third blinded reviewer (AS).

Effect measures

Systematically examined all types of effect measures used in the selected trials (e.g., risk ratio, odds ratio, mean difference, frequencies) for the effects of each intervention group on suicidal ideation, repeated suicide attempts, and death by suicide.

Synthesis methods

Firstly, a systematic review was employed to collect and synthesise the empirical evidence that met the eligibility criteria. Secondly, meta-analyses were conducted using a random-effects model. Due to the wide variety of study types included in the systematic review, a random-effects model was selected *a priori* for all analyses, and heterogeneity statistics were reported using this model, in accordance with the recommendations from the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (version 6.3) [47]. To ensure that the combined numerical

data from the different studies is comparable and can be adequately synthesised, analyses by sorting studies with the same evaluation measures time frame were performed for each outcome, and a narrative synthesis approach was adopted when a quantitative combination of the studies was not feasible.

Three types of meta-analyses were performed. (1) A random-effects model with Hedges' *g* [48] and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated for suicidal ideation. Effect sizes are considered small ($g \geq 0.2$), medium ($g \geq 0.5$), or large ($g \geq 0.8$) [48]. (2) A random-effects model with the effect estimates weighted by the inverse of the variance was calculated for suicide attempts. As proposed by Daly [49] and Zhang & Yu [50], the risk ratio (RR) and 95% CI were analysed. Finally, (3) a random-effects model with the effect estimates weighted by the Peto *et al.* method [51] was calculated for suicide deaths since the observed frequencies are very low. The Cochrane's Q test and tau^2 statistic were employed to identify heterogeneity among studies. The proportion of variability due to heterogeneity was indicated by I^2 value. Heterogeneity was considered moderate if I^2 was greater than 30%. All analyses were performed using the Meta-Essentials tool for Microsoft Excel (version 16.65) [52], applying the Knapp-Hartung adjustment by default in fitting random effects models. The trials with multiple assessment measurement periods were included as separate studies in the appropriate meta-analyses [47].

Certainty of evidence

The certainty of evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (https://gdt.gradepro.org/) [53]. The GRADE guidelines establish standardised and transparent criteria for grading the certainty of evidence [54]. In classifying the level of evidence quality, GRADE defines four categories: high, moderate, low, and very low [55]. The main domains used are risk of bias, inconsistency, indirect evidence, imprecision, and

publication bias [55]. Two reviewers (LC and MPJ) independently evaluated the certainty of the evidence of the included studies; any discrepancies were resolved through consultation with a third reviewer (AS). The assessment was carried out for each outcome of suicidal behaviours. Summary tables of the findings were presented to synthesise the process.

Patient and public involvement

Not involved in the review protocol, design, reporting, or dissemination plans.

RESULTS

Study selection

The initial search retrieved 4930 studies. After removing duplicates, 2802 articles were screened for title, abstract, and keywords. Of these, 131 studies were selected for full-text review. Finally, 28 publications were included in the systematic review and meta-analyses [56–83]. The article selection process was described in a PRISMA flowchart [84] (Figure 1). Studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria but were excluded and the reasons for exclusion are presented in Supplemental File 4: Table S2. Inter-rater agreement was calculated for initial screening using Delta (δ=0.91, 95% CI 0.88 to 0.94) [85], and for eligibility and extraction process using Cohen's Kappa (κ=0.82, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.0; κ=0.98, 95% CI 0.97 to 0.99, respectively) [86].

[Please insert here Figure 1]

Figure 1 PRISMA flowchart for systematic review and meta-analyses including database searches and other sources.

Study characteristics

A descriptive summary of the characteristics of the included studies is presented in Table 1 and Supplemental File 5: Table S3. The current systematic review included 28 studies, of which 19

were RCT (67.9%) [56–58, 61–63, 66, 69, 71, 72, 74–77, 79–83]. The sample size ranges from 10 to 3068 in the intervention group (IG) and from 10 to 3694 in the control group (CG). The mean age ranged from 23 to 45 years in the IG and from 23 to 47 years in the CG. The proportion of women in most of the studies was above 50% in both IG and CG, except in three studies [63, 79, 82]. The eligible articles were from 12 countries: France [64, 65, 72, 74, 78, 89, 81], Spain [59, 60, 67, 68, 70], United States of America [63, 73, 79, 82], Iran [69, 71, 75, 76], Brazil, India, Sri Lanka [57, 66], French Polynesia [56], Canada [58], Sweden [61], Australia [62], United Kingdom [77], and China [83].

As for outcome variables, 8 studies reported outcomes relating to suicidal ideation [58, 61–63, 77, 79, 82, 83], 26 studies reported the proportion of participants who reattempted suicide [56–61, 63–65, 67–83], and 13 reported the proportion of suicide deaths [56, 58, 60, 63, 66, 68–71, 73, 74, 80, 81]. There was high heterogeneity in the diagnostic methods used to identify suicide behaviours: European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS), Scale for Suicide Ideation (SSI), General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28), Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale (CSSRS), Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation (BSS), Suicide Attempt Self-Injury Count (SASI-Count), Beck's Suicide Intent Scale (SIS), Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours (SUPRE-MISS) questionnaire, forensic records of suicide deaths, data from electronic medical records, etc. The most frequently reported psychiatric diagnoses were affective disorders (*n*=13; 46.4%) [56, 58, 61, 64, 65, 68, 70, 72, 73, 74, 77, 79, 81], followed by anxiety disorders (*n*=10; 35.7%) [56, 58, 61, 64, 65, 72, 73, 77, 79, 81], personality disorders (*n*=5; 17.9%) [56, 58, 65, 68, 74], substance use disorders (*n*=5; 17.9%) [56, 58, 64, 72, 77], trauma-related disorders (*n*=5; 17.9%) [58, 64, 74, 79, 81], psychotic disorders (*n*=4; 14.3%) [56, 65, 68, 73], and eating disorders (*n*=3; 10.7%) [65, 72, 81] according to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III-R, DSM-IV-TR) or the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10).

The interventions were categorised as (a) telephone follow-up intervention (*n*=16; 57.1%) [59–61, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70–72, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 83], (b) Brief Intervention and Contact (BIC; *n*=5; 17.9%) [56, 57, 66, 69, 79], (c) web-based therapist-delivered Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR; *n*=1; 3.6%) [58], (d) 24-hour call-in services (*n*=1; 3.6%) [62], (e) instant text messages (*n*=1; 3.6%) [63], (f) Emergency Department Safety Assessment and Follow-up Evaluation (ED-SAFE intervention; *n*=1; 3.6%) [73], (g) postal cards, 24-hour telephone, and telephone follow-up (*n*=1; 3.6%) [74], (h) Safety Planning and telephone follow-up intervention (SAFETEL intervention; *n*=1; 3.6%) [77], and (i) Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up (*n*=1; 3.6%) [82]. On the other hand, the control group in most studies was TAU (*n*=26; 92.9%) [56–75, 77–81, 83], except for two studies, which was a face-to-face follow-up [76] and a relaxation training condition [82].

In relation to setting, the included studies were conducted in emergency departments (*n*=19; 67.9%) [56, 57, 59–61, 65, 66, 69–76, 78, 80, 81, 83], mental health services (*n*=4; 14.3%) [58, 64, 68, 82], general hospitals (*n*=2; 7.1%) [67, 77], military installations (*n*=2; 7.1%) [63, 79], or 24-hour call-in services (*n*=1; 3.6%) [62]. Interventions were performed by nurses (*n*=7; 25%) [59–61, 65, 67, 68, 70], psychologists (*n*=7; 25%) [63, 64, 71, 72, 77, 79, 81], psychiatrists (*n*=6; 21.4%) [58, 74–76, 78, 80], physicians (*n*=1; 3.6%) [73], and by a combination of health professionals– i.e., medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social worker (*n*=4; 14.3%) [56, 57, 66, 69]– although, few interventions were undertaken by non-health professionals (*n*=2; 7.1%) [62, 83] or not reported (*n*=1; 3.6%) [82]. The onset of the intervention– i.e., initial contact– could be categorised in a time interval of days (*n*=5; 17.9%) [58, 63, 64, 74, 77], weeks (*n*=19; 67.9%) [56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 65–72, 75, 76, 78, 81–83], months (*n*=2; 7.1%) [61, 80], or not reported (*n*=2; 7.1%) [73, 79]. The total number of contacts ranged from one [64, 72, 80, 81] to 14 [71], with a minimum duration of five minutes [59, 60, 66] and a maximum of 90 minutes

298 [58]. In addition, the follow-up period ranged from two months [65] to five years [60], with 12
299 months being the most prevalent period range (*n*=10; 35.7%) [59, 61–63, 67, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74].
300
301 **Table 1**
302 Overview of participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) for
303 studies evaluating suicide ideation, attempted suicide, and suicide death.

Table 1. Overview of participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) for studies evaluating suicide ideation, attempted suicide, and suicide death

Study (authors, date of publication, country)	**Study design**	**Setting, sample size (*N*)**	**Details of participants**	**Intervention (*n*) and comparison (*n*)**	**Follow-up**	**Outcome measure (Instrument)**
Amadéo *et al*., 2015 [56]. French Polynesia	RCT	Psychiatric ED *N*=190	Patients with suicidal behaviour; mean age IG 33, CG 31.48; 64.2% women	BIC (*n*=90) vs. TAU (*n*=100). 1h psycho-educational session combined with telephone contacts at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, and 18 months by psychologists and psychiatrists.	18 months	Suicide attempt (EPSIS) [87], Suicide death (Forensic records of suicide deaths)
Bertolote *et al*., 2010 [57]. Brazil, India, Sri Lanka, Iran, China	RCT	ED *N*=1867	Patients with suicide attempt; mean age IG 26.3, CG 25.5; 58.2% women	BIC (*n*=922) vs. TAU (*n*=945). 1h brief educational intervention combined with telephone contacts or visits at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, 18 months by medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social worker.	18 months	Suicide attempt (EPSIS) [87]
Burback *et al*., 2024 [58]. Canada	RCT	Mental health services. *N*=42	Patients with suicidal ideation in the past week; age IG 36.0, CG 36.0; 79.0% women	Web-based therapist-delivered EMDR (*n*=20) vs. TAU (*n*=22). 12 sessions of web-based EMDR (90 min.) delivered twice weekly via videoconferencing by psychiatrists.	4 months	Suicidal ideation (BSS) [88], Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [89], Suicide death (CSSRS) [89]
Cebrià *et al*., 2013 [59]. Spain	nRCT; case-control	2 Hospital ED *N*=514	Patients discharged from ED after a suicide attempt; age IG 41.92, CG 40.73; 66.5% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=296) vs. TAU (*n*=218). Telephone contacts (5-10 min.) at 1 week, 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12 months by a psychiatric nurse.	12 months	Suicide attempt (Interview + medical record)
Cebrià *et al*., 2015 [60]. Spain	nRCT; retrospective cohort	2 Hospital ED *N*=485	Patients discharged from ED after a suicide attempt; age IG 38.78, CG 41.92; 64.5% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=287) vs. TAU (*n*=198). Telephone contacts (5-10 min.) at 1 week, 1, 3, 6, 9, and 12 months by a psychiatric nurse.	60 months	Suicide attempt, Suicide death (Interview + Medical records)
Cedereke *et al*., 2002 [61]. Sweden	RCT	Hospital, Emergency Unit *N*=216	Patients treated after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 40, CG 42; 66% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=107) vs. TAU (*n*=109). Telephone contacts (20-25 min.) at 4 and 8 months after a suicide attempt, by a psychiatric nurse or social counsellor.	12 months	Suicidal ideation (SSI) [90], Suicide attempt (Semi-structured interview)
Christensen *et al*., 2013 [62]. Australia	RCT	Australia's Lifeline. *N*=155	Callers to a national 24h-helpline service with moderate-to-high psychological distress; mean age 41.49; 81.9% women	Web-based CBT (*n*=38) vs. Web-based CBT + telephone follow-up (*n*=45) vs. telephone follow-up (*n*=37) vs. TAU (*n*=35). CBT delivered across five modules. Telephone contacts (10 min.), weekly, by a Lifeline telephone counsellor.	12 months	Suicidal ideation (GHQ-28) [91]
Comtois *et al*., 2019 [63]. USA	RCT	3 military installations *N*=657	Soldiers and marines identified as being at risk of suicide; mean age IG 25.6, CG 24.8; 17.9% women	Caring contacts (*n*=329) vs. TAU (*n*=328). Text messages delivered on day 1, at week 1, at months 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12, and on participants' birthdays, by mental health clinicians. Text message replies from participants were monitored 24 hours a day. Replies indicating suicide risk or distress were handled by a few text messages exchanged or a single telephone call.	12 months	Suicidal ideation (SSI) [90], Suicide attempt (Interview + SASI-Count) [92], Suicide death (Interview)
Demesmaeker *et al*., 2024 [64]. France	nRCT; prospective cohort	General medical or psychiatric services *N*=733	Patients discharged from the hospital after a suicide attempt (non-first-time attempters); mean age IG 40.2, CG 39.4; 61.5% women	Telephone contact (*n*=236) vs. Telephone contact and postcards (*n*=411) vs. Postcards (*n*=34) vs. TAU (*n*=52). Telephone contact between the 10th and 21st days after discharge for suicide attempts by psychologists. Personalised postcards are sent at months 2–5 to those unavailable for a phone call or facing a suicidal crisis.	6 months	Suicide attempt (Standardised telephone interview)
Exbrayat *et al*., 2017 [65]. France	nRCT; non-randomised controlled	Emergency Psychiatry Dept. *N*=827	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 40.2, CG 39.7; 69.5% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=436) vs. TAU (*n*=387). Telephone contacts at 8, 30, 60 days after suicide attempt by nurses.	2 months	Suicide attempt (medical records)
Fleischmann *et al*., 2008 [66]. Brazil, India, Sri Lanka, Iran, China	RCT	ED *N*=1867	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 23, CG 23; 58.2% women	BIC (*n*=922) vs. TAU (*n*=945). 1h brief educational intervention combined with telephone contacts (5 min.) or visits at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, and 18 months by a medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social worker.	18 months	Suicide death (EPSIS) [87]
Gabilondo *et al*., 2020 [67]. Spain	nRCT; non-randomised controlled	3 General Hospitals *N*=586	Patients discharged from a General Hospital after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 41.2, CG 45.2; 58.5% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=123) vs. TAU (*n*=463). 6 months telephone contacts (10-15 min.) after 1, 2 weeks, 1, 3, 6 months by general nurses.	12 months	Suicide attempt (medical records)
Goñi-Sarriés *et al*., 2022 [68]. Spain	nRCT; prospective cohort	2 Psychiatric Units *N*=191	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; mean age IG 44.96, CG 46.91; 52.9% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=101) vs. TAU (*n*=90). Telephone contacts (15-20 min.) the day after discharge, at 15 days, and at 2, 4, 8, and 12 months by a specialist nurse.	12 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (Interview)
Hassanzadeh *et al*., 2010 [69]. Iran	RCT	5 General Hospitals ED *N*=632	Patients with suicide attempt; mean age IG 24 (*SD*=8.3), mean age CG 25; 62% women	BIC (*n*=319) vs. TAU (*n*=310). 1-hour psycho-educational session combined with telephone contacts at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, and 6 months by psychologists, nurses, consultants, and psychiatric residents.	6 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (SUPRE-MISS questionnaire) [93]

López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021 [70]. Spain	nRCT; prospective cohort	Psychiatric ED *N*=410	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; mean age IG 41.7, CG 44.6; 63.7% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=203) vs. TAU (*n*=207). Telephone follow-up at 15 days, 2, 4, 8, and 12 months by mental health nurses.	12 months	Suicide attempt, Suicide death (medical records)
Malakouti *et al*., 2022 [71]. Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N*=305	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; 66.9% women	Telephone contact programme (*n*=153) vs. TAU (*n*=152). Telephone contact calls (15-20 min.) at 1, 2, and 4 weeks, and monthly for up to 12 months by clinical psychologists with a master's degree.	12 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (SUPRE-MISS questionnaire) [93]
Messiah *et al*., 2019 [72]. France	RCT	23 Hospital ED and psychiatric crisis centres *N*=1040	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; 65.9% women	AlgoS: Telephone follow-up for multi-attempters (*n*=317) or crisis card for first attempters (*n*=203) vs. TAU (*n*=520). Telephone follow-up between the 10th and 21st by a psychologist. The patient could not be contacted after 3 attempts, on 3 different days, at 3 different times of day: postcards were sent at 2, 3, 4, and 5 months.	14 months	Suicide attempt (Semi-structured interview)
Miller *et al*., 2017 [73]. USA	nRCT; non-randomised controlled	8 Hospital ED *N*=1376	Patients with suicide attempt or ideation presented to hospital ED; mean age IG 36, CG 37; 56% women	Universal screening and ED-SAFE intervention (*n*=502) vs. Universal screening (*n*=377) vs. TAU (*n*=497). Risk screening by the ED physician, discharge resource, and 7 post-ED telephone calls (10-20 min.).	12 months	Suicide attempt, Suicide death (CSSRS) [89]
Mouaffak *et al*., 2015 [74]. France	RCT	Psychiatric ED *N*=320	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 39, CG 38.6; 70% women	Postal cards, 24-hour telephone and telephone follow-up (*n*=160) vs. TAU (*n*=160). Postal cards, few days, 1, 6, and 11 months providing 24-hour crisis telephone consultation with a psychiatrist, and telephone calls at 2 weeks, 1- and 3 months PD.	12 months	Suicide attempt (SIS) [94], Suicide death (Semi-structured interview)
Mousavi *et al*., 2014 [75]. Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N*=139	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt in 2010-2011; 63.3% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=69) vs. TAU (*n*=70). Telephone contacts (30 min.) at 2, 4 weeks, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 months by psychiatry.	6 months	Suicide attempt (*ad hoc* questionnaire)
Mousavi *et al*., 2016 [76]. Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N*=55	Patients admitted to ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 27.07, CG 29.69; 87.3% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=29) vs. face-to-face (*n*=26). Telephone contacts (20 min.) at 2, 4 weeks, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 months by an assistant of psychiatry.	8 months	Suicide attempt (Interview)
O'Connor *et al*., 2022 [77]. UK	RCT	4 general hospitals *N*=120	Patients with a history of a suicide attempt; mean age IG 36.1, CG 37.0 (*SD*=14.8); 62.5% women	SAFETEL intervention (*n*=80) vs. TAU (*n*=40). Safety planning intervention session and 5 optional telephone calls at 72h of patient discharge from the hospital and weekly thereafter depending on participants' availability by clinical psychologists.	6 months	Suicide Ideation, Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [89]
Plancke *et al*., 2020 [78]. France	nRCT; retrospective cohort	Hospital ED *N*=6762	Patients discharged from the hospital after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 37.9, mean age CG 39.4; 61.4% women	Telephone follow-up (*n*=3068) vs. TAU (*n*=3694). Telephone contacts at 10, 21 days, and 6 months by psychiatrists. The patient could not be reached by telephone: post-cards were sent at 2, 3, 4, and 5 months.	6 months	Suicide attempt (Interview)
Riblet *et al*., 2022 [79]. USA	RCT	Veterans Medical Center *N*=20	Patients at risk for suicide; mean age IG 54.9, CG 48.1; 35% women	BIC (*n*=10) vs. TAU (*n*=10). 6 contacts by phone or video over 3 months, educational materials mailed out to the patient, and 1-hour educational intervention on suicide prevention either over the phone or video by a clinical psychologist.	3 months	Suicide Ideation (BSS) [88] + Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [89]
Vaiva *et al*., 2006 [80]. France	RCT	13 ED *N*=605	Patients discharged from an ED after attempted suicide by deliberate self-poisoning; mean age IG 37, CG 35; 72.9% women	Telephone contact 1 month (*n*=147) or 3 months (*n*=146) vs. TAU (*n*=312). Telephone contact (20-25 min.) at 1 or 3 months after discharge from an ED for attempted suicide by psychiatrists.	13 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (medical records)
Vaiva *et al*., 2018 [81]. France	RCT	23 ED and psychiatry crisis centers *N*=987	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; mean age IG 38.4 (*SD*=13.4), mean age CG 38.1 (*SD*=13.1); 63.4% women	AlgoS algorithm (*n*=493) vs. TAU (*n*=494). Telephone contacts between the 10th and 21st day after a suicide attempt by a psychologist. The patient could not be contacted after 3 attempts, on 3 different days, at 3 different times of day, or decline follow-up care from other services, or identified being under stress/experiencing a suicidal crisis: programmed mailing post-cards at months 2, 3, 4, and 5.	13 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (Interview)
Ward-Ciesielski *et al*., 2017 [82]. USA	RCT	University Outpatient Clinic. *N*=93	Participants with suicidal ideation; mean age IG 38.6 (*SD*=15.0), mean age CG 41.8 (*SD*=15.3); 37% women	DBT-BSI and telephone follow-up (*n*=46) vs. RT control condition (*n*=47). Single-session DBT-BSI, presenting pre-selected skills (mindfulness, opposite-to-emotion action, distraction, and changing your body chemistry) and 3 months telephone contact (30-45 min.) at 1, 4, and 12 weeks.	3 months	Suicidal ideation (SSI) [90], Suicide attempts (Interview)
Wei *et al*., 2013 [83]. China	RCT	4 General Hospitals ED *N*=239	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; mean age IG 34.06 (*SD*=15.84), mean age CG 32.12 (*SD*=13.87); 77.1% women	Cognitive Therapy group (*n*=82) vs. Telephone intervention group (*n*=80), (3) vs. TAU (*n*=77). 12 weekly phone calls (20-40 min.) within a 3-month period by professors.	12 months	Suicide Ideation (SSI) [90], Suicide attempt (Structured Interview)

AlgoS: decision-making algorithm for suicide; BIC: Brief Intervention and Contact; BSS: Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation; CBT: Cognitive Behaviour Therapy; CG: Control Group; CSSRS: Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale; DBT-BSI: Dialectical Behaviour Therapy - Brief Suicide Intervention; ED-SAFE: Emergency Department Safety Assessment and Follow-up Evaluation; ED: Emergency Department; EMDR: Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing; EPSIS: European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule; GHQ-28: General Health Questionnaire; IG: Intervention Group; nRCT: Non-Randomised Clinical Trial; PD: Post-Discharge; RCT: Randomised Controlled Trial; RT: Relaxation Training; SAFETEL: safety planning and telephone follow-up intervention; SASI-Count: Suicide Attempt Self-Injury Count; SIS: Beck's Suicide Intent Scale; SUPRE-MISS: Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours; SSI: Scale for Suicide Ideation; TAU: Treatment As Usual; UK: United Kingdom; USA: United States of America; W: Women.

Risk of bias in studies

The results of the RoB 2 [45] and ROBINS-I [46] evaluations are presented in Figure 2. Inter-rater agreement was calculated using Cohen's Kappa (κ=0.94, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.0) [86]. The overall RoB ratings were classified as low, moderate, or high. A total of 8 (28.6%) studies met the criteria to be classified as low risk of bias; in 13 (46.4%) studies the risk of bias was moderate; while in 7 (25%) studies the risk of bias was high for the outcome of suicidal behaviours.

[Please insert here Figure 2]

Figure 2 RoB assessment. (**A**) RoB 2 evaluation; (**B**) ROBINS-I evaluation.

Results of individual studies

Suicidal ideation

The results of the meta-analyses of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on suicidal ideation are shown in Figure 3. Among the 28 trials, four studies reported the effects of the intervention on suicidal ideation in short-term (≤ 3 months) [58, 62, 79, 82] and four studies in medium-term (6–12 months) [61–63, 77]. There was a very small size, non-statistically significant effect of IG vs. CG on suicidal ideation at short-term (Hedges' *g* -0.17, 95% CI -0.62 to 0.28 at 1 month; Hedges' g -0.07, 95% CI -0.34 to 0.20 at 3 months). Also, there was a small size, non-statistically significant effect at medium-term (Hedges' *g* -0.28, 95% CI -0.89 to 0.34 at 6 months; Hedges' *g* -0.27, 95% CI -0.56 to 0.03 at 12 months). Heterogeneity was substantial for

333 nearly all the measurement moments (I^2=59.4% at 1 month, I^2=69.3% at 6 months, I^2=51.9% at
334 12 months) except for the measurement at 3 months (I^2=0.0%).
335
336 Suicide attempts
337 The results of the meta-analyses of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on
338 suicide reattempts are shown in Figure 4. Among the 28 trials, seven studies reported the effects
339 of the intervention on suicide attempts in short-term (≤ 3 months) [58, 65, 75, 76, 79, 82, 83],
340 17 studies in medium-term (6–12 months) [59, 63, 64, 67–78, 81, 83], and six studies in long-
341 term (>12 months) [56, 57, 61, 72, 80, 81]. There was a statistically significant effect (RR 0.73,
342 95% CI 0.62 to 0.85) on suicide attempts at 1 month favourable to the intervention group, with
343 a 27% reduction of the risk of making at least one suicide attempt, relative to control group.
344 There was a statistically significant effect (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.95) on suicide attempts at 6
345 months, with a 44% lower risk of making at least one suicide attempt in the intervention group
346 compared to the control group, despite considerable heterogeneity (I^2=85.4%). In addition, a
347 statistically significant effect (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.96) on suicide attempts at 12 months
348 was observed, with a 32% lower risk of making at least one suicide attempt in the intervention
349 group compared to the control group, although there was considerable heterogeneity
350 (I^2=87.6%). For the remaining measurement points, the heterogeneity was non-obvious (I^2=0.0%
351 at 1 month, 3 months, 13 months, and 18 months).
352
353 Suicide deaths
354 The results of the meta-analyses of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on
355 suicide deaths are shown in Figure 5. Among the 28 trials, seven studies reported the effects of
356 the intervention on suicide deaths in medium-term (6–12 months) [63, 68–70, 73, 74, 81], and
357 four studies in long-term (>12 months) [56, 66, 80, 81]. There was a statistically significant effect

358 on suicide deaths at 18 months (Peto OR 0.18, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.44), with the likelihood of dying
359 by suicide being 0.18 times lower in the intervention group compared to the control group. The
360 heterogeneity was low for all measurement points (I^2=17.9% at 6 months, I^2=0.0% at 12 months,
361 13 months, and 18 months).

362 [Please insert here Figures 3, 4, and 5]

363 **Figure 3** Forest plot comparing the effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicidal
364 intention.

365 **Figure 4** Forest plot comparing the effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicide
366 attempts.

367 **Figure 5** Forest plot comparing the effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicide
368 deaths.

369

370 In order to simplify interpretation, the results can be grouped into three timepoints: short- (≤ 3
371 months), medium- (6–12 months), and long-term (>12 months) (Table 2).

372

373 **Table 2**

374 Summary of intervention effects grouped by follow-up period (short-, medium-, and long-term).

Outcome	Term	Month	Effect (95% CI)	Indicators of heterogeneity	Interpretation
Suicidal ideation	Short-term	1 month	Hedges' *g* -0.17 (-0.62 to 0.28)	I^2=59.4%, Q=7.38, tau^2=0.13	Non-statistically significant
		3 months	Hedges' *g* -0.07 (-0.34 to 0.20)	I^2=0.0%, Q=1.16, tau^2=0.00	
	Medium-term	6 months	Hedges' *g* -0.28 (-0.89 to 0.34)	I^2=69.3%, Q=3.26, tau^2=0.14	Non-statistically significant
		12 months	Hedges' *g* -0.27 (-0.56 to 0.03)	I^2=51.9%, Q=4.16, tau^2=0.03	
Suicide attempts	Short-term	1 month	RR 0.73 (0.62 to 0.85)	I^2=0.0%, Q=0.70, tau^2=0.00	Statistically significant
		3 months	RR 0.50 (0.21 to 1.16)	I^2=0.0%, Q=1.32, tau^2=0.00	Non-statistically significant
	Medium-term	6 months	RR 0.56 (0.34 to 0.95)	I^2=85.4%, Q=54.92, tau^2=0.36	Statistically significant

		12 months	RR 0.68 (0.49 to 0.96)	I^2=87.6%, Q=72.63, tau^2=0.27	
	Long-term	13 months	RR 0.84 (0.66 to 1.06)	I^2=0.0%, Q=3.89, tau^2=0.00	Non-statistically significant
		18 months	RR 1.09 (0.30 to 3.91)	I^2=0.0%, Q=0.49, tau^2=0.00	
Suicide deaths	Medium-term	6 months	Peto OR 0.40 (0.00 to 789.93)	I^2=17.9%, Q=1.22, tau^2=0.15	Non-statistically significant
		12 months	Peto OR 0.87 (0.24 to 3.15)	I^2=0.0%, Q=3.63, tau^2=0.00	
	Long-term	13 months	Peto OR 0.42 (0.11 to 1.65)	I^2=0.0%, Q=0.77, tau^2=0.00	Non-statistically significant
		18 months	Peto OR 0.18 (0.08 to 0.44)	I^2=0.0%, Q=0.03, tau^2=0.00	Statistically significant

CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio; RR: risk ratio.

Results of narrative synthesis

Effects of Telephone Contact Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

A total of 15 articles examined the effectiveness of telephone follow-up interventions in the prevention of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide deaths [59–61, 64, 65, 67, 68, 70, 71, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 83]. The studies by Cebrià *et al*. [59], Exbrayat *et al*. [65], Malakouti *et al*. [71], Plancke *et al*. [78], and Vaiva *et al*. [80] reported differences in suicide reattempts in the intervention group compared to the control group, and a significant effect of the intervention group in reducing the rate of reattempts. Cebrià *et al*. [60], after a 60-month follow-up, indicated that the significant differences found at 12 months were not maintained in either group in terms of suicide reattempts (31.4% vs. 34.4%, *p*=0.40).

Demesmaeker *et al.* [64] examined the impact of the Vigilans programme by comparing interventions of a telephone call only between the 10th and 21st days after discharge, postcards at months 2–5 (if unreachable), a combination of both (if in suicidal crisis), and TAU. The Kaplan-Meier method, illustrating the time to the first suicide reattempt within 6 months, showed the highest survival probability for individuals receiving only a telephone contact and the lowest for those receiving TAU.

Cedereke *et al*. [61] and Mousavi *et al*. [76] found significant reductions in suicidal ideation, regardless of the intervention condition. On the other hand, Wei *et al*. [83] compared a telephone intervention with a cognitive therapy group and a control group, showing reductions in the number of suicide reattempts between the intervention and control groups (1.3% vs. 6.5%, p=0.08), although the differences were marginally significant. No statistically significant differences in suicidal ideation were shown between the three groups at any assessment point (baseline: p=0.43, 3-month: p=0.72, 6-month: p=0.75, 12-month: p=0.67).

Gabilondo *et al*. [67], Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [68], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [70], Mousavi *et al*. [75], Mousavi *et al*. [76], and Vaiva *et al*. [81] reported no significant differences between intervention and control groups for suicide reattempts. In addition, Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [68] informed that there were no significant differences in suicide deaths. More detailed information is in Table 1.

Effects of Text Message Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

Comtois *et al*. [63] conducted a follow-up text-messaging intervention with soldiers and marines considered at risk of suicide. Eleven contacts were made by mental health clinicians, with participants' text message responses monitored 24 hours a day. The authors reported no significant effect of the intervention on the presence or severity of current suicidal ideation; furthermore, the intervention did not significantly decrease the odds of a suicide risk incident during the 12-month follow-up period.

Effects of Multi-component Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

A total of 12 articles examined the effectiveness of a multi-component synchronous telepsychiatry strategies– e.g., 1-hour psychoeducational session plus telephone contacts– in the prevention of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide deaths [56–58, 62, 66, 69, 72–

418 74, 77, 79, 82]. Miller *et al*. [73] evaluated the ED-SAFE intervention, which consisted of a risk
419 screening and seven post-ED telephone calls. No significant differences in risk reduction were
420 found between the TAU and screening phases (22.9% vs. 21.5%, p=0.99). Mouaffak *et al*. [74]
421 delivered postcards, in combination with the possibility of calling a 24-hour telephone, and with
422 telephone follow-up at 2 weeks, 1, and 3 months after discharge from the ED. No significant
423 differences were found between the intervention and control groups for suicide reattempts
424 (14.5% vs. 14%, p=0.89). Messiah *et al*. [72] evaluated the effectiveness of the AlgoS Algorithm,
425 which consisted of a telephone follow-up at 10 and 21 days, for multi-attempters, or a crisis
426 card, for first-attempts, versus TAU. There was no significant difference for multi-attempters in
427 the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide reattempts at 6 (RR 0.84, 95%
428 CI 0.57 to 1.25) and 14 months (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.37).

429 Burback *et al.* [58] investigated the impact of 12 web-based, therapist-administered
430 EMDR sessions targeting experiences associated with suicidal ideation. Both EMDR and TAU
431 group participants reported significant differences (p=0.009) in suicide ideation scores between
432 baseline and 4-month follow-up (EMDR group baseline: M=20, SD=7.6; EMDR group 4-month:
433 M=13, SD=9.6; TAU group baseline: M=20, SD=7.6; TAU group 4-month: M=13, SD=9.6).
434 Additionally, EMDR group participants reported fewer serious adverse events compared to TAU
435 group participants.

436 Amadéo *et al*. [56], Bertolote *et al*. [57], Fleischmann *et al*. [66], and Hassanzadeh *et al*.
437 [69] investigated the efficacy of BIC using a brief 1-hour educational intervention combined with
438 telephone contacts at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, and 18 months delivered by physicians,
439 psychiatric nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, or social workers. No significant reduction was
440 found in the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide reattempts, although,
441 a significant reduction in suicide deaths in the intervention group compared with the control
442 group (0.2% vs. 2.2%, p<0.001) at 18 months was reported in the study by Fleischmann *et al*.

443 [66]. In a similar intervention protocol, Riblet *et al*. [79] contacted participants by telephone or
444 video over 3 months, mailed educational materials, and performed a 1-hour educational
445 intervention on suicide prevention also by telephone or video. A reduction in suicidal ideation
446 was found in the intervention group compared with the control group at 1 and 3 months.

447 Christensen *et al*. [62] conducted a web-based CBT intervention combined with
448 telephone follow-up compared with a CBT-only intervention and a TAU group. CBT was delivered
449 in five modules, and telephone contacts were provided weekly by a 24-hour telephone
450 counselling service. Significant reductions in suicidal ideation, in the telephone call condition, at
451 1-month post-intervention (p=0.003), 6-month follow-up (p=0.03), and 12-month follow-up
452 (p=0.01) were found. Similarly, Ward-Ciesielski *et al.* [82] conducted a single-session Dialectical
453 Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up at 1, 4, and 12
454 weeks, compared with a control group. A significant reduction in levels of suicidal ideation was
455 reported in both conditions, although there were no significant differences between conditions
456 for suicidal ideation and the number of suicide attempts. O'Connor *et al*. [77] evaluated the
457 effects of the SAFETEL intervention against TAU. A safety planning intervention (SPI) session and
458 five weekly optional telephone calls were conducted. No significant differences were found
459 between the intervention group and the control group for suicide attempts (Incidence Rate
460 Ratio; IRR 1.10, 95% CI 0.43 to 2.79, p=0.85).

461

462 Effects of Synchronous Remote-Based Interventions on Treatment Adherence

463 Nineteen studies reported on outcomes relating to treatment attendance [56–61, 64, 66–72,
464 77, 80–83]. Concerning the moderating effect of adherence on the effectiveness of the
465 intervention: Gabilondo *et al*. [67] observed that the intervention group showed significantly
466 higher adherence to outpatient follow-up (p<0.001); in addition, Hassanzadeh *et al*. [69]
467 revealed an increase in patients' perceived need for support (p<0.001) and positively influenced

468 attitudes towards seeking support from services and family. Moreover, Vaiva *et al*. [80] reported
469 that participants in the intervention group discussed their suicide attempts with their primary
470 care physician more frequently than controls.

471 According to Cebrià *et al*. [60], suicide attempters tend to be ambivalent to treatment,
472 do not attend treatment, or drop out prematurely; complementarily, López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés
473 [70] showed in their study that completion of the Telephone Follow-up Programme (TFP)
474 correlated with a reduction in suicidal behaviours. Along the same lines, Demesmaeker *et al.*
475 [64] highlight the importance of addressing the specific challenges faced by people who are
476 unwilling to enter treatment in the context of suicide prevention interventions. Interventions
477 may not uniformly benefit all patients, possibly due to differences in baseline suicidality or
478 programme adherence.

479 Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [82], and Wei *et al*. [83] also mention that the 75% retention rate
480 underscores the acceptability and effectiveness of the study in engaging a historically hard-to-
481 reach and difficult-to-retain population. As mentioned by Messiah *et al*. [72] telephone calls
482 could complement a multimodal strategy, providing a surveillance tool to drive more aggressive
483 interventions. Nevertheless, technical challenges, lack of access to computers, or lack of privacy
484 could prevent the enrollment of some individuals, as noted by Burback *et al.* [58].

485 Fleischmann *et al*. [66], Gabilondo *et al*. [67], and Demesmaeker *et al.* [64] mention that
486 BIC operates similarly to psychosocial counselling, providing temporary social support and
487 fostering feelings of connectedness through systematic follow-up contacts. BCI may help to
488 reduce social isolation and facilitate the progressive engagement of patients who may initially
489 be reluctant to participate in structured psychotherapies.

490 Concerning the predictor or moderator variables of adherence: Amadéo *et al*. [56],
491 López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [70], O'Connor *et al*. [77], Vaiva *et al*. [80], and Vaiva *et al*. [81]
492 concurred that patients lost to follow-up were more likely to be male. Gabilondo *et al*. [67],

493 Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [68], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [70], Vaiva *et al*. [80], and Vaiva *et al*. [81]
494 concluded that the intervention could be more effective for higher-risk populations requiring
495 additional support; in these studies, patients who completed PTF demonstrated a higher
496 severity of suicide attempts, greater psychopathological severity, used more violent methods,
497 and experienced predominantly affective disorders. In contrast, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [82] found
498 that participants lost to follow-up reported higher levels of depression and anxiety. In addition,
499 Demesmaeker *et al.* [64] reported that post-traumatic stress disorder and generalised anxiety
500 disorder appear to be predictors of non-adherence to the programme. On the other hand, four
501 studies [66, 71, 77, 83] discussed stigma around suicide as a factor that may affect patients'
502 attitudes towards seeking support from mental health services and family. More detailed
503 information is in Supplemental File 6: Table S4.
504
505 Causes of heterogeneity among study results
506 The investigations on the possible causes of heterogeneity between the outcomes of suicidal
507 ideation (I^2=59.4% at 1 month, I^2=69.3% at 6 months, I^2=51.9% at 12 months) and suicide
508 attempts (I^2=85.4% at 6 months, I^2=87.6% at 12 months) of the selected studies raise the
509 pertinence of qualitatively synthesising the results due to heterogeneity in: a) the evaluation
510 measures time frame of the outcomes (see Supplemental File 7. Table S5), b) the protocol of
511 intervention design and the characteristics of the intervention and control group– i.e., target
512 effect, measures of effect, method of implementation, administrator-participant interaction,
513 periodicity, number and duration of the intervention, professional delivering the intervention,
514 setting, participants, etc.– (see Supplemental File 5. Table S3), and c) assessment of RoB and
515 study design.
516
517 **Subgroup analysis**

518 Subgroup analysis was conducted based on length of intervention, type of treatment, research
519 design, and RoB assessment, if feasible [95]. Analysis revealed, for 1-month suicidal ideation
520 outcomes, that adjustment for confounding variables altered the direction of the effect, with
521 adjusted analysis indicating a negative effect (Hedges' *g* -0.41, 95% CI -1.12 to 0.31) and
522 unadjusted analysis showing a small positive effect (Hedges' *g* 0.17, 95% CI 0.00 to 0.33). On the
523 other hand, the results suggest that telephone contact interventions tend to show greater
524 effectiveness in reducing suicide attempts at the 6-month follow-up (RR 0.37, 95% CI 0.22 to
525 0.62) compared to multi-component interventions (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.65). Additionally,
526 nRCTs demonstrated a stronger effect (RR 0.31, 95% CI 0.18 to 0.53) compared to RCTs (RR 0.84,
527 95% CI 0.60 to 1.18) at 6 months follow-up. More detailed information is in Supplemental File
528 8: Table S6, S7 and S8.
529
530 **Publication bias**
531 Publication bias was examined using both funnel plots and Egger's test. The visual inspection of
532 the funnel plots suggested no evidence of publication bias (see Supplemental File 9: Figure S1,
533 S2, and S3); supported by the results of Egger's test, which indicated absence of evidence for
534 publication bias in the included primary studies for suicidal ideation (p=0.92), suicide attempts
535 (p=0.24), and suicide deaths (p=0.12).
536
537 **Certainty of evidence**
538 The overall certainty of the evidence, according to the Grading of Recommendations
539 Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) [53], was moderate for RCTs reporting
540 suicidal ideation and suicide death, and low for RCTs and nRCTs reporting suicide attempts. The
541 main reasons for downgrading were risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision in the results
542 (Supplemental File 10. Table S9).

DISCUSSION

The aim of the study was to assess the effectiveness of synchronous remote interventions in relation to three indicators related to suicidal behaviour: suicidal ideation, suicide attempt, and death by suicide. The results of our systematic review and meta-analyses are largely consistent with previous findings on the effectiveness of telematic interventions in preventing suicidal behaviour. In line with the Shoib *et al*. study [36], our conclusions reinforce the value of telepsychiatry in reducing suicide reattempt rates, although with heterogeneity in effects. Nevertheless, our research represents a significant advancement, offering more recent findings, a greater number of studies, additional variables, a wider range of telepsychiatry interventions, and an analysis of the temporal evolution of the intervention effects, providing a more nuanced understanding of their impact. Furthermore, we specifically analysed suicidal ideation as a possible mediator of the effects of these interventions, providing new insights into the mechanisms that might explain their effectiveness.

Meta-analyses: Effectiveness of synchronous remote-based interventions

The evidence suggests that, although synchronous remote-based interventions appear to reduce suicide attempts and, to some extent, deaths by suicide, their impact on suicidal ideation remains limited. The results seem to indicate that interventions have a clear effect in reducing suicide attempts, with an inverted U-shaped evolution over time, showing a peak of effectiveness at 6 months (-44%, 95% CI -66% to -5% in the intervention group compared to the control group) which subsequently declines. On the contrary, the results of the study do not show statistically significant effects on suicidal ideation, which exhibit a small effect size throughout the four evaluation moments. From the set of studies analysed in relation to deaths by suicide, it is observed that the confidence intervals cover very large ranges of odds ratios.

568 This is probably because they refer to a very low-frequency phenomenon, which exceeds the
569 sampling power of conventional empirical clinical trial studies. The juxtaposition of several of
570 these studies in a meta-analysis also does not solve the problem of lack of sampling power for
571 this rare occurrence. Likewise, the difficulty of obtaining reliable information on suicide deaths
572 is highlighted, which adds another challenge to reaching consistent conclusions. Moreover, in
573 some of our meta-analyses (e.g., 6-month time point in Figure 5), the use of the Knapp-Hartung
574 adjustment in random-effects models led to unusually wide confidence intervals when a few
575 studies were included (i.e., *n*=2). In situations like the one highlighted above, a high level of
576 uncertainty is generated, and the results clearly do not reflect the current weight of the evidence
577 in an intuitive sense.

578 In addition to the marked differences in the effect sizes of synchronous remote-based
579 interventions on the different indicators, their evolution over time differs, which can be
580 interpreted as a probable consequence of variations in the studies used for the evaluation of
581 the three indicators across the time points, compromising comparability. But it could also be
582 revealing differential effects of the interventions on each of the outcomes. In particular, the
583 marked difference in the effect sizes observed between suicidal behaviour and suicidal ideation,
584 which appears to be consistent across the assessment moments, along with the differing
585 evolution of these outcomes over time, suggests that the clear behavioural effect of the
586 intervention is not cognitively mediated. Most theoretical models of suicidal behaviour [96]
587 assume that it is constituted by a continuum of processes ranging from passive ideation and
588 planning to death through suicide attempt. Considering this sequencing, the apparent effect of
589 synchronous remote-based interventions on suicide attempts— but not on suicidal ideation—
590 suggests the probable involvement of an inhibitory mechanism. This mechanism may act directly
591 on behaviour, temporarily counteracting the influence of suicidal ideation on suicidal actions,
592 while the ideation itself probably persists as a latent risk factor. In this sense, it should be

593 considered that a key aspect of synchronous remote-based interventions is that they provide
594 the person at risk of death by suicide with regular, high-quality social interaction and support,
595 which is related to the concept of 'connectivity' discussed further. The discrepancy may also be
596 explained by the nature of the interventions, which often emphasise external support,
597 monitoring, and engagement rather than targeting the cognitive and emotional processes
598 underlying suicidal thoughts. While such strategies may enhance safety and prevent behavioural
599 outcomes like suicide attempts, they may not sufficiently address internal experiences. A recent
600 meta-analysis of safety planning-type interventions for suicide prevention [97] also finds
601 differences in reducing suicidal attempts but not suicidal ideation. The mechanism behind the
602 effectiveness of these interventions lies in risk management, preventing the transition from
603 suicidal ideation to suicidal action, even though no significant reduction in suicidal thoughts was
604 observed.

605 Despite differences in the trends over time of the three indicators evaluated, some
606 commonality exists since they generally tend to improve over time, probably reflecting a
607 cumulative effect of the intervention that plateaus around 12-13 months. However, this finding
608 should be taken with caution as the studies included in the different evaluation moments are
609 not always the same, which may partially explain apparent changes in effect size over time.

610

611 **Quality, comparability, and integrability of the studies included in the meta-analyses**

612 There are various aspects of the nature of the studies analysed, as well as the
613 methodology followed in the meta-analyses, that condition the interpretation of the results.
614 Firstly, of the 28 studies analysed, only eight (29%) had a low RoB, including seven randomised
615 controlled trials (37%) and one non-randomised trial (11%). Additionally, unexplained statistical
616 heterogeneity across studies warrants further investigation to determine effects.

Secondly, although the selected studies share key commonalities– namely, all being clinical trials and involving synchronous, remote-based interventions– there is substantial variability in their action protocols and evaluation points. Significant variations were found in the procedure of the intervention, and comparison group– i.e., periodicity, number of contacts, moment of assessment, content, practitioner, setting, type of usual treatment, etc.–, as well as in the methodology– i.e., study design and RoB– of the reviewed studies. Heterogeneity of results could be due to differences in the length of follow-up, the methods used in the different programmes, variability in the number of sessions, or different patient inclusion criteria. This heterogeneity complicates the integration of findings into a meta-analysis. However, it has been partially addressed by conducting specific meta-analyses based on temporal groupings, which enhance comparability while also assessing the dynamic evolution of the intervention's therapeutic effects. Replication of these interventions according to a standardised protocol would facilitate more consistent results [98].

Narrative synthesis

Firstly, the neologism ‘connectivity’ seems to serve as a central concept in the majority of studies [35]. In addition, the importance of a high frequency of follow-up contacts, earlier intervention, and involvement in the most critical period– i.e., 6 months post-discharged from ED– is also underlined [10, 13, 35, 80]. Reducing loss to follow-up is a critical challenge in suicide prevention, especially during the post-discharge period [13, 99], given historical problems with treatment completion among people involved in suicidal behaviour [100–103]. According to Gabilondo *et al*. [67] BIC reduces loneliness and improves adherence to routine treatment. Along the same lines, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [82] reported that a notable percentage of participants engaged with mental health services, or initiated psychotherapy, or pharmacotherapy during

641 the synchronous remote intervention follow-up, suggesting a significant benefit of these
642 interventions for a treatment-unengaged population.
643
644 **Recommendations, implications for clinical practice, and future research**
645 Following the synthesis of information and the articles collected on the topic of the
646 review, the authors would like to provide a series of recommendations to standardise the
647 implementation and development of these interventions. Firstly, the authors of future studies
648 should consider describing in detail a minimum set of component characteristics of the
649 intervention and comparison groups– particularly for the TAU group– as there is considerable
650 heterogeneity between studies. A comprehensive quality checklist is presented in Supplemental
651 File 11. Table S10.
652 Secondly, as concluded in the systematic review by Noh *et al*. [33] more structured and
653 theory-based interventions for the prevention of suicidal behaviours should be conducted and
654 examined, emphasising the importance of a conceptual and theoretical framework in the
655 development of interventions, and increasing measurable impacts on key outcomes in complex
656 therapies [104]. A universal intervention design protocol should be adopted according to the
657 characteristics of the studies in which an effect has been observed and the recommendations
658 of the authors of previous studies on the topic [59, 62, 65, 66, 71, 78, 80, 81]. In summary, the
659 preferred approach is a RCT design that delivers early interventions within a maximum of 7 days
660 post-ED discharge with long-term follow-up of approximately 12 months, often as concomitant
661 therapy to TAU– i.e., emergency medical care and follow-up based on the severity of suicidal
662 behaviour; psychopharmacology, or psychotherapy– conducted by a mental health professional
663 to enhance suicide risk assessments, clinician-patient connection, and adherence to routine
664 treatment.

Overall, the findings emphasise the importance of standardising interventions to enhance both research comparability and clinical application. Moreover, the results open up several avenues for further investigation into effectiveness, underscoring the need to standardise the outcomes to be assessed, the timing of evaluations, and the measurement instruments. Addressing the impact of this intervention on suicide deaths will require much larger cohorts, which in turn implies improving the protocols for recording this indicator to ensure data reliability. Finally, the suspicion that synchronous remote-based interventions could have an effectiveness on the reduction of suicide attempts not mediated by a reduction in suicidal ideation makes it necessary to focus the future of research on the processes that mediate the effectiveness of interventions, which may be crucial for improving their efficacy and cost-effectiveness. In particular, future research could benefit from integrating components designed to promote cognitive change and emotional regulation in order to more effectively influence ideation.

Strengths and limitations

The primary limitation is the significant heterogeneity observed in the overall meta-analyses and subgroup analyses, which may be attributed to the small number of studies included in some analyses or the substantial variability between their results. In addition, using ED data records or the authorities' forensic register may lead to the possibility of under-reporting the actual number of non-fatal suicidal behaviours [105]. Furthermore, suicide is a rare event, making the design of studies with high statistical power particularly difficult. Finally, the included trials used intervention and comparison groups that received TAU; these treatments are often different across studies. Relatedly, although study characteristics were described, the lack of standardised reporting across research limited further stratification.

The comprehensive literature review and the identification of key characteristics for improving future study designs are fundamental strengths. Other strengths of the study are the number of databases explored, the reporting according to PRISMA guidelines, the validation of the boolean searches according to PRESS guidelines, and the inter-reviewer consensus in the different phases of screening, data extraction, and RoB assessment.

CONCLUSIONS

Innovation in the prevention and management of suicidal behaviour is a therapeutic challenge [106]. The current research outlines emerging evidence on suicide prevention through telemedicine in reducing suicidal behaviours. The main conclusion of the study is that the results seem to indicate that synchronous remote-based interventions demonstrate a potential effect in reducing suicide attempts and suicide deaths, although their influence on suicidal ideation appears limited. The mechanisms underlying these effects remain unclear but may be related to the promotion of social bonding or 'connectedness'. The difficulties in studying the effectiveness of such preventive interventions are reflected by the great heterogeneity of studies to date and the problems in obtaining accurate information on suicidal behaviours in the absence of reliable registries [107]. Finally, an indirect positive effect on the treatment of patients at risk of death by suicide seems to derive from the increase in adherence fostered by remote synchronous interventions.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Ethics approval is not needed, as systematic reviews are based on published studies. The results will be disseminated through peer-reviewed publications.

ETHICS STATEMENTS

Patient consent for publication

Not applicable.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

AS is the guarantor. LC, JML, DP, AC, and AS: Writing - Original Draft. LC, AS, MPJ, JPS, and CM: Software. LC, JML, DP and AS: Project administration, Supervision. All authors: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing. JML, AS, JPS, and CM provided statistical expertise. DP and AC provided expertise on suicidal behaviours. All authors approved the final manuscript.

AI USE

Google Translate was used to check (and modify where necessary) the linguistic quality and suitability of the manuscript. No other AI tools were used in either the study or the writing of the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Authors' thanks to Guillem Cebrián, director of the Library at Parc Taulí University Hospital and head of the Unitat de Gestió del Coneixement de l'Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA), for his support in the refinement of the search strategies. DP thanks the support of Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation/ISCIII/MICIU/FEDER (PI21/01148); the Secretaria d'Universitats i Recerca del Departament d'Economia i Coneixement of the Generalitat de Catalunya (e-MH-PEMN – 2021 SGR 01431); the CERCA programme / Generalitat de Catalunya; the Instituto de Salud Carlos III; and the CIBER of Mental Health (CIBERSAM CB 19/09/00029). The research has been previously presented at a conference and has been published as a conference abstract [108].

FUNDING

This research was funded by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Subdirección General de Evaluación y Fomento de la Investigación (ISCIII), Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades (MICIU) co-funded by the European Union, Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER) (grant number PI21/01148 — COGNISUI) and MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 'ERDF A way of making Europe' (grant number PID2022-141403NB-I00). Fundació Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA), SENDO PI21/01148 (Fondo de Investigación Sanitaria-ISCIII/ FEDER), Instituto de Salud Carlos III. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; or in the decision to publish the results. The Department of Mental Health at the Parc Taulí University Hospital and the Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA) are the sponsors.

COMPETING INTERESTS

DP has received grants and served as a consultant or advisor for Rovi, Johnson & Johnson, and Lundbeck. The other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

PATIENT CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

PROVENANCE AND PEER REVIEW

764 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

765

766 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

767 Data are available in a public, open access repository. The dataset is available in [Dataset]
768 Comendador L; Jiménez-Villamizar MP; Sanabria-Mazo, JP, *et al*. Data from: Effect of
769 synchronous remote-based interventions on suicidal behaviours: systematic review and meta-
770 analysis. CORA Repository, February 9, 2025. https://doi.org/10.34810/data1310 [109]

771

772 **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL**

773 Supplemental File 1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist (DOCX 32 KB).

774 Supplemental File 2. Amendments made to the original protocol (DOCX 11 KB).

775 Supplementary File 3. Search strategy for databases, registers, and websites (DOCX 13 KB).

776 Supplemental File 4. List of articles excluded after full-text screening (DOCX 23 KB).

777 Supplemental File 5. Information on the components and characteristics of the intervention and
778 comparison groups (DOCX 20 KB).

779 Supplemental File 6. Information on therapeutic adherence (DOCX 15 KB).

780 Supplemental File 7. Evaluation measures the time frame of the selected studies (DOCX 14 KB).

781 Supplemental File 8. Subgroup analysis (DOCX 27 KB).

782 Supplemental File 9. Publication bias (DOCX 130 KB).

783 Supplemental File 10. GRADE (DOCX 689 KB).

784 Supplemental File 11. Report of the minimum set of component characteristics (DOCX 11 KB).

785

786 **OPEN ACCESS**

787 This is an open-access article distributed by the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial
788 (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work
789 non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original

work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes are made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

ORCID iDs

Laura Comendador Vázquez https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5221-4794

María P Jiménez-Villamizar https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2264-7422

Josep-Maria Losilla https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5140-5847

Juan P Sanabria-Mazo https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1688-435X

Corel Mateo-Canedo https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0620-9257

Antoni Sanz Ruíz https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7952-4477

Ana-Isabel Cebrià Meca https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2632-8130

Diego Palao Vidal https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3323-6568

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organisation. Suicide [online]. 2023. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April 2024).
2. World Health Organisation. Suicide worldwide in 2019 [online]. 2021. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240026643 (accessed 30 Jan 2024).
3. World Health Organisation. Suicide in the world: Global health estimates [online]. 2019. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/326948/WHO-MSD-MER-19.3-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 30 Jan 2024).
4. Artieda-Urrutia P, Parra-Uribe I, Garcia-Pares G, *et al*. Management of suicidal behaviour: Is the world upside down? *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2014;48:399–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867414525847

814 5. Mokdad AH, Forouzanfar MH, Daoud F, *et al*. Global burden of diseases, injuries, and risk
815 factors for young people's health during 1990–2013: A systematic analysis for the Global
816 Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2016;387:2383–401. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-
817 6736(16)00648-6
818 6. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, García-Parés G, *et al*. Attempted and completed suicide:
819 Not what we expected? *J Affect Disord* 2013;150:840–6.
820 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.03.013
821 7. World Health Organisation. Suicide: key facts. Geneva: World Health Organisation [online].
822 2021. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April
823 2024).
824 8. Olfson M, Wall M, Wang S, *et al*. Suicide following deliberate self-harm. *Am J Psychiat*
825 2017;174:765–74. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.16111288
826 9. Shand F, Vogl L, Robinson J. Improving patient care after a suicide attempt. *Australas*
827 *Psychiatry* 2018;26:145–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856218758560
828 10. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, Garcia-Parés G, *et al*. Risk of re-attempts and suicide death
829 after a suicide attempt: A survival analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2017;17:163.
830 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1317-z
831 11. Bostwick JM, Pabbati C, Geske JR, McKean AJ. Suicide Attempt as a Risk Factor for Completed
832 Suicide: Even More Lethal Than We Knew. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2016;173(11):1094-1100.
833 https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.15070854
834 12. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Evidence-based national suicide prevention
835 taskforce in Europe: A consensus position paper. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017;27:418–
836 21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2017.01.012
837 13. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Yonemoto N, *et al*. Active contact and follow-up interventions to
838 prevent repeat suicide attempts during high-risk periods among patients admitted to

839 emergency departments for suicidal behavior: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC*
840 *Psychiatry* 2019;19:44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-019-2017-7
841 14. Ganz D, Braquehais MD, Sher L. Secondary Prevention of Suicide. *PLoS Med*
842 2010;7:e1000271. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000271
843 15. World Health Organisation. The European Mental Health Action Plan 2013–2020 [online].
844 2013. https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-
845 Mental-Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
846 16. World Health Organisation. Preventing suicide: A global imperative [online]. 2014.
847 https://www.who.int/mental_health/suicide-prevention/exe_summary_english.pdf?ua=1
848 (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
849 17. World Health Organisation. Comprehensive mental health action plan 2013–2030 [online].
850 2021. https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1371507/retrieve (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
851 18. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Kawanishi C, *et al*. Interventions to prevent repeat suicidal
852 behavior in patients admitted to an emergency department for a suicide attempt: A meta-
853 analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2015;175:66–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.048
854 19. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year
855 systematic review. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3:646–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-
856 0366(16)30030-X
857 20. Andersson G, Titov N, Dear BF, Rozental A, Carlbring P. Internet-delivered psychological
858 treatments: from innovation to implementation. *World Psychiatry*. 2019;18(1):20-28.
859 https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20610
860 21. Carlbring P, Hadjistavropoulos H, Kleiboer A, Andersson G. A new era in Internet
861 interventions: The advent of Chat-GPT and AI-assisted therapist guidance. *Internet Interv.*
862 2023;32:100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2023.100621

863 22. Laranjeira C, Carvalho D, Valentim O, *et al*. Therapeutic Adherence of People with Mental
864 Disorders: An Evolutionary Concept Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.*
865 2023;20(5):3869. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20053869
866 23. Deng M, Zhai S, Ouyang X, Liu Z, Ross B. Factors influencing medication adherence among
867 patients with severe mental disorders from the perspective of mental health professionals.
868 *BMC Psychiatry*. 2022;22(1):22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03681-6
869 24. Kauppi K, Hätönen H, Adams CE, Välimäki M. Perceptions of treatment adherence among
870 people with mental health problems and health care professionals. *J Adv Nurs*.
871 2015;71(4):777-788. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12567
872 25. Gilat I, Shahar G. Emotional first aid for a suicide crisis: Comparison between telephonic
873 hotline and Internet. Psychiatry-Interpers *Biol Process* 2007;70:12–8.
874 https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2007.70.1.12
875 26. Seong JM, Cho Y, Cho GC, *et al*. Effects of mobile messenger counseling on case management
876 success for individuals engaging in self-harm or suicide attempts who were discharged from
877 emergency departments. *Clin Exp Emerg Med* 2021;8:48–54.
878 https://doi.org/10.15441/CEEM.20.133
879 27. Vijayakumar L, Umamaheswari C, Shujaath Ali Z, *et al*. Intervention for suicide attempters:
880 A randomized controlled study. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2011;53:244-8.
881 https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.86817
882 28. Martínez-Alés G, Cruz Rodríguez JB, Lázaro P, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of a Contact
883 Intervention and a Psychotherapeutic Program for Post-discharge Suicide Prevention. *Can J*
884 *Psychiatry.* 2021;66(8):737-746 https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720980135
885 29. De Leo D, Buono MD, Dwyer J. Suicide among the elderly: The long-term impact of a
886 telephone support and assessment intervention in northern Italy. *Br J Psychiatry*
887 2002;181:226–9. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.181.3.226

888 30. Gould MS, Munfakh JLH, Kleinman M, *et al*. National Suicide Prevention Lifeline: Enhancing
889 mental health care for suicidal individuals and other people in crisis. *Suicide Life-Threat*
890 *Behav* 2012;42:22–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00068.x
891 31. Aiello LM, Dadashzadeh S, Lynn JM, *et al*. Using telemedicine to reduce suicide ideation and
892 behavior: a systematic literature review. *THMT* 2021;6:1.
893 https://doi.org/10.30953/tmt.v6.226
894 32. Milner AJ, Carter G, Pirkis J, *et al*. Letters, green cards, telephone calls and postcards:
895 Systematic and meta-analytic review of brief contact interventions for reducing self-harm,
896 suicide attempts and suicide. *Br J Psychiatry* 2015;206:184–90.
897 https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.147819
898 33. Noh D, Park YS, Oh EG. Effectiveness of telephone-delivered interventions following suicide
899 attempts: A systematic review. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs* 2016;30:114–9.
900 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2015.10.012
901 34. Shin HD, Durocher K, Sequeira L, *et al*. Information and communication technology-based
902 interventions for suicide prevention implemented in clinical settings: a scoping review. *BMC*
903 *Health Serv Res.* 2023;23:281. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09254-5
904 35. Luxton DD, June JD, Comtois KA. Can postdischarge follow-up contacts prevent suicide and
905 suicidal behavior? A Review of the Evidence. *Crisis* 2013;34:32–41.
906 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000158
907 36. Shoib S, Shaheen N, Anwar A, *et al.* The effectiveness of telehealth interventions in suicide
908 prevention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2024;70:415–423.
909 https://doi.org/10.1177/00207640231206059
910 37. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, *et al*. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated
911 guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n160.
912 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160

38. Comendador L, Jiménez-Villamizar MP, Losilla JM, *et al*. Effect of synchronous remote-based interventions on suicidal behaviours: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(12):e075116. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-075116
39. World Health Organisation. ICD-11 for mortality and morbidity statistics [online]. 2021. https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en#/http://id.who.int/icd/entity/778734771 (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
40. Gómez A, Silva H, Amon R. El Suicidio. Teoría, Clínica y Manejo. Barcelona, ES: Editorial Mediterráneo 2018.
41. Savović J, Whiting PF, Dekkers OM. Systematic reviews of nonrandomized studies of interventions. In: Egger M, Higgins JPT, Davey Smith G, editors. *Systematic reviews in health research.* 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley 2022. Chapter 15. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119099369.ch15
42. Saldanha IJ, Skelly AC, Ley KV, *et al*. Inclusion of nonrandomized studies of interventions in systematic reviews of intervention effectiveness: an update [online]. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2022. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK584468/table/ch4.tab1/ (accessed 21 Jun 2025).
43. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, *et al*. PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;75:40–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021
44. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al*. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5(1):1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4
45. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al*. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898

46. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al*. ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;366:i4919. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919
47. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al*. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3. [online]. 2022. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook (accessed 20 Feb 2025).
48. Hedges LV. Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect Size and Related Estimators. *J Stat Educ* 1981;6:107-128. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164588
49. Daly LE. Confidence limits made easy: interval estimation using a substitution method. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1998;147(8):783-790. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009523
50. Zhang J, Yu KF. What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes. *JAMA*. 1998;280(19):1690-1691. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.19.1690
51. Peto R, Pike MC, Armitage P, *et al*. Design and analysis of randomized clinical trials requiring prolonged observation of each patient. I. Introduction and design. *Br J Cancer*. 1976;34(6):585-612. https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.1976.220
52. Suurmond R, van Rhee H, Hak T. Introduction, comparison, and validation of Meta-Essentials: A free and simple tool for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2017;8(4):537-553. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1260
53. Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, *et al*. GRADE Handbook for grading quality of evidence and strength of recommendations [online]. 2013. Available: https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html [Accessed 30 Jun 2024].
54. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, *et al*. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:401–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.07.015

960 55. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, *et al*. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-GRADE evidence
961 profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2011;64:383–94.
962 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.04.026
963 56. Amadéo S, Rereao M, Malogne A, *et al*. Testing Brief Intervention and Phone Contact among
964 Subjects with Suicidal Behavior: A Randomized Controlled Trial in French Polynesia in the
965 Frames of the World Health Organization/Suicide Trends in At-Risk Territories Study. *Ment*
966 *Illn*. 2015;7(2):5818. https://doi.org/10.4081/mi.2015.5818
967 57. Bertolote JM, Fleischmann A, De Leo D, *et al*. Repetition of suicide attempts: data from
968 emergency care settings in five culturally different low- and middle-income countries
969 participating in the WHO SUPRE-MISS Study. *Crisis*. 2010;31(4):194-201.
970 https://doi.org/10.1027/0027-5910/a000052
971 58. Burback L, Yap S, Purdon SE, *et al*. Randomized controlled trial investigating web-based,
972 therapist delivered eye movement desensitization and reprocessing for adults with suicidal
973 ideation. *Front Psychiatry.* 2024;15(1):1361086.
974 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1361086
975 59. Cebrià AI, Parra I, Pàmias M, *et al*. Effectiveness of a telephone management programme
976 for patients discharged from an emergency department after a suicide attempt: controlled
977 study in a Spanish population. *J Affect Disord*. 2013;147(1-3):269-276.
978 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.11.016
979 60. Cebrià AI, Pérez-Bonaventura I, Cuijpers P, *et al*. Telephone Management Program for
980 Patients Discharged From an Emergency Department After a Suicide Attempt: A 5-Year
981 Follow-Up Study in a Spanish Population. *Crisis*. 2015;36(5):345-352.
982 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000331
983 61. Cedereke M, Monti K, Ojehagen A. Telephone contact with patients in the year after a
984 suicide attempt: does it affect treatment attendance and outcome? A randomised

985 controlled study. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2002;17(2):82-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-
986 9338(02)00632-6
987 62. Christensen H, Farrer L, Batterham PJ, Mackinnon A, Griffiths KM, Donker T. The effect of a
988 web-based depression intervention on suicide ideation: secondary outcome from a
989 randomised controlled trial in a helpline. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(6):e002886.
990 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002886
991 63. Comtois KA, Kerbrat AH, DeCou CR, *et al*. Effect of Augmenting Standard Care for Military
992 Personnel With Brief Caring Text Messages for Suicide Prevention: A Randomized Clinical
993 Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(5):474-483.
994 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.4530
995 64. Demesmaeker A, Amad A, Blekic W, *et al*. Increased risk of suicide reattempt according to
996 the type of brief contact interventions in the VigilanS program: The critical role of PTSD and
997 anxiety disorders. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2024;181(1):29-35.
998 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2024.11.031
999 65. Exbrayat S, Coudrot C, Gourdon X, *et al*. Effect of telephone follow-up on repeated suicide
1000 attempt in patients discharged from an emergency psychiatry department: a controlled
1001 study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2017;17(1):96. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1258-6
1002 66. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, Wasserman D, *et al*. Effectiveness of brief intervention and
1003 contact for suicide attempters: a randomized controlled trial in five countries. *Bull World*
1004 *Health Organ*. 2008;86(9):703-709. https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.07.046995
1005 67. Gabilondo A, Aristegi E, Gonzalez-Pinto A, *et al*. Prevention of Suicidal Behavior with
1006 Telemedicine in Patients with a Recent Suicide Attempt: Is a 6-month Intervention Long
1007 Enough?. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*. 2020;50(1):211-219.
1008 https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12576

1009 68. Goñi-Sarriés A, Yárnoz-Goñi N, López-Goñi JJ. Psychiatric Hospitalization for Attempted
1010 Suicide and Reattempt at the One-Year Follow-Up. *Psicothema*. 2022;34(3):375-382.
1011 https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2021.455
1012 69. Hassanzadeh M, khajeddin N, Nojomi M, Fleischmann A, Eshrati T. Brief Intervention and
1013 Contact after Deliberate Self-Harm: An Iranian Randomized Controlled Trial. *Iran J Psychiatry*
1014 *Behav Sci*. 2010;4(2):5-12.
1015 70. López-Goñi JJ, Goñi-Sarriés A. Effectiveness of a telephone prevention programme on the
1016 recurrence of suicidal behaviour. One-year follow-up. *Psychiatry Res*. 2021;302:114029.
1017 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114029
1018 71. Malakouti SK, Nojomi M, Ghanbari B, Rasouli N, Khaleghparast S, Farahani IG. Aftercare and
1019 Suicide Reattempt Prevention in Tehran, Iran. *Crisis*. 2022;43(1):18-27.
1020 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000754
1021 72. Messiah A, Notredame CE, Demarty AL, Duhem S, Vaiva G; AlgoS investigators. Combining
1022 green cards, telephone calls and postcards into an intervention algorithm to reduce suicide
1023 reattempt (AlgoS): P-hoc analyses of an inconclusive randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*.
1024 2019;14(2):e0210778. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210778
1025 73. Miller IW, Camargo CA Jr, Arias SA, *et al*. Suicide Prevention in an Emergency Department
1026 Population: The ED-SAFE Study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017;74(6):563-570.
1027 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.0678
1028 74. Mouaffak F, Marchand A, Castaigne E, Arnoux A, Hardy P. OSTA program: A French follow
1029 up intervention program for suicide prevention. *Psychiatry Res*. 2015;230(3):913-918.
1030 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.11.024
1031 75. Mousavi SG, Zohreh R, Maracy MR, Ebrahimi A, Sharbafchi MR. The efficacy of telephonic
1032 follow up in prevention of suicidal reattempt in patients with suicide attempt history. *Adv*
1033 *Biomed Res.* 2014;3:198. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9175.142043

1034 76. Mousavi SG, Amini M, Mahaki B, Bagherian-Sararoudi R. Effect of phone call versus face-to-
1035 face follow-up on recurrent suicide attempts prevention in individuals with a history of
1036 multiple suicide attempts. *Adv Biomed Res*. 2016;5:184. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-
1037 9175.190990
1038 77. O'Connor RC, Smillie S, McClelland H, *et al*. SAFETEL: a pilot randomised controlled trial to
1039 assess the feasibility and acceptability of a safety planning and telephone follow-up
1040 intervention to reduce suicidal behaviour. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2022;8(1):156.
1041 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-022-01081-5
1042 78. Plancke L, Amariei A, Danel T, *et al*. Effectiveness of a French Program to Prevent Suicide
1043 Reattempt (VigilanS). *Arch Suicide Res*. 2021;25(3):570-581.
1044 https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2020.1735596
1045 79. Riblet NB, Kenneally L, Stevens S, *et al*. A virtual, pilot randomized trial of a brief intervention
1046 to prevent suicide in an integrated healthcare setting. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2022;75:68-74.
1047 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2022.02.002
1048 80. Vaiva G, Vaiva G, Ducrocq F, *et al*. Effect of telephone contact on further suicide attempts in
1049 patients discharged from an emergency department: randomised controlled study. *BMJ*.
1050 2006;332(7552):1241-1245. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7552.1241
1051 81. Vaiva G, Berrouiguet S, Walter M, *et al*. Combining Postcards, Crisis Cards, and Telephone
1052 Contact Into a Decision-Making Algorithm to Reduce Suicide Reattempt: A Randomized
1053 Clinical Trial of a Personalized Brief Contact Intervention. *J Clin Psychiatry*.
1054 2018;79(6):17m11631. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.17m11631
1055 82. Ward-Ciesielski EF, Tidik JA, Edwards AJ, Linehan MM. Comparing brief interventions for
1056 suicidal individuals not engaged in treatment: A randomized clinical trial. *J Affect Disord*.
1057 2017;222:153-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.07.011

1058 83. Wei S, Liu L, Bi B, *et al*. An intervention and follow-up study following a suicide attempt in
1059 the emergency departments of four general hospitals in Shenyang, China. *Crisis*.
1060 2013;34(2):107-115. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000181
1061 84. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al*. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline
1062 for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71
1063 85. Andrés AM, Marzo PF. Delta: a new measure of agreement between two raters. *Br J Math*
1064 *Stat Psychol*. 2004;57:1-19. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711004849268
1065 86. Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ PsycholMeas*. 1960; 20: 37-46.
1066 87. De Leo D, Scocco P, Marietta P, *et al*. Physical illness and parasuicide: evidence from the
1067 European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS/WHO-EURO). *Int J Psychiatry Med*.
1068 1999;29(2):149-163. https://doi.org/10.2190/E87K-FG03-CHEE-UJD3
1069 88. Beck AT, Steer RA. *Beck scale for suicide ideation: Manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological
1070 Corporation 1993.
1071 89. Posner K, Brown GK, Stanley B, *et al*. The Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale: initial
1072 validity and internal consistency findings from three multisite studies with adolescents and
1073 adults. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2011;168(12):1266-1277.
1074 https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.10111704
1075 90. Beck AT, Kovacs M, Weissman A. Assessment of suicidal intention: the Scale for Suicide
1076 Ideation. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1979;47(2):343-352. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-
1077 006x.47.2.343
1078 91. Gibbons P, de Arévalo HF, Mónico M. Assessment of the factor structure and reliability of
1079 the 28-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28) in El Salvador. *Int J Clin*
1080 *Health Psychol.* 2004;4(2):389-398.

1081 92. Linehan M, Comtois KA. Suicide Attempt and Self-Injury Count (SASI-Count) [online]. 1996.
1082 http://depts.washington.edu/uwbrtc/wp-content/uploads/L-SASI-Count.pdf (accessed 28
1083 April 2024)
1084 93. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, De Leo D, Wasserman D. Instruments used in SUPRE-MISS: The
1085 WHO Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours. In: Wasserman D, Wasserman C,
1086 eds. *Oxford Textbook of Suicidology and Suicide Prevention*. 1th ed. Oxford, OED: Oxford
1087 Textbooks; 2009. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780198570059.003.0042
1088 94. Beck AT, Schuyler D, Herman I. Development of suicidal intent scales. In: Beck AT, Resnik
1089 HLP, Lettieri DJ, eds. *The prediction of suicide*. Bowie, MD: Charles Press; 1974:45–56.
1090 95. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis.*
1091 *Chichester*, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2021.
1092 96. Díaz-Oliván I, Porras-Segovia A, Barrigón ML, Jiménez-Muñoz L. E. Baca-García. Theoretical
1093 models of suicidal behaviour: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Eur J Psychiatry*.
1094 2021;35:181-192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpsy.2021.02.002
1095 97. Nuij C, van Ballegooijen W, de Beurs D, *et al*. Safety planning-type interventions for suicide
1096 prevention: meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2021;219(2):419-426.
1097 https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2021.50
1098 98. Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D, *et al*. Suicide and suicide risk. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;5(1).
1099 http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0
1100 99. Hunt IM, Kapur N, Webb R, *et al*. Suicide in recently discharged psychiatric patients: a case-
1101 control study. *Psychol Med*. 2009;39(3):443-449.
1102 https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003644
1103 100. Andersen B, Bille-Brahe U. Aftercare of suicide attempters. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H,
1104 Eds. 4th European Symposium on Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention project.*
1105 *Intervention and Prevention*. Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 177-84.

1106 101. Borg S. Active intervention and comprehensive services following suicide attempts: a
1107 community-based program. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H, Eds. 4th European Symposium on
1108 Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention project. Intervention and prevention*.
1109 Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 159-67.
1110 102. Motto J, Boström AG. Post-crisis suicide preventing without therapy. *Alcohol Dis*. 1993;
1111 5: 564-7.
1112 103. O'Brien G, Holton AR, Hurren K, Watt L, Hassanyeh F. Deliberate self-harm and
1113 predictors of out-patient attendance. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1987; 150: 246-7.
1114 104. Corry M, Clarke M, While AE, Lalor J. Developing complex interventions for nursing: a
1115 critical review of key guidelines. *J Clin Nurs*. 2013;22(17-18):2366-86.
1116 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jocn.12173
1117 105. Serrano-Gimeno V, Diestre A, Agustin-Alcain M, *et al*. Non-fatal suicide behaviours
1118 across phases in the COVID-19 pandemic: a population-based study in a Catalan cohort.
1119 *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2024; 11(5):348-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(24)00065-8
1120 106. Goñi-Sarriés A, Zandio-Zorrilla M. Suicide: The Challenge of Prevention. *Anales Sis San*
1121 *Navarra*. 2017;40(3):335–8. https://dx.doi.org/10.23938/assn.0122
1122 107. Pérez V, Elices M, Prat B, *et al*. The Catalonia Suicide Risk Code: A secondary prevention
1123 program for individuals at risk of suicide. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;268:201-205.
1124 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.03.009
1125 108. Comendador Vázquez L, Cebrià Meca A, Sanz Ruíz A, et al. Efficacy of synchronous
1126 remote-based interventions for suicide prevention among adolescent and adult patients: a
1127 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Psychiatr* 2022;65:S295–6.
1128 109. [Dataset] Comendador L; Jiménez-Villamizar MP; Sanabria-Mazo, JP, et al. Data from:
1129 Effect of synchronous remote-based interventions on suicidal behaviours: systematic review
1130 and meta-analysis. *CORA Repository*, February 9, 2025. https://doi.org/10.34810/data1310


Identification of studies via databases and registers
Identification of studies via other methods
Identification
Records identified from:
Databases (n=4)
Medline (PubMed) (n=198)
Web Of Science (Core Collection) (n=1665)
SCOPUS (Elsevier) (n=2369)
PsycInfo (ProQuest) (n=675)
Total Registers (n=4907)
Records removed before screening:
Duplicate records removed (n=2128)
Records identified from:
Citation searching (n=19)
Websites
ClinicalTrials.gov (n=1)
Google Scholar (n=3)
Total Registers (n=23)
Screening
Records screened (n=2779)
Records excluded (n=2671)
Reports sought for retrieval (n=108)
Reports not retrieved
No full-text article (n=4)
Reports sought for retrieval (n=23)
Reports not retrieved (n=0)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n=104)
Reports excluded:
Asynchronous intervention (n=25)
No control group (n=18)
No population (n=14)
No outcome. No quantitative measurement of suicidal-related outcomes (n=12)
No study design (n=7)
In-person intervention (n=6)
Reports assessed for eligibility (n=23)
Reports excluded:
No outcome. No quantitative measurement of suicidal-relate
outcomes (n=4)
Asynchronous intervention (n=
No population (n=4)
No control group (n=3)
No study design (n=1)
In-person intervention (n=1)
Included
Studies included in systematic review and meta-analyses
Databases and registers (n=22)
Other methods (n=6)
Total (n=28)

A RoB 2 for randomised controlled trials

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	Overall bias
Amadéo et al. 2015	+	?	?	+	+	+
Bertolote et al. 2010	+	+	+	+	?	+
Burback et al. 2024	+	+	+	?	+	+
Cedereke et al. 2002	+	?	−	+	?	?
Christensen et al. 2013	+	?	−	+	+	?
Comtois et al. 2019	+	−	?	+	?	?
Fleischmann et al. 2008	+	+	?	+	+	+
Hassanzadeh et al. 2010	+	+	+	+	?	+
Malakouti et al. 2021	+	?	+	+	−	?
Messiah et al. 2019	+	−	+	+	?	?
Mouaffak et al. 2015	+	?	+	+	?	+
Mousavi et al. 2014	+	+	+	?	?	+
Mousavi et al. 2016	+	−	?	−	?	−
O'Connor et al. 2022	+	?	−	+	+	?
Riblet et al. 2022	+	+	+	+	−	?
Vaiva et al. 2006	+	+	−	+	?	−
Vaiva et al. 2018	+	+	−	+	+	?
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	+	+	−	+	+	?
Wei et al. 2012	+	−	−	+	?	−

RoB domains:
D1: Bias arising from the randomisatio
D2: Bias due to deviations from intend
D3: Bias due to missing outcome data.
D4: Bias in measurement of the outcor
D5: Bias in selection of the reported re

Judgement:
+ Low risk of bias.
? Moderate risk of bias.
− High risk of bias.

B ROBINS-I for non-randomised studies

	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	D7	Overall bias
Cebrià et al. 2013	−	+	+	+	+	?	+	?
Cebrià et al. 2015	−	?	+	+	+	?	+	−
Demesmaeker et al. 2024	?	+	?	+	+	+	?	?
Exbrayat et al. 2017	?	+	+	+	?	?	+	?
Gabilondo et al. 2020	−	?	?	−	−	?	+	−
Goñi-Sarriés et al. 2022	−	+	+	?	?	+	?	−
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021	−	+	+	?	?	?	?	−
Miller et al. 2017	−	+	+	+	+	+	?	?
Plancke et al. 2020	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	+

Study	Hedges' g	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit	Weight	Q	P_Q	I^2	tau ^{2}
Burback et al. 2024	0,23	-0,40	0,86	24,42%				
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,78	-1,31	-0,25	27,64%				
Riblet et al. 2022	0,05	-0,85	0,95	17,58%				
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	-0,06	-0,52	0,40	30,36%				
1 month	**-0,17**	**-0,62**	**0,28**	**100,00%**	**7,38**	**0,06**	**59,35%**	**0,13**
Burback et al. 2024	0,12	-0,58	0,81	27,12%				
Riblet et al. 2022	0,18	-0,72	1,09	17,15%				
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	-0,24	-0,72	0,24	55,73%				
3 months	**-0,07**	**-0,34**	**0,20**	**100,00%**	**1,16**	**0,56**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,63	-1,21	-0,04	44,05%				
O'Connor et al. 2022	0,00	-0,38	0,38	55,95%				
6 months	**-0,28**	**-0,89**	**0,34**	**100,00%**	**3,26**	**0,07**	**69,28%**	**0,14**
Cedereke et al. 2002	-0,25	-0,55	0,04	35,33%				
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,74	-1,33	-0,15	15,45%				
Comtois et al. 2019	-0,13	-0,31	0,06	49,22%				
12 months	**-0,27**	**-0,56**	**0,03**	**100,00%**	**4,16**	**0,13**	**51,92%**	**0,03**



Study	Risk Ratio	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit	Weight	Q	p_Q	I^2	tau^2
Burback et al. 2024	1,10	0,16	7,51	2,79%				
Exbrayat et al. 2017	0,71	0,51	0,98	90,83%				
Mousavi et al. 2014	0,34	0,01	8,39	0,96%				
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,90	0,02	47,89	0,64%				
Riblet et al. 2022	1,00	0,02	59,73	0,66%				
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	1,06	0,22	5,02	4,12%				
1 month	**0,73**	**0,62**	**0,85**	**100,00%**	**0,70**	**0,98**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Burback et al. 2024	0,22	0,03	1,84	25,33%				
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,30	0,01	7,59	10,78%				
Riblet et al. 2022	1,00	0,02	59,73	7,33%				
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	0,84	0,18	4,00	45,94%				
Wei et al. 2012	0,36	0,01	9,02	10,63%				
3 months	**0,50**	**0,21**	**1,16**	**100,00%**	**1,32**	**0,86**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Demesmaeker et al. 2024	0,26	0,12	0,55	12,31%				
Hassanzadeh et al. 2010	1,21	0,73	2,03	14,48%				
Messiah et al. 2019	0,84	0,57	1,25	15,54%				
Mousavi et al. 2014	0,25	0,03	2,26	3,93%				
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,21	0,02	1,84	4,08%				
O'Connor et al. 2022	1,11	0,55	2,23	12,84%				
Plancke et al. 2020	0,31	0,25	0,38	16,74%				
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,73	0,53	1,00	16,10%				
Wei et al. 2012	0,24	0,03	2,16	3,98%				
6 months	**0,56**	**0,34**	**0,95**	**100,00%**	**54,92**	**0,00**	**85,43%**	**0,36**
Cebria et al. 2013	0,38	0,21	0,68	10,00%				
Comtois et al. 2019	0,60	0,36	1,01	10,55%				
Gabilondo et al. 2020	1,14	0,63	2,05	9,91%				
Goñi-Sarriés et al. 2022	0,89	0,58	1,36	11,32%				
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021	1,17	0,81	1,68	11,73%				
Malakouti et al. 2021	0,42	0,23	0,76	9,95%				
Miller et al. 2017	0,80	0,63	1,02	12,53%				
Mouaffak et al. 2015	1,03	0,59	1,80	10,20%				
Plancke et al. 2020	0,36	0,30	0,42	12,96%				
Wei et al. 2012	0,76	0,01	39,95	0,84%				
12 months	**0,68**	**0,49**	**0,96**	**100,00%**	**72,63**	**0,00**	**87,61%**	**0,27**
Cedereke et al. 2002	1,00	0,51	1,95	6,53%				
Messiah et al. 2019	1,00	0,73	1,37	28,76%				
Vaiva et al. 2006a	0,55	0,31	0,96	9,36%				
Vaiva et al. 2006b	0,76	0,46	1,25	11,63%				
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,82	0,63	1,06	43,72%				
13 months	**0,84**	**0,66**	**1,06**	**100,00%**	**3,89**	**0,42**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Amadéo et al. 2015	1,27	0,76	2,13	30,14%				
Bertolote et al. 2010	1,02	0,73	1,43	69,86%				
18 months	**1,09**	**0,30**	**3,91**	**100,00%**	**0,49**	**0,48**	**0,00%**	**0,00**



Study	Peto Odds Ratio	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit	Weight	Q	p_Q	I^2	tau^2
Hassanzadeh et al. 2010	0,97	0,14	6,96	30,94%				
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,27	0,08	0,88	69,06%				
6 months	**0,40**	**0,00**	**789,93**	**100,00%**	**1,22**	**0,27**	**17,86%**	**0,15**
Comtois et al. 2019	1,91	0,20	18,58	17,70%				
Goñi-Sarriés et al. 2022	0,45	0,05	4,49	17,53%				
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021	0,30	0,05	1,78	29,34%				
Miller et al. 2017	1,48	0,25	8,59	29,51%				
Mouaffak et al. 2015	7,29	0,14	373,41	5,93%				
12 months	**0,87**	**0,24**	**3,15**	**100,00%**	**3,63**	**0,46**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Vaiva et al. 2006a	0,23	0,01	4,51	11,44%				
Vaiva et al. 2006b	1,07	0,09	12,27	17,09%				
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,37	0,11	1,23	71,47%				
13 months	**0,42**	**0,11**	**1,65**	**100,00%**	**0,77**	**0,68**	**0,00%**	**0,00**
Amadéo et al. 2015	0,15	0,01	2,44	9,12%				
Fleischmann et al. 2008	0,19	0,08	0,45	90,88%				
18 months	**0,18**	**0,08**	**0,44**	**100,00%**	**0,03**	**0,87**	**0,00%**	**0,00**