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, University Hospital Parc Taulí. 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): 6782 words.
Number of tables: 1.
Number of figures: 3.

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), 6 months (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.34 to 0.95), and 12 months (RR 0.68, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.96). 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).

Conclusions Synchronous remote-based interventions demonstrate moderate effectiveness in preventing suicidal behaviour and may serve as an adjunct to usual treatment; however, there is no strong evidence that such effects were cognitively mediated by a reduction in suicidal ideation. 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 current study examined the evidence for the effectiveness of synchronous remote-based interventions in the prevention of suicidal behaviours, including suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and death by suicide.
- Data extraction, synthesis, and quality assessment were conducted using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA-2020) criteria.
- 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.
- The heterogeneity of the interventions also makes it difficult to synthesize the results.

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 developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) criteria [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.

Comparisons

All comparison groups identified– e.g., treatment as usual (visits to mental health services, pharmacotherapy, etc.)– were included. Non-reporting of an intervention group was a reason for exclusion. Studies were excluded if both, the intervention and control groups, received synchronous and remote interventions.

Outcomes

Suicidal behaviours– i.e., suicide ideation [39], suicide attempt [3], and suicide death [40]– were included.

Study design

Randomised control trials (RCT) and non-randomised clinical trials (nRCT).

Data collection and analysis

Information sources

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 ClinicalTrials.gov and Google Scholar were searched for grey literature and unpublished records.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

Search strategy

The general structure of the search strategy is available in Supplemental File 1 of the protocol [38]. The search was unrestricted by year of publication, limited to English or Spanish, and developed adhering to the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) [41].

Study selection

The results of the literature search were imported into Mendeley (version 1.19.8), and Rayyan Systems Inc [42]. Duplicate articles were removed automatically by Rayyan Systems Inc. and manually by the first reviewer (LC). After, two authors (LC and MPJ) blind-screened all articles based on titles, abstracts, and keywords. Then, two reviewers (LC and MPJ) independently evaluated the full-text articles according to the eligibility criteria. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion with a third author (AS) until reaching consensus.

Data collection

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

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) [43] and Risk-of-bias In Non-randomised Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) [44]. Disagreements were resolved by

consensus with a third blinded reviewer (AS). More information can be found in the protocol article [38].

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) [45]. 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 [46] 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 ($g \geq 0.8$) [46]. (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 [47] and Zhang & Yu [48], the risk ratio (RR) and 95% CI were analysed. Finally, (3) a random-effects model with the effect estimates weighted by the

199 Peto *et al.* method [49] was calculated for suicide deaths since the observed frequencies are
200 very low. The Cochrane's Q test and tau^2 statistic were employed to identify heterogeneity
201 among studies. The proportion of variability due to heterogeneity was indicated by I^2 value.
202 Heterogeneity was considered moderate if I^2 was greater than 30%. All analyses were
203 performed using the Meta-Essentials tool for Microsoft Excel (version 16.65) [50]. The trials
204 with multiple assessment measurement periods were included as separate studies in the
205 appropriate meta-analyses [45].
206
207 **Patient and public involvement**
208 Not involved in the review protocol, design, reporting, or dissemination plans.
209
210 **RESULTS**
211 **Study selection**
212 The initial search retrieved 4930 studies. After removing duplicates, 2802 articles were
213 screened for title, abstract, and keywords. Of these, 131 studies were selected for full-text
214 review. Finally, 28 publications were included in the systematic review and meta-analyses [51–
215 78]. The article selection process was described in a PRISMA flowchart [79] (Figure 1). Studies
216 that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria but were excluded and the reasons for
217 exclusion are presented in Supplemental File 3: Table S2. Inter-rater agreement was calculated
218 for initial screening using Delta (δ=0.91, 95% CI 0.88 to 0.94) [80], and for eligibility and
219 extraction process using Cohen's Kappa (κ=0.82, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.0; κ=0.98, 95% CI 0.97 to
220 0.99, respectively) [81].
221 [Please insert here Figure 1]
222 **Figure 1** PRISMA flowchart for systematic review and meta-analyses including database
223 searches and other sources.

224

225 **Study characteristics**

226 A descriptive summary of the characteristics of the included studies is presented in Table 1 and
227 Supplemental File 4: Table S3. The current systematic review included 19 RCT (67.9%) [51–53,
228 56–58, 61, 64, 66, 67, 69–72, 74–78]. The sample size ranges from 10 to 3068 in the
229 intervention group (IG) and from 10 to 3694 in the control group (CG). The mean age ranged
230 from 23 to 45 years in the IG and from 23 to 47 years in the CG. The proportion of women in
231 most of the studies was above 50% in both IG and CG, except in three studies [58, 74, 77]. The
232 eligible articles were from 12 countries: France [59, 60, 67, 69, 73, 75, 76], Spain [54, 55, 62,
233 63, 65], United States of America [58, 68, 74, 77], Iran [64, 66, 70, 71], Brazil, India, Sri Lanka
234 [52, 61], French Polynesia [51], Canada [53], Sweden [56], Australia [57], United Kingdom [72],
235 and China [78].

236 As for outcome variables, 8 studies reported outcomes relating to suicidal ideation [53,
237 56–58, 72, 74, 77, 78], 26 studies reported the proportion of participants who reattempted
238 suicide [51–56, 58–60, 62–78], and 13 reported the proportion of suicide deaths [51, 53, 55,
239 58, 61, 63–66, 68, 69, 75, 76]. There was high heterogeneity in the diagnostic methods used to
240 identify suicide behaviours: European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS), Scale for
241 Suicide Ideation (SSI), General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28), Columbia Suicide Severity
242 Rating Scale (CSSRS), Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation (BSS), Suicide Attempt Self-Injury Count
243 (SASI-Count), Beck's Suicide Intent Scale (SIS), Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal
244 Behaviours (SUPRE-MISS) questionnaire, forensic records of suicide deaths, data from
245 electronic medical records, etc.

246 The interventions were categorised as (a) telephone follow-up intervention (*n*=16;
247 57.1%) [54–56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65–67, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78], (b) Brief Intervention and Contact
248 (BIC; *n*=5; 17.9%) [51, 52, 61, 64, 74], (c) web-based therapist-delivered Eye Movement

249 Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR; *n*=1; 3.6%) [53], (d) 24-hour call-in services (*n*=1;
250 3.6%) [57], (e) instant text messages (*n*=1; 3.6%) [58], (f) Emergency Department Safety
251 Assessment and Follow-up Evaluation (ED-SAFE intervention; *n*=1; 3.6%) [68], (g) postal cards,
252 24-hour telephone, and telephone follow-up (*n*=1; 3.6%) [69], (h) Safety Planning and
253 telephone follow-up intervention (SAFETEL intervention; *n*=1; 3.6%) [72], and (i) Dialectical
254 Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up (*n*=1; 3.6%)
255 [77]. On the other hand, the control group in most studies was TAU (*n*=26; 92.9%) [51–71, 72–
256 76], except for two studies, which were an active control group: relaxation training condition
257 [77] and cognitive therapy group [78].

258 Interventions were performed by nurses (*n*=7; 25%) [54–56, 60, 62, 63, 65],
259 psychologists (*n*=7; 25%) [58, 59, 66, 67, 72, 74, 76], psychiatrists (*n*=6; 21.4%) [53, 69–71, 73,
260 75], physicians (*n*=1; 3.6%) [68], and by a combination of health professionals– i.e., medical
261 doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social worker (*n*=4; 14.3%) [51, 52, 61, 64]–
262 although, few interventions were undertaken by non-health professionals (*n*=2; 7.1%) [57, 78]
263 or not reported (*n*=1; 3.6%) [77]. The onset of the intervention– i.e., initial contact– could be
264 categorised in a time interval of days (*n*=5; 17.9%) [53, 58, 59, 69, 72], weeks (*n*=19; 67.9%)
265 [51, 52, 54, 55, 57, 60–67, 70, 71, 73, 76–78], months (*n*=2; 7.1%) [56, 75], or not reported
266 (*n*=2; 7.1%) [68, 74]. The total number of contacts ranged from one [59, 67, 75, 76] to 14 [66],
267 with a minimum duration of five minutes [54, 55, 61] and a maximum of 90 minutes [53]. In
268 addition, the follow-up period ranged from two months [60] to five years [55], with 12 months
269 being the most prevalent period range (*n*=10; 35.7%) [54, 56–58, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69].

270

271 **Table 1**

272 Overview of participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS) for
273 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*)	Duration of follow-up	Outcome measure (Instrument)
Amadéo *et al.*, 2015 [51] French Polynesia	RCT	Psychiatric ED *N*=190	Patients with suicidal behaviour; mean age IG 33, mean age 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) [82], Suicide death (Forensic records of suicide deaths)
Bertolote *et al.*, 2010 [52] Brazil, India, Sri Lanka, Iran, China	RCT	ED *N*=1867	Patients with suicide attempt; mean age IG 26.3, mean age 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) [82]
Burback *et al.*, 2024 [53] Canada	RCT	Mental health services *N*=42	Patients with suicidal ideation in the past week; mean age IG 36.0 (*SD*=12.0), mean age CG 36.0 (*SD*=12.0); 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 Zoom video conferencing by psychiatrists.	4 months	Suicidal ideation (BSS) [83], Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [84], Suicide death (CSSRS) [84]
Cebrià *et al.*, 2013 [54] Spain	nRCT; Case-Control Study	2 Hospital ED *N*=514	Patients discharged from ED after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 41.92 (*SD*=14.7), mean age CG 40.73 (*SD*=15.1); 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 + Data from electronic medical records)
Cebrià *et al.*, 2015 [55] Spain	nRCT	2 Hospital ED *N*=485	Patients discharged from ED after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 38.78 (*SD*=14.8), mean age CG 41.92 (*SD*=14.7); 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 + Data from electronic medical records)
Cedereke *et al.*, 2002 [56] Sweden	RCT	University Hospital, Medical Emergency Inpatient Unit *N*=216	Patients treated after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 40 (*SD*=17.1), mean age CG 42 (*SD*=17.1); 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) [85], Suicide attempt (Semi-structured interview)
Christensen *et al.*, 2013 [57] Australia	RCT	Lifeline, Australia's 24-hour telephone counselling service *N*=155	Callers to a national 24h-helpline service with moderate-to-high psychological distress; mean age 41.49 (*SD*=12.35); 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) [86]
Comtois *et al.*, 2019 [58] USA	RCT	3 military installations *N*=657	Soldiers and marines identified as being at risk of suicide; mean age IG 25.6 (*SD*=6.3), mean age CG 24.8 (*SD*=5.8); 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) [85], Suicide attempt (Interview + SASI-Count) [87], Suicide death (Interview)
Demesmaeker *et al.*, 2024 [59] France	nRCT; prospective cohort study	General or psychiatric hospitals *N*=733	Patients discharged from the hospital after a suicide attempt (non-first-time attempters); mean age IG 40.2 (*SD*=15.3), mean age CG 39.4 (*SD*=15.2); 61.5% women	Vigilans programme: 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 [60] France	nRCT	Department of Emergency Psychiatry *N*=827	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 40.2 (*SD*=15.3), mean age CG 39.7 (*SD*=15.1); 69.5%	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 (Data from electronic medical records)

			women			
Fleischmann *et al.*, 2008 [61] Brazil, India, Sri Lanka, Iran, China	RCT	ED *N*=1867	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 23, mean age 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) [82]
Gabilondo *et al.*, 2020 [62] Spain	nRCT; prospective cohort study	3 General Hospitals *N*=586	Patients discharged from a General Hospital after a suicide attempt; mean age IG 41.2 (*SD*=13.6), mean age CG 45.2 (*SD*=16); 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 (Data from electronic medical records)
Goñi-Sarriés *et al.*, 2022 [63] Spain	nRCT; pre-post study	2 Psychiatric Units *N*=191	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; mean age IG 44.96 (*SD*=15.21), mean age CG 46.91 (*SD*=15.84); 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 [64] Iran	RCT	5 General Hospitals ED *N*=632	Patients with suicide attempt; mean age IG 24 (*SD*=8.3), mean age CG 25 (*SD*=9.7); 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) [88]
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021 [65] Spain	nRCT; pre-post study	Psychiatric ED *N*=410	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; mean age IG 41.7 (*SD*=14.3), mean age CG 44.6 (*SD*=14.3); 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 (Data from electronic medical records)
Malakouti *et al.*, 2022 [66] 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) [88]
Messiah *et al.*, 2019 [67] France	RCT	23 Hospital ED and psychiatric crisis centres *N*=1040	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; 65.9% women	AlgoS algorithm: 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 [68] USA	nRCT; pre-post study	8 Hospital ED *N*=1376	Patients with suicide attempt or ideation presented to hospital ED; mean age IG 36 (*SD*=9.5), mean age CG 37 (*SD*=10.5); 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) [84]
Mouaffak *et al.*, 2015 [69] France	RCT	Psychiatric ED and Psychiatric Department of University Hospital *N*=320	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 39 (*SD*=13), mean age CG 38.6 (*SD*=13.3); 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 senior psychiatrist, and telephone calls at 2 weeks, 1, and 3 months post-discharge.	12 months	Suicide attempt (SIS) [89], Suicide death (Semi-structured interview)
Mousavi *et al.*, 2014 [70] Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N*=139	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt in 2010-2011; 63.3%	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	6 months	Suicide attempt (*ad hoc* questionnaire)

			women	psychiatry.		
Mousavi *et al.*, 2016 [71] Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N*=55	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt; mean age IG 27.07 (*SD*=7.79), mean age CG 29.69 (*SD*=7.73); 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 [72] UK	RCT	4 general hospitals *N*=120	Patients with a history of a suicide attempt; mean age IG 36.1 (*SD*=16.1), mean age 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) [84]
Plancke *et al.*, 2020 [73] France	nRCT; Longitudinal Study	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 [74] USA	RCT	Veterans Medical Center *N*=20	Patients at risk for suicide; mean age IG 54.9 (*SD*=17.1), mean age CG 48.1 (*SD*=17.6); 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 [83] + Data from the electronic medical record), Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [84]
Vaiva *et al.*, 2006 [75] France	RCT	13 ED *N*=605	Patients discharged from an ED after attempted suicide by deliberate self-poisoning; mean age IG 37 (*SD*=12), mean age CG 35 (*SD*=11); 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 (Data from the electronic medical record)
Vaiva *et al.*, 2018 [76] 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 [77] 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) [85], Suicide attempts (Interview)
Wei *et al.*, 2013 [78] 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) [85], 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 Controlled Trial; 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.

Risk of bias in studies

The results of the RoB 2 [43] and ROBINS-I [44] evaluations are presented in Figure 2. Inter-rater agreement was calculated using Cohen's Kappa (κ=0.94, 95% CI 0.87 to 1.02) [81]. 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.

[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(A). Among the 28 trials, four studies reported the effects of the intervention on suicidal ideation within 1 month [53, 57, 74, 77], three studies within 3 months [53, 74, 77], two studies within 6 months [57, 72], and three studies within 12 months [56–58]. There was a very small size, non-statistically significant effect of IG vs. CG on suicidal ideation at 1 month (Hedges' *g* -0.17, 95% CI -0.62 to 0.28) and 3 months (Hedges' g -0.07, 95% CI -0.34 to 0.20). There was a small size, non-statistically significant effect at 6 months (Hedges' *g* -0.28, 95% CI -0.89 to 0.34) and 12 months (Hedges' *g* -0.27, 95% CI -0.56 to 0.03). Heterogeneity was substantial for nearly all the measurement moments (I^2=59.4% at 1

303 month, I^2=69.3% at 6 months, I^2=51.9% at 12 months) except for the measurement at 3
304 months (I^2=0.0%).
305
306 Suicide attempts
307 The results of the meta-analyses of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on
308 suicide reattempts are shown in Figure 3(B). Among the 28 trials, six studies reported the
309 effects of the intervention on suicidal ideation within 1 month [53, 60, 70, 71, 74, 77], five
310 studies within 3 months [53, 71, 74, 77, 78], 9 studies within 6 months [59, 64, 67, 70–73, 76,
311 78], 10 studies within 12 months [54, 58, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 69, 73, 78], four studies within 13
312 months [56, 67, 75, 76], and two studies within 18 months [51, 52]. There was a statistically
313 significant effect (RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.62 to 0.85) on suicide attempts at 1 month favourable to
314 the intervention group, with a 27% reduction of the risk of making at least one suicide
315 attempt, relative to no intervention. There was a statistically significant effect (RR 0.56, 95% CI
316 0.34 to 0.95) on suicide attempts at 6 months, with a 44% lower risk of making at least one
317 suicide attempt in the intervention group compared to the non-intervention group, despite
318 considerable heterogeneity (I^2=85.4%). In addition, a statistically significant effect (RR 0.68,
319 95% CI 0.49 to 0.96) on suicide attempts at 12 months was observed, with a 32% lower risk of
320 making at least one suicide attempt in the intervention group compared to the non-
321 intervention group, although there was considerable heterogeneity (I^2=87.6%). For the
322 remaining measurement points, the heterogeneity was non-obvious (I^2=0.0% at 1 month, 3
323 months, 13 months, and 18 months).
324
325 Suicide deaths
326 The results of the meta-analyses of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on
327 suicide deaths are shown in Figure 3(C). Among the 28 trials, two studies reported the effects

328 of the intervention on suicide deaths within 6 months [64, 76], five studies within 12 months
329 [58, 63, 65, 68, 69], two studies within 13 months [75, 76], and two studies within 18 months
330 [51, 61]. There was a statistically significant effect on suicide deaths at 18 months (Peto OR
331 0.18, 95% CI 0.08 to 0.44), with the likelihood of dying by suicide being 0.18 times lower in the
332 intervention group compared to the non-intervention group. The heterogeneity was low for all
333 measurement points (I^2=17.9% at 6 months, I^2=0.0% at 12 months, 13 months, and 18
334 months).

335 [Please insert here Figure 3]

336 **Figure 3** Forest plots comparing the effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicide
337 behaviours according to the time frame of the evaluation measures. (**A**) Suicidal ideation; (**B**)
338 Suicide attempts; (**C**) Suicide deaths. The dots represent the individual studies, while the
339 rhombus illustrates the overall combined effect size.

340

341 **Results of narrative synthesis**

342 Effects of Telephone Contact Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

343 A total of 15 articles examined the effectiveness of telephone follow-up interventions in the
344 prevention of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide deaths [54–56, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65,
345 66, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78]. The studies by Cebrià *et al*. [54], Exbrayat *et al*. [60], Malakouti *et al*.
346 [66], Plancke *et al*. [73], and Vaiva *et al*. [75] reported differences in suicide reattempts in the
347 intervention group compared to the control group, and a significant effect of the intervention
348 group in reducing the rate of reattempts. Cebrià *et al*. [55], after a 60-month follow-up,
349 indicated that the significant differences found at 12 months were not maintained in either
350 group in terms of suicide reattempts (31.4% vs. 34.4%, p=0.40).

351 Demesmaeker *et al.* [59] examined the impact of the Vigilans programme by
352 comparing interventions of a telephone call only between the 10th and 21st days after

353 discharge, postcards at months 2–5 (if unreachable), a combination of both (if in suicidal
354 crisis), and no intervention. The Kaplan-Meier method, illustrating the time to the first suicide
355 reattempt within 6 months, showed the highest survival probability for individuals receiving
356 only a telephone contact and the lowest for those receiving no intervention.

357 Cedereke *et al*. [56] and Mousavi *et al*. [71] found significant reductions in suicidal
358 ideation, regardless of the intervention condition. On the other hand, Wei *et al*. [78] compared
359 a telephone intervention with a cognitive therapy group and a control group, showing
360 reductions in the number of suicide reattempts between the intervention and control groups
361 (1.3% vs. 6.5%, p=0.08), although the differences were marginally significant. No statistically
362 significant differences in suicidal ideation were shown between the three groups at any
363 assessment point (baseline: p=0.43, 3-month: p=0.72, 6-month: p=0.75, 12-month: p=0.67).

364 Gabilondo *et al*. [62], Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [63], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [65], Mousavi
365 *et al*. [70], Mousavi *et al*. [71], and Vaiva *et al*. [76] reported no significant differences between
366 intervention and control groups for suicide reattempts. In addition, Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [63]
367 informed that there were no significant differences in suicide deaths. More detailed
368 information is in Table 1.

369

370 Effects of Text Message Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

371 Comtois *et al*. [58] conducted a follow-up text-messaging intervention with soldiers and
372 marines considered at risk of suicide. Eleven contacts were made by mental health clinicians,
373 with participants' text message responses monitored 24 hours a day. The authors reported no
374 significant effect of the intervention on the presence or severity of current suicidal ideation;
375 furthermore, the intervention did not significantly decrease the odds of a suicide risk incident
376 during the 12-month follow-up period.

377

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 [51–53, 57, 61, 64, 67–69, 72, 74, 77]. Miller *et al*. [68] evaluated the ED-SAFE intervention, which consisted of a risk screening and seven post-ED telephone calls. No significant differences in risk reduction were found between the TAU and screening phases (22.9% vs. 21.5%, p=0.99). Mouaffak *et al*. [69] delivered postcards, in combination with the possibility of calling a 24-hour telephone, and with telephone follow-up at 2 weeks, 1, and 3 months after discharge from the ED. No significant differences were found between the intervention and control groups for suicide reattempts (14.5% vs. 14%, p=0.89). Messiah *et al*. [67] evaluated the effectiveness of the AlgoS Algorithm, which consisted of a telephone follow-up at 10 and 21 days, for multi-attempters, or a crisis card, for first-attempts, versus TAU. There was no significant difference for multi-attempters in the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide reattempts at 6 (RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.57 to 1.25) and 14 months (RR 1.00, 95% CI 0.73 to 1.37).

Burback *et al.* [53] investigated the impact of 12 web-based, therapist-administered EMDR sessions targeting experiences associated with suicidal ideation. Both EMDR and TAU group participants reported significant differences (p=0.009) in suicide ideation scores between baseline and 4-month follow-up (EMDR group baseline: M=20, SD=7.6; EMDR group 4-month: M=13, SD=9.6; TAU group baseline: M=20, SD=7.6; TAU group 4-month: M=13, SD=9.6). Additionally, EMDR group participants reported fewer serious adverse events compared to TAU group participants.

Amadéo *et al*. [51], Bertolote *et al*. [52], Fleischmann *et al*. [61], and Hassanzadeh *et al*. [64] investigated the efficacy of BIC using a brief 1-hour educational intervention combined with telephone contacts at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, and 18 months delivered by

403 physicians, psychiatric nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, or social workers. No significant
404 reduction was found in the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide
405 reattempts, although, a significant reduction in suicide deaths in the intervention group
406 compared with the control group (0.2% vs. 2.2%, $p<0.001$) at 18 months was reported in the
407 study by Fleischmann *et al*. [61]. In a similar intervention protocol, Riblet *et al*. [74] contacted
408 participants by telephone or video over 3 months, mailed educational materials, and
409 performed a 1-hour educational intervention on suicide prevention also by telephone or video.
410 A reduction in suicidal ideation was found in the intervention group compared with the control
411 group at 1 and 3 months.

412 Christensen *et al*. [57] conducted a web-based CBT intervention combined with
413 telephone follow-up compared with a CBT-only intervention and a TAU group. CBT was
414 delivered in five modules, and telephone contacts were provided weekly by a 24-hour
415 telephone counselling service. Significant reductions in suicidal ideation, in the telephone call
416 condition, at 1-month post-intervention ($p=0.003$), 6-month follow-up ($p=0.03$), and 12-month
417 follow-up ($p=0.01$) were found. Similarly, Ward-Ciesielski *et al.* [77] conducted a single-session
418 Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up at
419 1, 4, and 12 weeks, compared with a control group. A significant reduction in levels of suicidal
420 ideation was reported in both conditions, although there were no significant differences
421 between conditions for suicidal ideation and the number of suicide attempts. O'Connor *et al*.
422 [72] evaluated the effects of the SAFETEL intervention against TAU. A safety planning
423 intervention (SPI) session and five weekly optional telephone calls were conducted. No
424 significant differences were found between the intervention group and the control group for
425 suicide attempts (Incidence Rate Ratio; IRR 1.10, 95% CI 0.43 to 2.79, $p=0.85$).

426

427 Effects of Synchronous Remote-Based Interventions on Treatment Adherence

428 Nineteen studies reported on outcomes relating to treatment attendance [51–56, 59, 61–67,
429 72, 75–78]. Concerning the moderating effect of adherence on the effectiveness of the
430 intervention: Gabilondo *et al*. [62] observed that the intervention group showed significantly
431 higher adherence to outpatient follow-up ($p<0.001$); in addition, Hassanzadeh *et al*. [64]
432 revealed an increase in patients' perceived need for support ($p<0.001$) and positively
433 influenced attitudes towards seeking support from services and family. Moreover, Vaiva *et al*.
434 [75] reported that participants in the intervention group discussed their suicide attempts with
435 their primary care physician more frequently than controls.

436 According to Cebrià *et al*. [55], suicide attempters tend to be ambivalent to treatment,
437 do not attend treatment, or drop out prematurely; complementarily, López-Goñi & Goñi-
438 Sarriés [65] showed in their study that completion of the Telephone Follow-up Programme
439 (TFP) correlated with a reduction in suicidal behaviours. Along the same lines, Demesmaeker
440 *et al.* [59] highlight the importance of addressing the specific challenges faced by people who
441 are unwilling to enter treatment in the context of suicide prevention interventions.
442 Interventions may not uniformly benefit all patients, possibly due to differences in baseline
443 suicidality or programme adherence.

444 Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [77], and Wei *et al*. [78] also mention that the 75% retention rate
445 underscores the acceptability and effectiveness of the study in engaging a historically hard-to-
446 reach and difficult-to-retain population. As mentioned by Messiah *et al*. [67] telephone calls
447 could complement a multimodal strategy, providing a surveillance tool to drive more
448 aggressive interventions. Nevertheless, technical challenges, lack of access to computers, or
449 lack of privacy could prevent the enrollment of some individuals, as noted by Burback *et al.*
450 [53].

451 Fleischmann *et al*. [61], Gabilondo *et al*. [62], and Demesmaeker *et al.* [59] mention
452 that BIC operates similarly to psychosocial counselling, providing temporary social support and

453 fostering feelings of connectedness through systematic follow-up contacts. BCI may help to
454 reduce social isolation and also facilitate the progressive engagement of patients who may
455 initially be reluctant to participate in structured psychotherapies.

456 Concerning the predictor or moderator variables of adherence: Amadéo *et al*. [51],
457 López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [65], O'Connor *et al*. [72], Vaiva *et al*. [75], and Vaiva *et al*. [76]
458 concurred that patients lost to follow-up were more likely to be male. Gabilondo *et al*. [62],
459 Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [63], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [65], Vaiva *et al*. [75], and Vaiva *et al*. [76]
460 concluded that the intervention could be more effective for higher-risk populations requiring
461 additional support; in these studies, patients who completed PTF demonstrated a higher
462 severity of suicide attempts, greater psychopathological severity, used more violent methods,
463 and experienced predominantly affective disorders. In contrast, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [77]
464 found that participants lost to follow-up reported higher levels of depression and anxiety. In
465 addition, Demesmaeker *et al.* [59] reported that post-traumatic stress disorder and
466 generalised anxiety disorder appear to be predictors of non-adherence to the programme. On
467 the other hand, four studies [61, 66, 72, 78] discussed stigma around suicide as a factor that
468 may affect patients' attitudes towards seeking support from mental health services and family.
469 More detailed information is in Supplemental File 5: Table S4.

470

471 Causes of heterogeneity among study results

472 The investigations on the possible causes of heterogeneity between the outcomes of suicidal
473 ideation (I^2=59.4% at 1 month, I^2=69.3% at 6 months, I^2=51.9% at 12 months) and suicide
474 attempts (I^2=85.4% at 6 months, I^2=87.6% at 12 months) of the selected studies raise the
475 pertinence of qualitatively synthesising the results due to heterogeneity in: a) the evaluation
476 measures time frame of the outcomes (see Supplemental File 6. Table S5), b) the protocol of
477 intervention design and the characteristics of the intervention and control group– i.e., target

478 effect, measures of effect, method of implementation, administrator-participant interaction,
479 periodicity, number and duration of the intervention, professional delivering the intervention,
480 setting, participants, etc. – (see Supplemental File 4. Table S3), and c) assessment of RoB and
481 study design.
482
483 **Subgroup analysis**
484 Subgroup analysis was conducted based on length of intervention, type of treatment, research
485 design, and RoB assessment, if feasible [90]. Analysis revealed, for 1-month suicidal ideation
486 outcomes, that adjustment for confounding variables altered the direction of the effect, with
487 adjusted analysis indicating a negative effect (Hedges' *g*=-0.41, 95% CI -1.12 to 0.31) and
488 unadjusted analysis showing a small positive effect (Hedges' *g*=0.17, 95% CI 0.00 to 0.33). On
489 the other hand, the results suggest that telephone contact interventions tend to show greater
490 effectiveness in reducing suicide attempts at the 6-month follow-up (RR 0.37, 95% CI 0.22 to
491 0.62) compared to multi-component interventions (RR 0.99, 95% CI 0.59 to 1.65). Additionally,
492 nRCTs demonstrated a stronger effect (RR 0.31, 95% CI 0.18 to 0.53) compared to RCTs (RR
493 0.84, 95% CI 0.60 to 1.18) at 6 months follow-up. More detailed information is in Supplemental
494 File 7: Table S6, S7 and S8.
495
496 **Publication bias**
497 Publication bias was checked using both funnel plots and Egger's test. The evidence from the
498 visual inspection of the funnel plot revealed that there was no publication bias (see
499 Supplemental File 8: Figure S1, S2, and S3). Additionally, the Egger's test confirmed the
500 absence of publication bias in the included primary studies for suicidal ideation (*p*=0.77),
501 suicide attempts (*p*=0.06), and suicide deaths (*p*=0.12).
502

503 **DISCUSSION**

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

516 **Meta-analyses: Effectiveness of synchronous remote-based interventions**

517 The results seem to indicate that synchronous remote-based interventions have a
518 clear effect in reducing suicide attempts, with an inverted U-shaped evolution over time,
519 showing a peak of effectiveness at 6 months (-44%, 95% CI -66% to -5% in the intervention
520 group compared to the control group) which subsequently declines. On the contrary, the
521 results of the study do not show statistically significant effects on suicidal ideation which,
522 although increasing, exhibit a very small effect size throughout the four evaluation moments.
523 Likewise, and contrary to the clear effectiveness of synchronous remote-based interventions
524 for suicide attempts, it does not seem possible to draw conclusions from the set of studies
525 analysed in relation to deaths by suicide. In this case, it is observed that the confidence
526 intervals of the different studies cover very large ranges of odds ratios. This is probably

527 because they refer to a very low-frequency phenomenon, which exceeds the sampling power
528 of conventional empirical clinical trial studies. The juxtaposition of several of these studies in a
529 meta-analysis also does not solve the problem of lack of sampling power for this rare
530 occurrence. Likewise, the difficulty of obtaining reliable information on suicide deaths is
531 highlighted, which adds another challenge to reaching consistent conclusions.

532 In addition to the marked differences in the effect sizes of synchronous remote-based
533 interventions on the different indicators, their evolution over time differs, which can be
534 interpreted as a probable consequence of variations in the studies used for the evaluation of
535 the three indicators across the time points, compromising comparability. But it could also be
536 revealing differential effects of the interventions on each of the outcomes. In particular, the
537 marked difference in the effect sizes observed between suicidal behaviour and suicidal
538 ideation, which appears to be consistent across the assessment moments, along with the
539 differing evolution of these outcomes over time, suggests that the clear behavioural effect of
540 the intervention is not cognitively mediated. Most theoretical models of suicidal behaviour
541 [91] assume that it is constituted by a continuum of processes ranging from passive ideation
542 and planning to death through suicide attempt. Considering this sequencing, the apparent
543 effect of synchronous remote-based interventions on suicide attempts—but not on suicidal
544 ideation—suggests the probable involvement of an inhibitory mechanism. This mechanism
545 may act directly on behaviour, temporarily counteracting the influence of suicidal ideation on
546 suicidal actions, while the ideation itself probably persists as a latent risk factor. In this sense,
547 it should be taken into account that a key aspect of synchronous remote-based interventions is
548 that they provide the person at risk of death by suicide with regular, high-quality social
549 interaction and support, which is related to the concept of 'connectivity' discussed further. A
550 recent meta-analysis of safety planning-type interventions for suicide prevention [92] also
551 finds differences in reducing suicidal attempts but not suicidal ideation. The mechanism

552 behind the effectiveness of these interventions lies in risk management, preventing the
553 transition from suicidal ideation to suicidal action, despite the fact that no significant reduction
554 in suicidal thoughts was observed.

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

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

562 There are various aspects of the nature of the studies analysed, as well as the
563 methodology followed in the meta-analyses, that condition the interpretation of the results.
564 Firstly, of the 28 studies analysed, only eight (29%) had a low RoB, including seven randomised
565 controlled trials (37%) and one non-randomised trial (11%). The certainty of evidence
566 according to the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation
567 (GRADE) [93] was moderate to low, primarily due to RoB and imprecision in the results.
568 Additionally, unexplained statistical heterogeneity across studies warrants further
569 investigation to determine effects.

570 Secondly, although the selected studies share key commonalities– namely, all being
571 clinical trials and involving synchronous, remote-based interventions– there is substantial
572 variability in their action protocols and evaluation points. Significant variations were found in
573 the procedure of the intervention, and comparison group– i.e., periodicity, number of
574 contacts, moment of assessment, content, practitioner, setting, type of usual treatment, etc.–,
575 as well as in the methodology– i.e., study design, and RoB– of the reviewed studies.

576 Heterogeneity of results could be due to differences in the length of follow-up, the methods
577 used in the different programmes, variability in the number of sessions, or different patient
578 inclusion criteria. This heterogeneity complicates the integration of findings into a meta-
579 analysis. However, it has been partially addressed by conducting specific meta-analyses based
580 on temporal groupings, which enhance comparability while also assessing the dynamic
581 evolution of the intervention's therapeutic effects. Replication of these interventions
582 according to a standardised protocol would facilitate more consistent results [94].

583 **Narrative synthesis**

584 Firstly, the neologism 'connectivity' seems to serve as a central concept in the majority
585 of studies [35]. In addition, the importance of a high frequency of follow-up contacts, earlier
586 intervention, and involvement in the most critical period– i.e., 6 months post-discharged from
587 ED– is also underlined [10, 13, 35, 75]. Reducing loss to follow-up is a critical challenge in
588 suicide prevention, especially during the post-discharge period [13, 95], given historical
589 problems with treatment completion among people involved in suicidal behaviour [96–99].
590 According to Gabilondo *et al*. [62] BIC reduces loneliness and improves adherence to routine
591 treatment. Along the same lines, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [77] reported that a notable percentage
592 of participants engaged with mental health services, or initiated psychotherapy, or
593 pharmacotherapy during the synchronous remote intervention follow-up, suggesting a
594 significant benefit of these interventions for a treatment-unengaged population.

595 **Recommendations, implications for clinical practice, and future research**

596 Following the synthesis of information and the articles collected on the topic of the
597 review, the authors would like to provide a series of recommendations to standardise the
598 implementation and development of these interventions. Firstly, the authors of future studies
599 should consider describing in detail a minimum set of component characteristics of the
600 intervention and comparison groups– particularly for the TAU group– as there is considerable

601 heterogeneity between studies. A comprehensive quality checklist is presented in
602 Supplemental File 9. Table S9.

603 Secondly, as concluded in the systematic review by Noh *et al*. [33] more structured
604 and theory-based interventions for the prevention of suicidal behaviours should be conducted
605 and examined, emphasising the importance of a conceptual and theoretical framework in the
606 development of interventions, and increasing measurable impacts on key outcomes in
607 complex therapies [100]. A universal intervention design protocol should be adopted according
608 to the characteristics of the studies in which an effect has been observed and the
609 recommendations of the authors of previous studies on the topic [54, 57, 60, 61, 66, 73, 75,
610 76]. In summary, the preferred approach is a RCT design that delivers early interventions
611 within a maximum of 7 days post-ED discharge with long-term follow-up of approximately 12
612 months, often as concomitant therapy to TAU– i.e., emergency medical care and follow-up
613 based on the severity of suicidal behaviour; psychopharmacology, or psychotherapy–
614 conducted by a mental health professional to enhance suicide risk assessments, clinician-
615 patient connection, and adherence to routine treatment.

616 Overall, the findings emphasise the importance of standardising interventions to
617 enhance both research comparability and clinical application. Moreover, the results open up
618 several avenues for further investigation into effectiveness, underscoring the need to
619 standardise the outcomes to be assessed, the timing of evaluations, and the measurement
620 instruments. As mentioned above, the results obtained are inconclusive in terms of deaths by
621 suicide. Addressing the impact of this intervention on suicide deaths will require much larger
622 cohorts, which in turn implies improving the protocols for recording this indicator to ensure
623 data reliability. Finally, the suspicion that synchronous remote-based interventions could have
624 an effectiveness on the reduction of suicide attempts not mediated by a reduction in suicidal
625 ideation makes it necessary to focus the future of research on the processes that mediate the

626 effectiveness of interventions, which may be crucial for improving their efficacy and cost-
627 effectiveness.

628 **Strengths and limitations**

629 The primary limitation is the significant heterogeneity observed in the overall meta-
630 analyses and subgroup analyses, which may be attributed to the small number of studies
631 included in some analyses or the substantial variability between their results. In addition, using
632 ED data records or the authorities' forensic register may lead to the possibility of under-
633 reporting the actual number of non-fatal suicidal behaviours [101]. Furthermore, suicide is a
634 rare event, making the design of studies with high statistical power particularly difficult.
635 Finally, the included trials used intervention and comparison groups that received TAU; these
636 treatments are often different across studies.

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

642

643 **CONCLUSIONS**

644 Innovation in the prevention and management of suicidal behaviour is a therapeutic
645 challenge [102]. The current research outlines emerging evidence on suicide prevention
646 through telemedicine in reducing suicidal behaviours. The main conclusion of the study is that
647 the results seem to indicate that synchronous remote-based interventions are moderately
648 effective in reducing suicide attempts without mediating a reduction in suicidal ideation. The
649 process that mediates this effect is unknown, but it could be related to underlying social
650 bonding or 'connectedness'. However, the results are particularly inconclusive with regard to

suicide deaths. 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 [103]. Robust and accessible registries of suicide death for research could help significantly in future studies. 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 Hospital Universitari Parc Taulí 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/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 [104].

FUNDING

This research was funded by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Subdirección General de Evaluación y Fomento de la Investigación (ISCIII) and Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional (FEDER; grant number PI21/01148) and by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and 'ERDF A way of making Europe' (grant number PID2022-141403NB-I00). 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 University Hospital Parc Taulí University Hospital and the Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA) are the sponsors.

700 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

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

703

704 **PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

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

707

708 **PATIENT CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION**

709 Not applicable.

710

711 **PROVENANCE AND PEER REVIEW**

712 Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

713

714 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

715 Data are available in a public, open access repository. The dataset is available in CORA RDR,
716 https://doi.org/10.34810/data1310

717

718 **SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL**

719 Supplemental File 1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist (DOCX 22 KB).

720 Supplemental File 2. Amendments made to the original protocol (DOCX 10 KB).

721 Supplemental File 3. List of articles excluded after full-text screening (DOCX 23 KB).

722 Supplemental File 4. Information on the components and characteristics of the intervention
723 and comparison groups (DOCX 13 KB).

724 Supplemental File 5. Information on therapeutic adherence (DOCX 15 KB).

Supplemental File 6. Evaluation measures the time frame of the selected studies (DOCX 14 KB).

Supplemental File 7. Subgroup analysis (DOCX 15 KB).

Supplemental File 8. Publication bias (DOCX 110 KB).

Supplemental File 9. Report of the minimum set of component characteristics (DOCX 11 KB).

OPEN ACCESS

This is an open-access article distributed by the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work 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

750 1. World Health Organisation. Suicide [online]. 2023. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-
751 sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April 2024).
752 2. World Health Organisation. Suicide worldwide in 2019 [online]. 2021.
753 https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240026643 (accessed 30 Jan 2024).
754 3. World Health Organisation. Suicide in the world: Global health estimates [online]. 2019.
755 https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/326948/WHO-MSD-MER-19.3-
756 eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 30 Jan 2024).
757 4. Artieda-Urrutia P, Parra-Uribe I, Garcia-Pares G, *et al*. Management of suicidal behaviour:
758 Is the world upside down? *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2014;48:399–401.
759 https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867414525847
760 5. Mokdad AH, Forouzanfar MH, Daoud F, *et al*. Global burden of diseases, injuries, and risk
761 factors for young people's health during 1990–2013: A systematic analysis for the Global
762 Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2016;387:2383–401.
763 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00648-6
764 6. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, García-Parés G, *et al*. Attempted and completed suicide:
765 Not what we expected? *J Affect Disord* 2013;150:840–6.
766 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.03.013
767 7. World Health Organisation. Suicide: key facts. Geneva: World Health Organisation [online].
768 2021. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April
769 2024).
770 8. Olfson M, Wall M, Wang S, *et al*. Suicide following deliberate self-harm. *Am J Psychiat*
771 2017;174:765–74. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.16111288
772 9. Shand F, Vogl L, Robinson J. Improving patient care after a suicide attempt. *Australas*
773 *Psychiatry* 2018;26:145–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856218758560

774 10. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, Garcia-Parés G, *et al*. Risk of re-attempts and suicide
775 death after a suicide attempt: A survival analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2017;17:163.
776 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1317-z
777 11. Bostwick JM, Pabbati C, Geske JR, McKean AJ. Suicide Attempt as a Risk Factor for
778 Completed Suicide: Even More Lethal Than We Knew. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2016;173(11):1094-
779 1100. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.15070854
780 12. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Evidence-based national suicide prevention
781 taskforce in Europe: A consensus position paper. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*
782 2017;27:418–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2017.01.012
783 13. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Yonemoto N, *et al*. Active contact and follow-up interventions to
784 prevent repeat suicide attempts during high-risk periods among patients admitted to
785 emergency departments for suicidal behavior: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
786 *BMC Psychiatry* 2019;19:44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-019-2017-7
787 14. Ganz D, Braquehais MD, Sher L. Secondary Prevention of Suicide. *PLoS Med*
788 2010;7:e1000271. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000271
789 15. World Health Organisation. The European Mental Health Action Plan 2013–2020 [online].
790 2013. https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-
791 Mental-Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
792 16. World Health Organisation. Preventing suicide: A global imperative [online]. 2014.
793 https://www.who.int/mental_health/suicide-prevention/exe_summary_english.pdf?ua=1
794 (accessed 15 Feb 2024).
795 17. World Health Organisation. Comprehensive mental health action plan 2013–2030 [online].
796 2021. https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1371507/retrieve (accessed 15 Feb 2024).

797 18. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Kawanishi C, *et al*. Interventions to prevent repeat suicidal
798 behavior in patients admitted to an emergency department for a suicide attempt: A meta-
799 analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2015;175:66–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.048
800 19. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year
801 systematic review. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3:646–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-
802 0366(16)30030-X
803 20. Andersson G, Titov N, Dear BF, Rozental A, Carlbring P. Internet-delivered psychological
804 treatments: from innovation to implementation. *World Psychiatry*. 2019;18(1):20-28.
805 https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20610
806 21. Carlbring P, Hadjistavropoulos H, Kleiboer A, Andersson G. A new era in Internet
807 interventions: The advent of Chat-GPT and AI-assisted therapist guidance. *Internet Interv*.
808 2023;32:100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2023.100621
809 22. Laranjeira C, Carvalho D, Valentim O, *et al*. Therapeutic Adherence of People with Mental
810 Disorders: An Evolutionary Concept Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.
811 2023;20(5):3869. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20053869
812 23. Deng M, Zhai S, Ouyang X, Liu Z, Ross B. Factors influencing medication adherence among
813 patients with severe mental disorders from the perspective of mental health professionals.
814 *BMC Psychiatry*. 2022;22(1):22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03681-6
815 24. Kauppi K, Hätönen H, Adams CE, Välimäki M. Perceptions of treatment adherence among
816 people with mental health problems and health care professionals. *J Adv Nurs*.
817 2015;71(4):777-788. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12567
818 25. Gilat I, Shahar G. Emotional first aid for a suicide crisis: Comparison between telephonic
819 hotline and Internet. Psychiatry-Interpers *Biol Process* 2007;70:12–8.
820 https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2007.70.1.12

821 26. Seong JM, Cho Y, Cho GC, *et al*. Effects of mobile messenger counseling on case
822 management success for individuals engaging in self-harm or suicide attempts who were
823 discharged from emergency departments. *Clin Exp Emerg Med* 2021;8:48–54.
824 https://doi.org/10.15441/CEEM.20.133
825 27. Vijayakumar L, Umamaheswari C, Shujaath Ali Z, *et al*. Intervention for suicide attempters:
826 A randomized controlled study. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2011;53:244-8.
827 https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.86817
828 28. Martínez-Alés G, Cruz Rodríguez JB, Lázaro P, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of a Contact
829 Intervention and a Psychotherapeutic Program for Post-discharge Suicide Prevention. *Can J*
830 *Psychiatry*. 2021;66(8):737-746 https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720980135
831 29. De Leo D, Buono MD, Dwyer J. Suicide among the elderly: The long-term impact of a
832 telephone support and assessment intervention in northern Italy. *Br J Psychiatry*
833 2002;181:226–9. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.181.3.226
834 30. Gould MS, Munfakh JLH, Kleinman M, *et al*. National Suicide Prevention Lifeline: Enhancing
835 mental health care for suicidal individuals and other people in crisis. *Suicide Life-Threat*
836 *Behav* 2012;42:22–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00068.x
837 31. Aiello LM, Dadashzadeh S, Lynn JM, *et al*. Using telemedicine to reduce suicide ideation
838 and behavior: a systematic literature review. *THMT* 2021;6:1.
839 https://doi.org/10.30953/tmt.v6.226
840 32. Milner AJ, Carter G, Pirkis J, *et al*. Letters, green cards, telephone calls and postcards:
841 Systematic and meta-analytic review of brief contact interventions for reducing self-harm,
842 suicide attempts and suicide. *Br J Psychiatry* 2015;206:184–90.
843 https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.147819

844 33. Noh D, Park YS, Oh EG. Effectiveness of telephone-delivered interventions following
845 suicide attempts: A systematic review. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs* 2016;30:114–9.
846 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2015.10.012
847 34. Shin HD, Durocher K, Sequeira L, *et al*. Information and communication technology-based
848 interventions for suicide prevention implemented in clinical settings: a scoping review.
849 *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2023;23:281. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09254-5
850 35. Luxton DD, June JD, Comtois KA. Can postdischarge follow-up contacts prevent suicide and
851 suicidal behavior? A Review of the Evidence. *Crisis* 2013;34:32–41.
852 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000158
853 36. Shoib S, Shaheen N, Anwar A, *et al*. The effectiveness of telehealth interventions in suicide
854 prevention: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2024;70:415–423.
855 https://doi.org/10.1177/00207640231206059
856 37. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, *et al*. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated
857 guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n160.
858 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160
859 38. Comendador L, Jiménez-Villamizar MP, Losilla JM, *et al*. Effect of synchronous remote-
860 based interventions on suicidal behaviours: protocol for a systematic review and meta-
861 analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(12):e075116. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-075116
862 39. World Health Organisation. ICD-11 for mortality and morbidity statistics [online]. 2021.
863 https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en#/http://id.who.int/icd/entity/778734771 (accessed
864 15 Feb 2024).
865 40. Gómez A, Silva H, Amon R. El Suicidio. Teoría, Clínica y Manejo. Barcelona, ES: Editorial
866 Mediterráneo 2018.

867 41. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, *et al*. PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search
868 Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;75:40–6.
869 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021
870 42. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al*. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for
871 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5(1):1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4
872 43. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al*. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in
873 randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898
874 44. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al*. ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-
875 randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;366:i4919.
876 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919
877 45. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al*. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of
878 Interventions version 6.3. [online]. 2022. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook
879 (accessed 20 Feb 2025).
880 46. Hedges LV. Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect Size and Related Estimators.
881 *J Stat Educ* 1981;6:107-128. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164588
882 47. Daly LE. Confidence limits made easy: interval estimation using a substitution method. *Am*
883 *J Epidemiol.* 1998;147(8):783-790. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009523
884 48. Zhang J, Yu KF. What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort
885 studies of common outcomes. *JAMA*. 1998;280(19):1690-1691.
886 https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.19.1690
887 49. Peto R, Pike MC, Armitage P, *et al*. Design and analysis of randomized clinical trials
888 requiring prolonged observation of each patient. I. Introduction and design. *Br J Cancer*.
889 1976;34(6):585-612. https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.1976.220

890 50. Suurmond R, van Rhee H, Hak T. Introduction, comparison, and validation of Meta-
891 Essentials: A free and simple tool for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2017;8(4):537-
892 553. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1260
893 51. Amadéo S, Rereao M, Malogne A, *et al*. Testing Brief Intervention and Phone Contact
894 among Subjects with Suicidal Behavior: A Randomized Controlled Trial in French Polynesia
895 in the Frames of the World Health Organization/Suicide Trends in At-Risk Territories Study.
896 *Ment Illn*. 2015;7(2):5818. https://doi.org/10.4081/mi.2015.5818
897 52. Bertolote JM, Fleischmann A, De Leo D, *et al*. Repetition of suicide attempts: data from
898 emergency care settings in five culturally different low- and middle-income countries
899 participating in the WHO SUPRE-MISS Study. *Crisis*. 2010;31(4):194-201.
900 https://doi.org/10.1027/0027-5910/a000052
901 53. Burback L, Yap S, Purdon SE, *et al*. Randomized controlled trial investigating web-based,
902 therapist delivered eye movement desensitization and reprocessing for adults with suicidal
903 ideation. *Front Psychiatry*. 2024;15(1):1361086.
904 https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2024.1361086
905 54. Cebrià AI, Parra I, Pàmias M, *et al*. Effectiveness of a telephone management programme
906 for patients discharged from an emergency department after a suicide attempt: controlled
907 study in a Spanish population. *J Affect Disord*. 2013;147(1-3):269-276.
908 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.11.016
909 55. Cebrià AI, Pérez-Bonaventura I, Cuijpers P, *et al*. Telephone Management Program for
910 Patients Discharged From an Emergency Department After a Suicide Attempt: A 5-Year
911 Follow-Up Study in a Spanish Population. *Crisis*. 2015;36(5):345-352.
912 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000331
913 56. Cedereke M, Monti K, Ojehagen A. Telephone contact with patients in the year after a
914 suicide attempt: does it affect treatment attendance and outcome? A randomised

915 controlled study. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2002;17(2):82-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-
916 9338(02)00632-6
917 57. Christensen H, Farrer L, Batterham PJ, Mackinnon A, Griffiths KM, Donker T. The effect of a
918 web-based depression intervention on suicide ideation: secondary outcome from a
919 randomised controlled trial in a helpline. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(6):e002886.
920 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002886
921 58. Comtois KA, Kerbrat AH, DeCou CR, *et al*. Effect of Augmenting Standard Care for Military
922 Personnel With Brief Caring Text Messages for Suicide Prevention: A Randomized Clinical
923 Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(5):474-483.
924 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.4530
925 59. Demesmaeker A, Amad A, Blekic W, et al. Increased risk of suicide reattempt according to
926 the type of brief contact interventions in the VigilanS program: The critical role of PTSD
927 and anxiety disorders. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2024;181(1):29-35.
928 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychires.2024.11.031
929 60. Exbrayat S, Coudrot C, Gourdon X, *et al*. Effect of telephone follow-up on repeated suicide
930 attempt in patients discharged from an emergency psychiatry department: a controlled
931 study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2017;17(1):96. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1258-6
932 61. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, Wasserman D, *et al*. Effectiveness of brief intervention and
933 contact for suicide attempters: a randomized controlled trial in five countries. *Bull World*
934 *Health Organ*. 2008;86(9):703-709. https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.07.046995
935 62. Gabilondo A, Aristegi E, Gonzalez-Pinto A, *et al*. Prevention of Suicidal Behavior with
936 Telemedicine in Patients with a Recent Suicide Attempt: Is a 6-month Intervention Long
937 Enough?. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*. 2020;50(1):211-219.
938 https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12576

939 63. Goñi-Sarriés A, Yárnoz-Goñi N, López-Goñi JJ. Psychiatric Hospitalization for Attempted
940 Suicide and Reattempt at the One-Year Follow-Up. *Psicothema*. 2022;34(3):375-382.
941 https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2021.455
942 64. Hassanzadeh M, khajeddin N, Nojomi M, Fleischmann A, Eshrati T. Brief Intervention and
943 Contact after Deliberate Self-Harm: An Iranian Randomized Controlled Trial. *Iran J*
944 *Psychiatry Behav Sci*. 2010;4(2):5-12.
945 65. López-Goñi JJ, Goñi-Sarriés A. Effectiveness of a telephone prevention programme on the
946 recurrence of suicidal behaviour. One-year follow-up. *Psychiatry Res*. 2021;302:114029.
947 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114029
948 66. Malakouti SK, Nojomi M, Ghanbari B, Rasouli N, Khaleghparast S, Farahani IG. Aftercare
949 and Suicide Reattempt Prevention in Tehran, Iran. *Crisis*. 2022;43(1):18-27.
950 https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000754
951 67. Messiah A, Notredame CE, Demarty AL, Duhem S, Vaiva G; AlgoS investigators. Combining
952 green cards, telephone calls and postcards into an intervention algorithm to reduce suicide
953 reattempt (AlgoS): P-hoc analyses of an inconclusive randomized controlled trial. *PLoS*
954 *One*. 2019;14(2):e0210778. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210778
955 68. Miller IW, Camargo CA Jr, Arias SA, *et al*. Suicide Prevention in an Emergency Department
956 Population: The ED-SAFE Study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017;74(6):563-570.
957 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.0678
958 69. Mouaffak F, Marchand A, Castaigne E, Arnoux A, Hardy P. OSTA program: A French follow
959 up intervention program for suicide prevention. *Psychiatry Res*. 2015;230(3):913-918.
960 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.11.024
961 70. Mousavi SG, Zohreh R, Maracy MR, Ebrahimi A, Sharbafchi MR. The efficacy of telephonic
962 follow up in prevention of suicidal reattempt in patients with suicide attempt history. *Adv*
963 *Biomed Res*. 2014;3:198. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9175.142043

964 71. Mousavi SG, Amini M, Mahaki B, Bagherian-Sararoudi R. Effect of phone call versus face-
965 to-face follow-up on recurrent suicide attempts prevention in individuals with a history of
966 multiple suicide attempts. *Adv Biomed Res*. 2016;5:184. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-
967 9175.190990
968 72. O'Connor RC, Smillie S, McClelland H, *et al*. SAFETEL: a pilot randomised controlled trial to
969 assess the feasibility and acceptability of a safety planning and telephone follow-up
970 intervention to reduce suicidal behaviour. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2022;8(1):156.
971 https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-022-01081-5
972 73. Plancke L, Amariei A, Danel T, *et al*. Effectiveness of a French Program to Prevent Suicide
973 Reattempt (VigilanS). *Arch Suicide Res*. 2021;25(3):570-581.
974 https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2020.1735596
975 74. Riblet NB, Kenneally L, Stevens S, *et al*. A virtual, pilot randomized trial of a brief
976 intervention to prevent suicide in an integrated healthcare setting. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*.
977 2022;75:68-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2022.02.002
978 75. Vaiva G, Vaiva G, Ducrocq F, *et al*. Effect of telephone contact on further suicide attempts
979 in patients discharged from an emergency department: randomised controlled study. *BMJ*.
980 2006;332(7552):1241-1245. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7552.1241
981 76. Vaiva G, Berrouiguet S, Walter M, *et al*. Combining Postcards, Crisis Cards, and Telephone
982 Contact Into a Decision-Making Algorithm to Reduce Suicide Reattempt: A Randomized
983 Clinical Trial of a Personalized Brief Contact Intervention. *J Clin Psychiatry*.
984 2018;79(6):17m11631. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.17m11631
985 77. Ward-Ciesielski EF, Tidik JA, Edwards AJ, Linehan MM. Comparing brief interventions for
986 suicidal individuals not engaged in treatment: A randomized clinical trial. *J Affect Disord*.
987 2017;222:153-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.07.011

988 78. Wei S, Liu L, Bi B, *et al*. An intervention and follow-up study following a suicide attempt in
989 the emergency departments of four general hospitals in Shenyang, China. *Crisis*.
990 2013;34(2):107-115. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000181
991 79. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al*. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated
992 guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71.
993 https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71
994 80. Andrés AM, Marzo PF. Delta: a new measure of agreement between two raters. *Br J Math*
995 *Stat Psychol*. 2004;57:1-19. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711004849268
996 81. Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ PsycholMeas*. 1960; 20: 37-
997 46.
998 82. De Leo D, Scocco P, Marietta P, *et al*. Physical illness and parasuicide: evidence from the
999 European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS/WHO-EURO). *Int J Psychiatry Med*.
1000 1999;29(2):149-163. https://doi.org/10.2190/E87K-FG03-CHEE-UJD3
1001 83. Beck AT, Steer RA. *Beck scale for suicide ideation: Manual*. San Antonio, TX: Psychological
1002 Corporation 1993.
1003 84. Posner K, Brown GK, Stanley B, *et al*. The Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale: initial
1004 validity and internal consistency findings from three multisite studies with adolescents and
1005 adults. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2011;168(12):1266-1277.
1006 https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.10111704
1007 85. Beck AT, Kovacs M, Weissman A. Assessment of suicidal intention: the Scale for Suicide
1008 Ideation. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1979;47(2):343-352. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-
1009 006x.47.2.343
1010 86. Gibbons P, de Arévalo HF, Mónico M. Assessment of the factor structure and reliability of
1011 the 28-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28) in El Salvador. *Int J Clin*
1012 *Health Psychol*. 2004;4(2):389-398.

1013 87. Linehan M, Comtois KA. Suicide Attempt and Self-Injury Count (SASI-Count) [online]. 1996.
1014 http://depts.washington.edu/uwbrtc/wp-content/uploads/L-SASI-Count.pdf (accessed 28
1015 April 2024)
1016 88. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, De Leo D, Wasserman D. Instruments used in SUPRE-MISS:
1017 The WHO Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours. In: Wasserman D,
1018 Wasserman C, eds. *Oxford Textbook of Suicidology and Suicide Prevention*. 1th ed. Oxford,
1019 OED: Oxford Textbooks; 2009. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780198570059.003.0042
1020 89. Beck AT, Schuyler D, Herman I. Development of suicidal intent scales. In: Beck AT, Resnik
1021 HLP, Lettieri DJ, eds. *The prediction of suicide*. Bowie, MD: Charles Press; 1974:45–56.
1022 90. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis.*
1023 *Chichester*, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2021.

1024 91. Díaz-Oliván I, Porras-Segovia A, Barrigón ML, Jiménez-Muñoz L. E. Baca-García. Theoretical
1025 models of suicidal behaviour: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Eur J Psychiatry*.
1026 2021;35:181-192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpsy.2021.02.002

1027 92. Nuij C, van Ballegooijen W, de Beurs D, *et al*. Safety planning-type interventions for suicide
1028 prevention: meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry.* 2021;219(2):419-426.
1029 https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2021.50

1030 93. Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, *et al*. GRADE Handbook for grading quality of evidence
1031 and strength of recommendations [online]. 2013. Available:
1032 https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html [Accessed 30 Jun 2024].
1033 94. Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D, *et al*. Suicide and suicide risk. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*.
1034 2019;5(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0

1035 95. Hunt IM, Kapur N, Webb R, *et al*. Suicide in recently discharged psychiatric patients: a case-
1036 control study. *Psychol Med*. 2009;39(3):443-449.
1037 https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003644
1038 96. Andersen B, Bille-Brahe U. Aftercare of suicide attempters. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H,
1039 Eds. 4th European Symposium on Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention*
1040 *project. Intervention and Prevention*. Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 177-84.
1041 97. Borg S. Active intervention and comprehensive services following suicide attempts: a
1042 community-based program. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H, Eds. 4th European Symposium on
1043 Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention project. Intervention and prevention*.
1044 Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 159-67.
1045 98. Motto J, Boström AG. Post-crisis suicide preventing without therapy. *Alcohol Dis*. 1993; 5:
1046 564-7.
1047 99. O'Brien G, Holton AR, Hurren K, Watt L, Hassanyeh F. Deliberate self-harm and predictors
1048 of out-patient attendance. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1987; 150: 246-7.
1049 100. Corry M, Clarke M, While AE, Lalor J. Developing complex interventions for nursing: a
1050 critical review of key guidelines. *J Clin Nurs*. 2013;22(17-18):2366-86.
1051 http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jocn.12173
1052 101. Serrano-Gimeno V, Diestre A, Agustin-Alcain M, *et al*. Non-fatal suicide behaviours
1053 across phases in the COVID-19 pandemic: a population-based study in a Catalan cohort.
1054 *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2024; 11(5):348-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(24)00065-8
1055 102. Goñi-Sarriés A, Zandio-Zorrilla M. Suicide: The Challenge of Prevention. *Anales Sis San*
1056 *Navarra*. 2017;40(3):335–8. https://dx.doi.org/10.23938/assn.0122
1057 103. Pérez V, Elices M, Prat B, *et al*. The Catalonia Suicide Risk Code: A secondary
1058 prevention program for individuals at risk of suicide. *J Affect Disord*. 2020;268:201-205.
1059 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2020.03.009

1060 104. Comendador Vázquez L, Cebrià Meca A, Sanz Ruíz A, et al. Efficacy of synchronous
1061 remote-based interventions for suicide prevention among adolescent and adult patients: a
1062 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Psychiatr* 2022;65:S295–6.


Identification of studies via databases and registers
Identification of studies via other methods
Identification
Screening
Included
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)
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-related outcomes (n=4)
Asynchronous intervention (n=4)
No population (n=4)
No control group (n=3)
No study design (n=1)
In-person intervention (n=1)
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 randomisation process.
D2: Bias due to deviations from intended intervention.
D3: Bias due to missing outcome data.
D4: Bias in measurement of the outcome.
D5: Bias in selection of the reported result.

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

RoB domains:
D1: Bias due to confounding.
D2: Bias due to selection of participants.
D3: Bias in classification of interventions.
D4: Bias due to deviations from intended interventions.
D5: Bias due to missing data.
D6: Bias in measurement of outcomes.
D7: Bias in selection of the reported result.

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

A

	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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**-0.17**	**-0.62**	**0.28**	**100.00%**	**7.38**	**0.061**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**-0.07**	**-0.34**	**0.20**	**100.00%**	**1.16**	**0.561**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**-0.28**	**-0.89**	**0.34**	**100.00%**	**3.26**	**0.071**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**-0.27**	**-0.56**	**0.03**	**100.00%**	**4.16**	**0.125**	**51.92%**	**0.03**



B

	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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.73**	**0.62**	**0.85**	**100.00%**	**0.70**	**0.983**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.50**	**0.21**	**1.16**	**100.00%**	**1.32**	**0.858**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.56**	**0.34**	**0.95**	**100.00%**	**54.92**	**0.000**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.68**	**0.49**	**0.96**	**100.00%**	**72.63**	**0.000**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.84**	**0.66**	**1.06**	**100.00%**	**3.89**	**0.421**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**1.09**	**0.30**	**3.91**	**100.00%**	**0.49**	**0.482**	**0.00%**	**0.00**



C

	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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.40**	**0.00**	**789.93**	**100.00%**	**1.22**	**0.270**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.87**	**0.24**	**3.15**	**100.00%**	**3.63**	**0.458**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.42**	**0.11**	**1.65**	**100.00%**	**0.77**	**0.682**	**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	**Random effects model, 95% CI**	**0.18**	**0.08**	**0.44**	**100.00%**	**0.03**	**0.873**	**0.00%**	**0.00**