medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Challenges in Synthesising the Effects of Synchronous Remote-based Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

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

[1]Department of Psychiatry and Forensic Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[2] Department of Mental Health. e-MH-PEMN – 2021 SGR 01431. Parc Taulí Hospital Universitari. Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA), Unitat de Neurociències Traslacional I3PT-INc UAB, Institut de Neurociències. 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]Department of Clinical and Health Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.
[7]Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Salud Mental (CIBERSAM), Instituto de Salud Carlos III. 28029 Madrid, Spain.
[8]Stress and Health Research Group (GIES). Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Spain.

Corresponding authors
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

Ana Isabel Cebrià, PhD
Department of Mental Health. e-MH-PEMN – 2021 SGR 01431. Parc Taulí Hospital Universitari. Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA), Unitat de Neurociències Traslacional I3PT-INc UAB, Institut de Neurociències. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. 08208 Sabadell, Spain.
Parc Taulí, 1. 08208 Sabadell, Barcelona (Spain).
E-mail: acebria@tauli.cat

ABSTRACT

Introduction Suicide is one of the leading causes of preventable death worldwide. Evidence reported in the literature seems to support the impact of providing active contact for people that have attempted suicide. The current systematic review and meta-analysis aim to investigate the effects of suicide prevention strategies implemented through remote and synchronous technology-based interventions.
Methods The systematic review and meta-analysis followed the PRISMA 2020 guidelines. The searches were conducted in PubMed, PsycInfo, Scopus, and Web of Science. Screening, selection process, data extraction, and risk of bias (RoB) assessment have been performed independently by two reviewers. A systematic review and narrative synthesis of the data has been performed. Data on adherence to treatment and suicide-related factors to explain heterogeneity were extracted. A meta-analysis was conducted to determine effect sizes (Hedge's *g*) for suicidal ideation, odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for lethal and non-lethal suicide behaviours. Data were pooled using a random-effects model. Subgroup analyses were performed by classifying the studies according to the evaluation period.
Results A total of 26 publications were finally included. Synchronous remote-based interventions were effective in preventing repeated suicide attempts (OR = 0.75; 95% CI 0.62 – 0.90) and suicide deaths (Peto OR = 0.37; 95% CI 0.18 – 0.77); however, considerable heterogeneity was reported. The effects on suicidal ideation were not confirmed (Hedge's *g* = 0.23; 95% CI -1.54 – 1.07).
Conclusions The observed heterogeneity suggests that the effects should be considered under caution. Methodological and procedural guidelines are proposed to improve the quality of future research studies.
Keywords Suicide, Telemedicine, Preventive Medicine.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Challenges in Synthesising the Effects of Synchronous Remote-based Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

ABSTRACT

Introduction Suicide is one of the leading causes of preventable death worldwide. Evidence reported in the literature seems to support the impact of providing active contact for people that have attempted suicide. The current systematic review and meta-analysis aim to investigate the effects of suicide prevention strategies implemented through remote and synchronous technology-based interventions.

Methods The systematic review and meta-analysis followed the PRISMA 2020 guidelines. The searches were conducted in PubMed, PsycInfo, Scopus, and Web of Science. Screening, selection process, data extraction, and risk of bias (RoB) assessment have been performed independently by two reviewers. A systematic review and narrative synthesis of the data has been performed. Data on adherence to treatment and suicide-related factors to explain heterogeneity were extracted. A meta-analysis was conducted to determine effect sizes (Hedge's *g*) for suicidal ideation, odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for lethal and non-lethal suicide behaviours. Data were pooled using a random-effects model. Subgroup analyses were performed by classifying the studies according to the evaluation period.

Results A total of 26 publications were finally included. Synchronous remote-based interventions were effective in preventing repeated suicide attempts (OR = 0.75; 95% CI 0.62 – 0.90) and suicide deaths (Peto OR = 0.37; 95% CI 0.18 – 0.77); however, considerable heterogeneity was reported. The effects on suicidal ideation were not confirmed (Hedge's *g* = 0.23; 95% CI -1.54 – 1.07).

Conclusions The observed heterogeneity suggests that the effects should be considered under caution. Methodological and procedural guidelines are proposed to improve the quality of future research studies.

Keywords Suicide, Telemedicine, Preventive Medicine.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that over 703,000 people die annually from suicide worldwide [1, 2]. Suicide is a complex behaviour with multiple etiological factors that has become a serious public health problem. Every suicide is a major grievous blow that affects families, communities and entire countries and has lasting effects on the people left behind [1]. 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, 9, 10, 11].

Suicide prevention is emerging as a priority for the public health system [12]. Increasing evidence in the literature suggests that post-discharge follow-up contacts can be an effective suicide prevention strategy [13-17]. Information and communication technology-based interventions (ICT) have created opportunities and challenges in prevention, research, and clinical practice. Brief Intervention and Contact (BIC), 24/7 hotlines, letter/postcard delivery, or telephone follow-up have been classified as active contact interventions to prevent repeat suicidal behaviour in patients admitted to an Emergency Department (ED) [18, 19]. There is a wide range of eHealth-based treatments that are commonly classified into two categories: real-time synchronous therapy – such as telephone contact or telepsychiatry via videoconferencing – or digital self-help programs without human guidance, often asynchronous [20, 21].

An essential component of the effects of suicide prevention interventions is adherence to treatment, a factor at the core of mental health care [22]. The evaluation of therapeutic adherence in clinical care is critically important since poor adherence results in adverse outcomes, such as relapses and hospitalizations, among people with mental health disorders worldwide [22, 23, 24]. The multivariate character of treatment adherence has been

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

emphasized in the literature as a facilitator for optimizing the benefits of all current therapies [22]. Accordingly, most post-discharge suicide prevention programmes reinforce contact with mental health professionals. Brief contact interventions have three rationales: first, allows for repeated suicide risk assessments; second, reduce feelings of social isolation and provide emotional support; third, improve adherence to treatment and reduce dropout from mental health care [25–28]. In recent decades, studies have been published with promising results implementing follow-up contact interventions for at-risk individuals as a suicide prevention strategy [29,30]. Along these lines, Milner *et al.* [31] propose that large-scale clinical trials would be appropriate to examine the cost-effectiveness and usefulness of implementing brief contact intervention programs and, at present, they are not recommending generalized clinical implementation. In 2016, Noh *et al.* [32] reviewed five randomized controlled trials (RCTs) comparing telephone-delivered interventions after suicide attempts with a control group. The results suggest that more intensive, structured, evidence-based telephone interventions led by mental health professionals should be developed. In a recent scoping review, Shin *et al.* [33] present several trends of the ICT-based intervention for suicide prevention applied in clinical settings and identify a need for future research to strengthen the evidence for improving implementation. Luxton *et al.* [34] suggest that repeated follow-up contacts appear to reduce suicidal behaviour, reporting in their systematic review four studies that showed mixed results with trends toward a preventive effect and two studies that showed no preventive effect.

The present review aims to systematically explore the evidence on remote suicide prevention strategies implemented through synchronous technology-based interventions (i.e., via remote, interactive, real-time communication).

METHODS

The protocol of the systematic review and meta-analysis was registered in the Prospective International Registry of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO), with the identification

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

number CRD42021275044. The review was developed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) criteria [36]. The method is briefly described as follows; more information can be found in the published study protocol [35].

Eligibility criteria

Types of studies

Randomized control trials (RCT), and non-randomized clinical trials (nRCT)– e.g., quasi-experimental trials.

Types of 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.

Types of 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.

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.

Types of outcomes measures

Suicidal behaviours– i.e., suicide ideation [37], suicide attempt [3], and suicide death [38]– were included.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Data collection and analysis

Information sources

Bibliographic searches were conducted in PubMed, PsycInfo, Scopus, and Web of Science for studies published before June 2023. ClinicalTrials.gov and Google Scholar were searched for gray 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 syntax and the electronic search strategy developed for the PubMed database are available in Supplementary file 1 of the study protocol [35]. The search was unrestricted by year of publication, limited to English or Spanish, and developed with the collaboration of a health sciences librarian (GC), adhering to the Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) [39].

Selection process

The results of the literature search were imported into Mendeley (version 1.19.8), and Rayyan Systems Inc [40]. 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 process

Two authors (LC and MPJ) performed the data extraction independently, applying an *ad hoc* extraction form in Microsoft Excel (version 16.56).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Data items

Data were extracted on participants and intervention characteristics, outcomes related to suicidal behaviour for intervention and comparison groups– for all measures, time points, analyses, etc.–, and limitations. In addition, therapeutic adherence– specifically, the moderating effect of adherence on the efficacy of the intervention, the description of measures to maximize adherence to treatment, and predictor or moderator variables of adherence– were examined.

Risk of bias (RoB) assessment

Two reviewers (LC and MPJ) performed the RoB assessment independently, using the Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomised trials (RoB 2.0) [41] and Risk-of-bias In Non-randomised Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) [42]. Disagreements were resolved by consensus with a third blinded reviewer (AS).

Effect measures

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

Synthesis methods

A systematic review, meta-analysis, and narrative synthesis were performed. First, a systematic review was employed to collect and synthesize the empirical evidence that complied the eligibility criteria. Second, a meta-analysis using a random-effects model was calculated. To ensure that the combined numerical data from the different studies are comparable and can be adequately synthesized, subgroup 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Three types of meta-analyses were performed: a random-effects model with Hedges' *g* [43] as the effect size measure and 95% confidence intervals (CI) was calculated for suicidal ideation. Effect sizes are considered small ($g \geq 0.2$), medium ($g \geq 0.5$) or large ($g \geq 0.8$) [43]; a random-effects model with the effect estimates weighted by the inverse of the variance was calculated for suicide attempts. As proposed by Daly [44] and Zhang and Yu [45], the odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI were analysed; and a random-effects model with the effect estimates weighted by the Peto *et al.* method [46] was calculated for suicide deaths, since the observed frequencies are relatively low. Statistical heterogeneity was accounted for using I^2 statistic. Heterogeneity was considered substantial if I^2 was greater than 30%. All analyses were performed using the Meta-Essentials tool for Microsoft Excel (version 16.56) [47].

In trials with multiple assessment measurement periods, the trials were included as two separate studies; to avoid double counting, the control group data were shared between the two study comparisons [48].

RESULTS

Study selection

The initial search retrieved 2817 studies. After removing duplicates, 1742 articles were screened for title, abstract, and keywords. Of these, 159 studies were selected for full-text review. Finally, 26 publications were included in the review [49 – 74]. The article selection process was described in a PRISMA flowchart [75] (Figure 1). Inter-rater agreement was calculated for initial screening using Delta (δ = .91, CI 95%: 0.88 – 0.94) [76], and for eligibility and extraction process using Cohen's Kappa (κ = .82, CI 95%: 0.62 – 1.01; κ = .91; κ = .98, CI 95%: 0.97 – 0.99, respectively) [77].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1 PRISMA flow diagram for the systematic reviews which included searches of databases and other sources.

Study characteristics

A descriptive summary of the characteristics of the included studies is presented in Table 1. The studies were classified into two categories: 15 trials in the Active Contact and Follow-up group, and 11 studies in the Multi-Component Interventions group (Supplemental File 1: Table S1). The present review included 18 RCT (69.2%) [49, 50, 53 – 55, 57, 60, 62, 63, 65 – 68, 70 – 74]. The sample size ranges from 10 to 3068 in the intervention group (IG) and from 10 to 3694 in the control group (CG). The mean age ranged from 23 to 45 years in the IG and from 23 to 47 years in the CG. The proportion of women in most of the studies was above 50% in both IG and CG, except in three studies [55, 70, 73]. The participants in 23 studies were patients discharged from ED for suicidal behaviour [49 – 53, 56 – 69, 71 – 74], the participants in the remaining studies were callers to a national 24h-helpline service with moderate-to-high psychological distress [54], or patients identified as being at risk of suicide [55, 70]. The eligible articles were from 11

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

countries: France [56, 63, 65, 69, 71, 72], Spain [51, 52, 58, 59, 61], United States of America (USA) [55, 64, 70, 73], Iran [60, 62, 66, 67], Brazil, India, Sri Lanka, Iran, China [50, 57], French Polynesia [49], Sweden [53], Australia [54], United Kingdom (UK) [68], and China [74].

As for outcomes variables, seven studies reported outcomes relating to suicidal ideation [53 – 55, 68, 70, 73, 74], 24 studies reported the proportion of participants who reattempted suicide [49 – 53, 55, 56, 58 – 74], and 12 reported the proportion of suicide deaths [49, 52, 55, 57, 59 – 62, 64, 65, 71, 72]. There was a high heterogeneity in the diagnostic methods used to identify suicide behaviours: European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS), Scale for Suicide Ideation (SSI), General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28), Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale (CSSRS), Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation (BSS), Suicide Attempt Self-Injury Count (SASI-Count), Beck's Suicide Intent Scale (SIS), Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours (SUPRE-MISS), forensic records of suicide deaths, data from electronic medical records, etc. The secondary outcomes assessed included: sociodemographic and clinical characteristics (e.g., physical health status, clinical psychopathology, alcohol and drug use, psychosocial difficulties, quality of life, psychological distress, hopelessness, anxiety, depression, etc.) [49 – 74], method and characteristics of the index suicide attempt (psychiatric hospitalization, lethality of the suicide attempt, concomitant consumption of toxic substances before the suicide behaviour, personal and family history of previous suicidal behaviour, etc.) [50, 57, 60, 61, 63, 65 – 69, 71, 72, 74], time to relapse [51, 52, 58], adherence to treatment as usual (TAU) [55, 58, 70, 73], social connectedness, support from a significant other, family, and friends [70], and self-injurious behaviours [73].

The interventions were categorised as (a) telephone follow-up intervention (*n* = 15; 57.7%) [51 – 53, 56, 58, 59, 61 – 63, 66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74], (b) BIC (*n* = 5; 19.2%) [49, 50, 57, 60, 70], (c) 24-hour call-in services (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [54], (d) instant text messages (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [55], (e) Emergency Department Safety Assessment and Follow-up Evaluation (ED-SAFE intervention; *n* = 1; 3.8%) [64], (f) postal cards, 24-hour telephone, and telephone follow-up (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [65],

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

(g) Safety Planning and telephone follow-up intervention (SAFETEL intervention; *n* = 1; 3.8%) [68], and (h) Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [73]. On the other side, the control group in most studies was TAU (*n* = 24; 92.3%) [49 – 67, 68 – 72], except for two studies which were an active control group: relaxation training condition [73] and cognitive therapy group [74]. Most interventions were performed by nurses (*n* = 7; 26.9%) [51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 61], psychologists (*n* = 6; 23.1%) [55, 62, 63, 68, 70, 72], psychiatrists (*n* = 5; 19.2%) [65, 66, 67, 69, 71], physicians (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [64], and by a combination of health professionals– i.e., medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social work, in some cases (*n* = 4; 15.4%) [49, 50, 57, 60]– although, few interventions were undertaken by non-health professionals (*n* = 2; 7.7%) [54, 74] or not reported (*n* = 1; 3.8%) [73]. The onset of the intervention– i.e., initial contact– could be categorised in a time interval of days (*n* = 3; 11.5%) [55, 65, 68], weeks (*n* = 19; 73.1%) [49 – 52, 54, 56 – 63, 66, 67, 69, 72 – 74], months (*n* = 2; 7.7%) [53, 71], or not reported (*n* = 2; 7.7%) [64, 70]. The total number of contacts ranged from 1 [63, 71, 72] to 14 [62], with a minimum duration of 5 minutes [51, 52, 57] and a maximum of 40 minutes [74]. In addition, the follow-up period ranged from 2 months [56] to 5 years [52], with 12 months being the most prevalent research period range (*n* = 10; 38.5%) [51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65], reflecting that suicide risk is high within the first year of a suicide attempt [32].

Table 1

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

Study (authors, date of publication, country)	Study design	Setting, sample size (*N*)	Details of participants	Intervention (*n*) and comparison (*n*)	Duration of follow-up	Outcome measure (Instrument)
Amadéo *et al.*, 2015 [49] 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) [78], Suicide death (Forensic records of suicide deaths)
Bertolote *et al.*, 2010 [50] Brazil, India,	RCT	ED *N* = 1867	Patients with suicide attempt; mean age IG	BIC (*n* = 922) vs. TAU (*n* = 945) 1h brief educational intervention combined with telephone contacts or	18 months	Suicide attempt (EPSIS) [78]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Sri Lanka, Iran, China			26.3, mean age CG 25.5; 58.2% women	visits at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, 18 months by medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social work.		
Cebrià *et al.*, 2013 [51] Spain	nRCT; Case-Control Study	2 Hospital ED *N* = 514	Patients discharged from ED after 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 psychiatric nurse.	12 months	Suicide attempt (Interview + Data from electronic medical records)
Cebrià *et al.*, 2015 [52] Spain	nRCT	2 Hospital ED *N* = 485	Patients discharged from ED after 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 psychiatric nurse.	60 months	Suicide attempt, Suicide death (Interview + Data from electronic medical records)
Cedereke *et al.*, 2002 [53] 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) [79], Suicide attempt (Semi-structured interview)
Christensen *et al.*, 2013 [54] Australia	RCT	Lifeline, Australia's 24h 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) [80]
Comtois *et al.*, 2019 [55] 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) [79], Suicide attempt (Interview + SASI-Count) [81], Suicide death (Interview)
Exbrayat *et al.*, 2017 [56] 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% women	Telephone follow-up (*n* = 436) vs. TAU (*n* = 387) Telephone contacts at 8, 30, 60 days after suicide attempt by nurses.	2 months	Suicide attempt (Data from electronic medical records)
Fleischmann *et al.*, 2008 [57] 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, 18 months by medical doctor, psychiatric nurse, psychologist, or social work.	18 months	Suicide death (EPSIS) [78]
Gabilondo *et al.*, 2019 [58] 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 [59] 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 specialist nurse.	12 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (Interview)
Hassanzadeh *et al.*, 2010 [60] 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) [82]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021 [61] 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 nurse.	12 months	Suicide attempt, Suicide death (Data from electronic medical records)
Malakouti *et al.*, 2022 [62] Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N* = 305	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; IG Age < 27 years 58.2%, age 28-37 years 29.4%, age 38-47 years 11.1%, age > 48 years 1.3%; CG Age < 27 years 60.5%, age 28-37 years 30.9%, age 38-47 years 7.2%, age > 48 years 1.3%; 66.9% women	Telephone contact program (*n* = 153) vs. TAU (*n* = 152) Telephone contacts calls (15-20 min.) at 1, 2, and 4 weeks, and monthly for up to 12 months by clinical psychologists with master's degree.	12 months	Suicide attempts, Suicide death (SUPRE-MISS) [82]
Messiah *et al.*, 2019 [63] France	RCT	23 Hospital ED and psychiatric crisis centres *N* = 1040	Patients discharged from the ED for a suicide attempt; mean age not reported: IG Age 18-35 years 42.9%, age 36-55 years 46.1%, age above 55 years 11.0%; CG Age 18-35 years 43.1%, age 36-55 years 45.9%, age above 55 years 11.0%; 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 psychologist. The patient could not be contacted after 3 attempts, on 3 different days, at 3 different times of day: post-cards were sent at 2, 3, 4, and 5 months.	14 months	Suicide attempt (Semi-structured interview)
Miller *et al.*, 2017 [64] 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) [83]
Mouaffak *et al.*, 2015 [65] 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) [84], Suicide death (Semi-structured interview)
Mousavi *et al.*, 2014 [66] Iran	RCT	Hospital ED *N* = 139	Patients admitted to the ED for suicide attempt in 2010-2011; mean age not reported: IG Age 15-25 years 65.2%, age 26-35 years 21.7%, age above 35 years 13%; CG Age 15-25 years 51.4%, age 26-35 years 31.4%, age above 35 years 17.1%; 63.3% women	Telephone follow-up (*n* = 69) vs. TAU (*n* = 70) Telephone contacts (30 min.) at 2, 4 weeks, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 months by psychiatry.	6 months	Suicide attempt (*ad hoc* questionnaire)
Mousavi *et al.*, 2016 [67] 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 [68] 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 hospital and weekly thereafter depending on participants' availability by clinical psychologists.	6 months	Suicide Ideation, Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [83]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Plancke *et al.*, 2020 [69] France	nRCT; Longitudinal Study	Hospital ED *N* = 6762	Patients discharged from the hospital 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 [70] 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 phone or video by clinical psychologist.	3 months	Suicide Ideation (BSS [85] + Data from the electronic medical record), Suicide attempt (CSSRS) [83]
Vaiva *et al.*, 2006 [71] 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 [72] 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 suicide attempt by 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 [73] 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) [79], Suicide attempts (Interview)
Wei *et al.*, 2013 [74] China	RCT	4 General Hospitals ED *N* = 239	Patients admitted to the ED after attempted suicide; aged > 15 years, 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 3-month period by professors.	12 months	Suicide Ideation (SSI) [79], Suicide attempt (Structured Interview)

AlgoS: decision-making algorithm for suicide; BIC: Brief Intervention and Contact; BSI: Brief Suicide Intervention; BSS: Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation; CBT: Cognitive Behaviour Therapy; CG: Control Group; CSSRS: Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale; DBT-BSI: Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention; DSH: Deliberate Self-Harm; ED-SAFE: Emergency Department Safety Assessment and Follow-up Evaluation; ED: Emergency Department; EPSIS: European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule; GHQ-28: General Health Questionnaire; HR: Hazard Ratio; 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; SPI: Safety planning intervention; TAU: Treatment As Usual; UK: United Kingdom; USA: United States of America.

Risk of bias in studies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

The results of the RoB 2.0 [41] evaluation is presented in Table 2, in addition, the ROBINS-I [42] evaluation is shown in Table 3. Inter-rater agreement was calculated using Cohen's Kappa (κ = .94, CI 95%: 0.87 – 1.02) [77]. The overall RoB ratings were classified as low, moderate, or serious. A total of 7 (26.9%) studies met the criteria to be classified as low risk of bias; in 12 (46.2%) studies the risk of bias was moderate; while in 7 (26.9%) studies the risk of bias was high.

Table 2

RoB assessment using the RoB 2.0 [41].

	Randomisation process	Deviations from indented interventions	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the report result	Overall bias
Amadéo et al. (2015) [49]	+	?	?	+	+	+
Bertolote et al. (2010) [50]	+	+	+	+	?	+
Cedereke et al. (2002) [53]	+	?	−	+	?	?
Christensen et al. (2013) [54]	+	?	−	+	+	?
Comtois et al. (2019) [55]	+	−	?	+	?	?
Fleischmann et al. (2008) [57]	+	+	?	+	+	+
Hassanzadeh et al. (2010) [60]	+	+	+	+	?	+
Malakouti et al. (2021) [62]	+	?	+	+	−	?
Messiah et al. (2019) [63]	+	−	+	+	?	?
Mouaffak et al. (2015) [65]	+	?	+	+	?	+
Mousavi et al. (2014) [66]	+	+	+	?	?	+
Mousavi et al. (2016) [67]	+	−	?	−	?	−
O'Connor et al. (2022) [68]	+	?	−	+	+	?
Riblet et al. (2022) [70]	+	+	+	+	−	?
Vaiva et al. (2006) [71]	+	+	−	+	?	−
Vaiva et al. (2018) [72]	+	+	−	+	+	?
Ward-Ciesielski et al. (2017) [73]	+	+	−	+	+	?
Wei et al. (2012) [74]	+	−	−	+	?	−

Abbreviations: (+) indicates low risk of bias; the study is judged to be at low risk of bias for most domains, (-) high risk of bias; the study is judged to be at high risk of bias in at least two domains OR the study is judged to have some concerns for multiple domains in a way that substantially lowers confidence, and (?) moderate risk of bias; the study is judged to raise some concerns in at least three domains.

Table 3

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

RoB assessment using the ROBINS-I [42].

	Confounding	Selection of participants	Classification of interventions	Deviations from intended intervention	Missing data	Measurement of outcomes	Selection of the reported results	Overall bias
Cebrià et al. (2013) [51]	−	+	+	+	+	?	+	?
Cebrià et al. (2015) [52]	−	?	+	+	+	?	+	−
Exbrayat et al. (2017) [56]	?	+	+	+	?	?	+	?
Gabilondo et al. (2019) [58]	−	?	?	−	−	?	+	−
Goñi-Sarriés et al. (2022) [59]	−	+	+	?	?	+	?	−
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés (2021) [61]	−	+	+	?	?	?	?	−
Miller et al. (2017) [64]	−	+	+	+	+	+	?	?
Plancke et al. (2020) [69]	?	+	+	+	+	+	?	+

Abbreviations: (+) indicates low risk of bias; the study is comparable to a well-performed randomized trial, (-) high risk of bias; the study has some important problems, and (?) moderate risk of bias; the study is sound for a non-randomized study but cannot be considered comparable to a well-performed randomized trial.

Results of individual studies

Suicidal ideation

The results of the meta-analysis of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on suicidal ideation are shown in Figure 2. Among the 26 trials, three studies reported the effects of the intervention on suicidal ideation within 1 month [54, 73, 70], two studies within 3 months [70, 73], two studies within 6 months [54, 68], and three studies within 12 months [53 – 55]. There was a small, non-statistically significant effect (Hedge's *g* = -0.23; 95% CI -1.54 – 1.07) on the prevention of suicidal ideation.

Study name / Subgroup name	Hedges' g	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,78	-1,31	-0,25
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	-0,06	-0,52	0,40
Riblet et al. 2022	0,05	-0,85	0,95
1 month	**-0,30**	**-0,81**	**0,22**
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	-0,24	-0,72	0,24
Riblet et al. 2022	0,18	-0,72	1,09
3 months	**-0,14**	**-0,50**	**0,22**
O'Connor et al. 2022	0,00	-0,38	0,38
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,63	-1,21	-0,04
6 months	**-0,28**	**-0,89**	**0,34**
Comtois et al. 2019	-0,13	-0,31	0,06
Christensen et al. 2013	-0,74	-1,33	-0,15
Cedereke et al. 2002	-0,25	-0,55	0,04
12 months	**-0,27**	**-0,56**	**0,03**
Combined Effect Size	**-0,23**	**-1,54**	**1,07**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 34.5%

Combined effect size: Hedge's *g* = -0.23; standard error = 0.58; 95% CI -1.54 – 1.07

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Figure 2 Forest plot comparing effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicidal ideation with subgroup analysis according to the time frame of the evaluation measures.

Suicide attempts

The results of the meta-analysis of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on suicide reattempts are shown in Figure 3. Among the 26 trials, five studies reported the effects of the intervention on suicidal ideation within 1 month [56, 66, 67, 70, 73], four studies within 3 months [67, 70, 73, 74], 8 studies within 6 months [60, 63, 66 – 69, 72, 74], 10 studies within 12 months [51, 55, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 65, 69, 74], four studies within 13 months [53, 63, 71, 72], and two studies within 18 months [49, 50]. There was a statistically significant effect (OR = 0.75; 95% CI 0.62 – 0.90) on the reduction (25%) of suicide attempt, although there was severe heterogeneity (78.8%).

Study name / Subgroup name	Odds Ratio	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit
Mousavi et al. 2014	0,33	0,01	8,57
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,90	0,02	51,33
Riblet et al. 2022	1,00	0,01	72,57
Exbrayat et al. 2017	0,67	0,45	0,98
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	1,06	0,19	5,79
1 month	**0,68**	**0,56**	**0,82**
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,29	0,01	7,96
Ward-Ciesielski et al. 2017	0,83	0,15	4,55
Wei et al. 2012	0,36	0,01	9,25
Riblet et al. 2022	1,00	0,01	72,57
3 months	**0,63**	**0,27**	**1,46**
Hassanzadeh et al. 2010	1,24	0,71	2,17
Mousavi et al. 2014	0,24	0,03	2,27
Mousavi et al. 2016	0,18	0,02	1,84
Plancke et al. 2020	0,28	0,23	0,35
Messiah et al. 2019	0,81	0,50	1,32
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,69	0,48	1,00
Wei et al. 2012	0,23	0,02	2,18
O'Connor et al. 2022	1,15	0,46	2,85
6 months	**0,59**	**0,33**	**1,07**
Cebria et al. 2013	0,41	0,23	0,76
Comtois et al. 2019	0,57	0,32	1,01
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021	1,22	0,76	1,95
Miller et al. 2017	0,75	0,55	1,03
Goñi-Sarriés et al. 2022	0,85	0,46	1,56
Malakouti et al. 2021	0,36	0,19	0,71
Wei et al. 2012	0,75	0,01	42,37
Gabilondo et al. 2019	1,15	0,60	2,23
Mouaffak et al. 2015	1,04	0,54	1,99
Plancke et al. 2020	0,32	0,27	0,38
12 months	**0,66**	**0,45**	**0,95**
Vaiva et al. 2006a	0,49	0,25	0,93
Vaiva et al. 2006b	0,71	0,39	1,31
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,77	0,56	1,08
Messiah et al. 2019	1,00	0,64	1,56
Cedereke et al. 2002	1,00	0,45	2,24
13 months	**0,79**	**0,58**	**1,06**
Amadéo et al. 2015	1,37	0,70	2,69
Bertolote et al. 2010	1,02	0,71	1,47
18 months	**1,09**	**0,23**	**5,17**
Combined effect size	**0,75**	**0,62**	**0,90**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 78.8%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Combined effect size: OR = 0.75; 95% CI 0.62 – 0.90

Figure 3 Forest plot comparing effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicide attempts with subgroup analysis according to the time frame of the evaluation measures.

Suicide death

The results of the meta-analysis of the effects of synchronous remote-based intervention on suicide deaths are shown in Figure 4. Among the 26 trials, two studies reported the effects of the intervention on suicide deaths within 6 months [60, 72], five studies within 12 months [55, 59, 61, 64, 65], two studies within 13 months [71, 72], and two studies within 18 months [49, 57]. There was a statistically significant effect (Peto OR = 0.37; 95% CI 0.18 – 0.77) on the reduction (63%) of suicide deaths.

Study name / Subgroup name	Peto Odds Ratio	CI Lower limit	CI Upper limit
Hassanzadeh et al. 2010	0,97	0,14	6,96
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,27	0,08	0,88
6 months	**0,40**	**0,00**	**789,93**
Comtois et al. 2019	1,91	0,20	18,58
López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés 2021	0,30	0,05	1,78
Miller et al. 2017	1,48	0,25	8,59
Goñi-Sarriés et al. 2022	0,45	0,05	4,49
Mouaffak et al. 2015	7,29	0,14	373,41
12 months	**0,87**	**0,24**	**3,15**
Vaiva et al. 2018	0,37	0,11	1,23
Vaiva et al. 2006a	0,23	0,01	4,51
Vaiva et al. 2006b	1,07	0,09	12,27
13 months	**0,42**	**0,11**	**1,65**
Fleischmann et al. 2008	0,19	0,08	0,45
Amadéo et al. 2015	0,15	0,01	2,44
18 months	**0,18**	**0,08**	**0,44**
Combined effect size	**0,37**	**0,18**	**0,77**



Heterogeneity: I^2 = 3.8%

Combined effect size: Peto OR = 0.37; 95% CI 0.18 – 0.77

Figure 4 Forest plot comparing effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicide deaths with subgroup analysis according to the time frame of the evaluation measures.

Results of narrative synthesis

Effects of Telephone Contact Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

A total of 14 articles examined the efficacy of Telephone Follow-up Interventions in the prevention of suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and suicide deaths [51 – 53, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

66, 67, 69, 71, 72, 74]. The studies by Cebrià *et al*. [51], Exbrayat *et al*. [56], Malakouti *et al*. [62], Plancke *et al*. [69], and Vaiva *et al*. [71] reported differences for suicide reattempts in the intervention group compared to the control group, and a significant effect of the intervention group in reducing the rate of reattempts. Cebrià *et al*. [52], after a 60-month follow-up, indicated that there was no significant difference in either group in terms of suicide reattempts (31.4% vs. 34.4%, p = .40). The reattempt prevention effect observed in the first 12 months of follow-up was not sustained over 5 years of follow-up.

Cedereke *et al*. [53] and Mousavi *et al*. [67] found significant reductions for suicidal ideation, regardless of the intervention condition, although no significant differences between groups were reported. On the other hand, Wei *et al*. [74] compared a telephone intervention with a cognitive therapy group and a control group, showing reductions in the number of suicide reattempts between intervention and control groups (1.3% vs. 6.5%, p = .08), although the differences were marginally significant. No statistically significant differences in suicidal ideation were shown between the three groups at any assessment point (baseline: p = .43, 3-month: p = .72, 6-month: p = .75, 12-month: p = .67).

Gabilondo *et al*. [58], Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [59], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [61], Mousavi *et al*. [66], Mousavi *et al*. [67], and Vaiva *et al*. [72] reported no significant differences between intervention and control groups for suicide reattempts. In addition, Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [59] informed that there were no significant differences for suicide deaths. More detailed information in Table 1.

Effects of Text Message Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

Comtois *et al*. [55] conducted a follow-up text-messaging intervention with soldiers and marines targeted as being at risk for suicide. Eleven contacts were made by mental health clinicians, with participants' text message responses monitored 24 hours a day. The authors reported no significant effect of the intervention on the presence or severity of current suicidal ideation;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

furthermore, the intervention did not significantly decrease the odds of a suicide risk incident during the 12 months follow-up period.

Effects of Multi-component Interventions on Suicidal Behaviours

A total of 11 articles examined the efficacy 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 [49, 50, 54, 57, 60, 63 – 65, 68, 70, 73]. Miller *et al*. [64] evaluated the ED-SAFE intervention, which consisted of a risk screening and 7 post-ED telephone calls. No significant differences in risk reduction were found between the TAU and screening phases (22.9% vs. 21.5%, p = .99). Mouaffak *et al*. [65] 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%, OR = 1.01, 95% CI 0.52 – 1.97, p = .89). Messiah *et al*. [63] evaluated the effectiveness of the AlgoS Algorithm, which consisted of a telephone follow-up for multi-attempters or a crisis card for first-attempts versus TAU. Telephone follow-up was conducted at 10 and 21 days by a psychologist. There was no significant difference for multi-attempters in the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide reattempts at 6 (Relative Risk; RR = 0.84, 95% CI 0.57 – 1.25) and 14 months (RR = 1.00, 95% CI 0.73 – 1.37).

Amadéo *et al*. [49], Bertolote *et al*. [50], Fleischmann *et al*. [57], and Hassanzadeh *et al*. [60] investigated the efficacy of BIC, using brief 1-hour educational intervention combined with telephone contacts at 1, 2, 4, 7, 11 weeks, 4, 6, 12, and 18 months delivered by physicians, psychiatric nurses, psychologists, psychiatrists, or social workers. No significant reduction was found in the intervention group compared to the control group for suicide reattempts, although, a significant reduction in suicide deaths in the intervention group compared with the control group (0.2% vs. 2.2%, p < .001) at 18-months was reported in the study by Fleischmann *et al*.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

[57]. In a similar intervention protocol, Riblet *et al*. [70] contacted by telephone or video over 3 months, mailed educational materials, and performed a 1-hour educational intervention on suicide prevention also by telephone or video. A reduction in suicidal ideation was found in the intervention group compared with the control group at 1 and 3 months, with effect sizes in the medium to large range for suicidal ideation (Hedges' g = 0.71). No suicide attempts occurred during the study.

Christensen *et al*. [54] conducted a web-based CBT intervention combined with telephone follow-up compared with a CBT-only intervention and a TAU group. CBT was delivered in five modules and telephone contacts were provided weekly by a 24h telephone counselling service. Significant reductions in suicidal ideation, in the telephone call condition, at 1-month post-intervention (p = .003), 6-month follow-up (p = .03), and 12-month follow-up (p = .01) were found. Similarly, Ward-Ciesielski *et al.* [73] conducted a single-session Dialectical Behaviour Therapy Skills-Based Intervention (DBT-BSI) and telephone follow-up at 1, 4, and 12 weeks, compared with a control group. A significant reduction in levels of suicidal ideation was reported in both conditions, although there were no significant differences between conditions for suicidal ideation and number of suicide attempts. O'Connor *et al*. [68] evaluated the effects of the SAFETEL intervention against TAU. A safety planning intervention (SPI) session and 5 weekly optional telephone calls were conducted. No significant differences were found between the intervention group and the control group for suicide attempts (Incidence Rate Ratio; IRR = 1.10, 95% CI 0.43 – 2.79, p = .85).

Effects of Synchronous Remote-Based Interventions on Treatment Adherence

Seventeen studies reported on outcomes relating to treatment attendance [49 – 53, 57 – 63, 68, 71 – 74]. In relation to the moderating effect of adherence on the efficacy of the intervention: Gabilondo *et al*. [58] observed that the intervention group showed significantly higher adherence to outpatient follow-up (p < .001); in addition, Hassanzadeh *et al*. [60] revealed an

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

increase in patients' perceived need for support ($p < .001$) and positively influenced attitudes toward seeking support from services and family.

According to Cebrià *et al*. [52], suicide attempters tend to be ambivalent to treatment, do not attend treatment, or drop out prematurely; complementary, López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [61] showed in their study that completion of the Telephone Follow-up Programme (TFP) correlated with a reduction in suicidal behaviours. Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [73], and Wei *et al*. [74] also mention that the 75% retention rate underscores the acceptability and effectiveness of the study in engaging a historically hard-to-reach and difficult-to-retain population. Fleischmann *et al*. [57] mention that BIC operates similarly to psychosocial counselling, providing temporary social support and fostering feelings of connectedness through systematic follow-up contacts.

Moreover, Vaiva *et al*. [71] reported that participants in the intervention group discussed their suicide attempt with their primary care physician more frequently than controls. As mentioned by Messiah *et al*. [63] telephone calls could complement a multimodal strategy, providing a surveillance tool to drive more aggressive interventions.

In relation to the predictor or moderator variables of adherence: Amadéo *et al*. [49], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [61], O'Connor *et al*. [68], Vaiva *et al*. [71], and Vaiva *et al*. [72] concurred that patients lost to follow-up were more likely to be male. Gabilondo *et al*. [58], Goñi-Sarriés *et al*. [59], López-Goñi & Goñi-Sarriés [61], Vaiva *et al*. [71], and Vaiva *et al*. [72] concluded that the intervention could be more effective for higher risk populations requiring additional support; in these studies, patients who completed PTF demonstrated higher severity of suicide attempts, greater psychopathological severity, used more violent methods, and experienced predominantly affective disorders. In contrast, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [73] found that participants lost to follow-up reported higher levels of depression and anxiety. On the other hand, four studies [57, 62, 68, 74] discussed stigma around suicide as a factor that may affect patients' attitudes toward seeking support from mental health services and family. More detailed information in Supplemental File 2: Table S2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Causes of heterogeneity among study results

The investigations on the possible causes of heterogeneity between the outcomes of suicidal ideation (I^2 = 34.5%) and suicide attempts (I^2 = 78.8%) of the selected studies raise the pertinence of qualitatively synthesizing the results due to heterogeneity in: a) the evaluation measures time frame of the outcomes (Supplementary File 3. Table S3), b) the protocol of intervention design and the characteristics of the intervention and control group– i.e., target effect, measures of effect, method of implementation, administrator-participant interaction, periodicity, number and duration of the intervention, professional delivering the intervention, setting, participants, etc. – (Supplementary File 1. Table S1), c) assessment of risk of bias and study design– differences were observed in the result of RCT versus nRCT studies for suicide attempts and suicide deaths outcomes– (Supplementary File 4. Figure S1; Figure S2). Conclusions regarding the efficacy of synchronous and remote interventions for suicide prevention are complex, given the large heterogeneity reflected in the studies conducted to date.

DISCUSSION

Innovation in the prevention and management of suicidal behaviour is a therapeutic challenge [86]. The present research outlines emerging evidence on suicide prevention through telemedicine in reducing suicidal ideation and behaviours; however, it is not possible to confirm the effectiveness of the interventions, as the methodological and procedural heterogeneity of the available articles does not allow for a quantitative synthesis of the accumulated scientific evidence.

The studies considered investigate the provision of information and counselling to people with suicidal ideation and a history of suicide attempts, (1) assessing the current risk of suicidal behaviour; (2) reinforcing adherence to treatment and follow-up by a health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

professional; (3) contributing to psychoeducation and identification of factors related to suicidal behaviour; and (4) providing crisis intervention in case of detection of an immediate risk situation. The neologism "connectivity" serves as the central concept in the majority of studies [34]. In addition, the importance of a high frequency of follow-up contacts, earlier intervention, and involvement in the most critical period– i.e., 6 months post-discharged from ED– is also underlined [10, 13, 34, 71]. Reducing loss to follow-up is a critical challenge in suicide prevention, especially during the post-discharge period [13, 87], given historical problems with treatment completion among people involved in suicidal behaviour [88 – 91]. According to Gabilondo *et al*. [58] BIC reduce loneliness, increase knowledge about suicide prevention, and improve adherence to routine treatment. Along the same lines, Ward-Ciesielski *et al*. [73] reported that a notable percentage of participants engaged with mental health services, or initiated psychotherapy, or pharmacotherapy during the synchronous remote intervention follow-up, suggesting a significant benefit of these interventions with a treatment-unengaged population. Nevertheless, Cedereke *et al*. [53] argued that more research is needed to establish the relationship between adherence to treatment and reduction in suicidal behaviour.

The wide variety of distance programmes for suicide prevention, and the current lack of treatment guidance on their implementation warrant further research to improve and standardise patient care. As concluded in the systematic review by Noh *et al*. [32] more structured and theory-based interventions for the prevention of suicidal behaviours should be conducted and examined, emphasizing the importance of a conceptual and theoretical framework in the development of interventions and to increase measurable impacts on key outcomes in complex interventions [92]. Despite the common prevention approach, significant variations were found in the procedure of the intervention, and comparison group– i.e., periodicity, number of contacts, moment of assessment, content, practitioner, setting, type of usual treatment, etc.–, as well as in the methodology– i.e., study design, and RoB– of the reviewed studies. Heterogeneity of results could be due to differences in the length of follow-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

up, the methods used in the different programmes, variability in the number of sessions, or different patient inclusion criteria. Replication of these interventions according to a standardised protocol would facilitate more consistent results [93]. In addition, the lack of adequate reporting of information on the intervention group, comparison group, and TAU components of the studies constitutes an important gap in the literature and opens new lines of research.

Recommendations

In accordance with the synthesis of information and the articles collected on the topic of the review, the authors would like to provide a series of recommendations to standardise the implementation and development of these interventions to obtain data that can be meta-analysed in the future. Firstly, the authors of future studies should consider describing in detail a minimum set of component characteristics of the intervention and comparison groups– particularly for TAU group– as there is considerable heterogeneity between studies. A comprehensive quality checklist is presented in Supplementary file 5. Table S4. In addition, it should be evaluated not only for efficacy and effectiveness, but also for cost-effectiveness, adherence to the intervention and TAU, etc.

Secondly, a universal intervention design protocol should be adopted according to the characteristics of the studies in which an effect has been observed and the recommendations of the authors of previous studies on the topic [51, 54, 56, 57, 62, 69, 71, 72]. Overall, the recommendation is for RCT study designs that provide early interventions after discharge from the ED–maximum 7 days– with long-term follow-up– approximately 12 months–, often as concomitant therapy to TAU– i.e., emergency medical care and follow-up based on severity of suicidal behaviour; psychopharmacology and/or psychotherapy– conducted by a mental health professional to promote suicide risk assessments, clinician-patient connection, and adherence to routine treatment.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Strength and limitations

The main limitation of the present review is the lack of efficacy measurement to determine which protocol of telemedicine for suicide prevention is the most recommendable. The present review is not intended to criticize the selected articles, but to offer opportunities for improving future research. Therefore, we propose recommendations for methodological and practical guidance in developing synchronous remote interventions for suicide prevention (Supplementary file 5. Table S4).

The focus of the present review was synchronous remote-based interventions; therefore, many studies using asynchronous telecommunication devices– i.e., crisis card, self-directed web-based programmes, etc.– were excluded. In addition, the limitation of using ED medical data records or the authorities' forensic registry is the possibility of underreporting the actual number of nonfatal suicidal behaviours [94]; additionally, suicide is a rare event, making the design of studies with high statistical power particularly difficult. Finally, the included trials used intervention and comparison groups that received TAU; these treatments are often different across studies.

Conclusions

Promoting comprehensive mental health treatment, emphasising follow-up and continuity of care after discharge from the ED may help prevent repeat suicide attempts; however, the precise mechanisms by which interventions reduce repeated suicidal behaviour are unclear, and more protocolised research is required. The effects of telemedicine-based interventions in multicomponent programs remain difficult to assess.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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.

Contributors 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.

Acknowledgements Authors' thanks Guillem Cebrián (GC), 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 invaluable support in the refinement of the search strategies. Authors' gratitude goes to Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and Hospital Universitari Parc Taulí for critically analysing the study proposal and motivational support to conduct this protocol. 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 (2021 SGR 01431); the CERCA programme of the I3PT; the Instituto de Salud Carlos III; and the CIBER of Mental Health (CIBERSAM). The research has been previously presented at a conference and has been published as a conference abstract [76].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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). The APC 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). 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 of Hospital Universitari Parc Taulí, Unitat Mixta de Neurociència Traslacional I3PT-INc-UAB, is the sponsor.

Competing interests D.P. has received grants and also served as a consultant or advisor for Rovi, Angelini, Janssen, Lundbeck and Servier. The other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Patient consent for publication Not applicable.

Supplemental material Supplementary File 1. Information on the components and characteristics of the intervention and comparison groups (DOCX 29 KB).

Supplementary File 2. Information on therapeutic adherence (DOCX 29 KB).

Supplementary File 3. Evaluation measures time frame of the selected studies (DOCX 31 KB).

Supplementary File 4. Forest plot comparing effects of synchronous – remote interventions on suicidal behaviours with subgroup analysis according to the study design (DOCX 677 KB).

Supplementary File 5. Report of the minimum set of component characteristics (DOCX 23 KB).

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Suicide [online]. 2023. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April 2024).
2. World Health Organization. Suicide worldwide in 2019 [online]. 2021. https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789240026643 (accessed 30 Jan 2022).
3. World Health Organization. Suicide in the world: Global health estimates [online]. 2019. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/326948/WHO-MSD-MER-19.3-eng.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (accessed 30 Jan 2022).
4. Artieda-Urrutia P, Parra-Uribe I, Garcia-Pares G, *et al*. Management of suicidal behaviour: Is the world upside down? *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 2014;48:399–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867414525847
5. Mokdad AH, Forouzanfar MH, Daoud F, *et al*. Global burden of diseases, injuries, and risk factors for young people's health during 1990–2013: A systematic analysis for the Global

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2016;387:2383–401. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)00648-6

6. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, García-Parés G, *et al*. Attempted and completed suicide: Not what we expected? *J Affect Disord* 2013;150:840–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.03.013
7. World Health Organization. Suicide: key facts. Geneva: World Health Organization [online]. 2021. https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/suicide (accessed 06 April 2024).
8. Olfson M, Wall M, Wang S, *et al*. Suicide following deliberate self-harm. *Am J Psychiat* 2017;174:765–74. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2017.16111288
9. Shand F, Vogl L, Robinson J. Improving patient care after a suicide attempt. *Australas Psychiatry* 2018;26:145–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/1039856218758560
10. Parra-Uribe I, Blasco-Fontecilla H, Garcia-Parés G, *et al*. Risk of re-attempts and suicide death after a suicide attempt: A survival analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2017;17:163. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1317-z
11. Bostwick JM, Pabbati C, Geske JR, McKean AJ. Suicide Attempt as a Risk Factor for Completed Suicide: Even More Lethal Than We Knew. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2016;173(11):1094-1100. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2016.15070854
12. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Evidence-based national suicide prevention taskforce in Europe: A consensus position paper. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol* 2017;27:418–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroneuro.2017.01.012
13. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Yonemoto N, *et al*. Active contact and follow-up interventions to prevent repeat suicide attempts during high-risk periods among patients admitted to emergency departments for suicidal behavior: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry* 2019;19:44. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-019-2017-7

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

14. Ganz D, Braquehais MD, Sher L. Secondary Prevention of Suicide. *PLoS Med* 2010;7:e1000271. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000271
15. World Health Organization. The European Mental Health Action Plan 2013–2020 [online]. 2013. https://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/280604/WHO-Europe-Mental-Health-Acion-Plan-2013-2020.pdf (accessed 15 Feb 2022).
16. World Health Organization. Preventing suicide: A global imperative [online]. 2014. https://www.who.int/mental_health/suicide-prevention/exe_summary_english.pdf?ua=1 (accessed 15 Feb 2022).
17. World Health Organization. Comprehensive mental health action plan 2013–2030 [online]. 2021. https://apps.who.int/iris/rest/bitstreams/1371507/retrieve (accessed 15 Feb 2022).
18. Inagaki M, Kawashima Y, Kawanishi C, *et al*. Interventions to prevent repeat suicidal behavior in patients admitted to an emergency department for a suicide attempt: A meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* 2015;175:66–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.048
19. Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, *et al*. Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year systematic review. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2016;3:646–59. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30030-X
20. Andersson G, Titov N, Dear BF, Rozental A, Carlbring P. Internet-delivered psychological treatments: from innovation to implementation. *World Psychiatry*. 2019;18(1):20-28. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20610
21. Carlbring P, Hadjistavropoulos H, Kleiboer A, Andersson G. A new era in Internet interventions: The advent of Chat-GPT and AI-assisted therapist guidance. *Internet Interv.* 2023;32:100621. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.invent.2023.100621
22. Laranjeira C, Carvalho D, Valentim O, *et al*. Therapeutic Adherence of People with Mental Disorders: An Evolutionary Concept Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2023;20(5):3869. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20053869

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

23. Deng M, Zhai S, Ouyang X, Liu Z, Ross B. Factors influencing medication adherence among patients with severe mental disorders from the perspective of mental health professionals. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2022;22(1):22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-021-03681-6

24. Kauppi K, Hätönen H, Adams CE, Välimäki M. Perceptions of treatment adherence among people with mental health problems and health care professionals. *J Adv Nurs*. 2015;71(4):777-788. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.12567

25. Gilat I, Shahar G. Emotional first aid for a suicide crisis: Comparison between telephonic hotline and Internet. Psychiatry-Interpers *Biol Process* 2007;70:12–8. https://doi.org/10.1521/psyc.2007.70.1.12

26. Seong JM, Cho Y, Cho GC, *et al*. Effects of mobile messenger counseling on case management success for individuals engaging in self-harm or suicide attempts who were discharged from emergency departments. *Clin Exp Emerg Med* 2021;8:48–54. https://doi.org/10.15441/CEEM.20.133

27. Vijayakumar L, Umamaheswari C, Shujaath Ali Z, *et al*. Intervention for suicide attempters: A randomized controlled study. *Indian J Psychiatry* 2011;53:244-8. https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.86817

28. Martínez-Alés G, Cruz Rodríguez JB, Lázaro P, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of a Contact Intervention and a Psychotherapeutic Program for Post-discharge Suicide Prevention. *Can J Psychiatry.* 2021;66(8):737-746 https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720980135

29. De Leo D, Buono MD, Dwyer J. Suicide among the elderly: The long-term impact of a telephone support and assessment intervention in northern Italy. *Br J Psychiatry* 2002;181:226–9. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.181.3.226

30. Gould MS, Munfakh JLH, Kleinman M, *et al*. National Suicide Prevention Lifeline: Enhancing mental health care for suicidal individuals and other people in crisis. *Suicide Life-Threat Behav* 2012;42:22–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.2011.00068.x

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

31. Milner AJ, Carter G, Pirkis J, *et al*. Letters, green cards, telephone calls and postcards: Systematic and meta-analytic review of brief contact interventions for reducing self-harm, suicide attempts and suicide. *Br J Psychiatry* 2015;206:184–90. https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.114.147819
32. Noh D, Park YS, Oh EG. Effectiveness of telephone-delivered interventions following suicide attempts: A systematic review. *Arch Psychiatr Nurs* 2016;30:114–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apnu.2015.10.012
33. Shin, H.D., Durocher, K., Sequeira, L. *et al*. Information and communication technology-based interventions for suicide prevention implemented in clinical settings: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 23, 281 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-023-09254-5
34. Luxton DD, June JD, Comtois KA. Can postdischarge follow-up contacts prevent suicide and suicidal behavior? A Review of the Evidence. *Crisis* 2013;34:32–41. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000158
35. Comendador L, Jiménez-Villamizar MP, Losilla JM, *et al*. Effect of synchronous remote-based interventions on suicidal behaviours: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*. 2023;13(12):e075116. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2023-075116
36. Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, *et al*. PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n160. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n160
37. World Health Organization. ICD-11 for mortality and morbidity statistics [online]. 2021. https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en#/http://id.who.int/icd/entity/778734771 (accessed 15 Feb 2022).
38. Gómez A, Silva H, Amon R. El Suicidio. Teoría, Clínica y Manejo. Barcelona, ES: Editorial Mediterráneo 2018.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

39. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, *et al*. PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;75:40–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021
40. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, *et al*. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;5(1):1-10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4
41. Sterne JA, Savović J, Page MJ, *et al*. RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2019;366:l4898. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898
42. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, *et al*. ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ* 2016;366:i4919. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919
43. Hedges LV. Distribution Theory for Glass's Estimator of Effect Size and Related Estimators. *J Stat Educ* 1981;6:107-128. https://doi.org/10.2307/1164588
44. Daly LE. Confidence limits made easy: interval estimation using a substitution method. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1998;147(8):783-790. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a009523
45. Zhang J, Yu KF. What's the relative risk? A method of correcting the odds ratio in cohort studies of common outcomes. *JAMA*. 1998;280(19):1690-1691. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.19.1690
46. Peto R, Pike MC, Armitage P, *et al*. Design and analysis of randomized clinical trials requiring prolonged observation of each patient. I. Introduction and design. *Br J Cancer*. 1976;34(6):585-612. https://doi.org/10.1038/bjc.1976.220
47. Suurmond R, van Rhee H, Hak T. Introduction, comparison, and validation of Meta-Essentials: A free and simple tool for meta-analysis. *Res Synth Methods*. 2017;8(4):537-553. https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1260
48. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, *et al*. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.2. [online]. 2021. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook (accessed 30 Jan 2022).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

49. Amadéo S, Rereao M, Malogne A, *et al*. Testing Brief Intervention and Phone Contact among Subjects with Suicidal Behavior: A Randomized Controlled Trial in French Polynesia in the Frames of the World Health Organization/Suicide Trends in At-Risk Territories Study. *Ment Illn*. 2015;7(2):5818. https://doi.org/10.4081/mi.2015.5818

50. Bertolote JM, Fleischmann A, De Leo D, *et al*. Repetition of suicide attempts: data from emergency care settings in five culturally different low- and middle-income countries participating in the WHO SUPRE-MISS Study. *Crisis*. 2010;31(4):194-201. https://doi.org/10.1027/0027-5910/a000052

51. Cebrià AI, Parra I, Pàmias M, *et al*. Effectiveness of a telephone management programme for patients discharged from an emergency department after a suicide attempt: controlled study in a Spanish population. *J Affect Disord*. 2013;147(1-3):269-276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.11.016

52. Cebrià AI, Pérez-Bonaventura I, Cuijpers P, *et al*. Telephone Management Program for Patients Discharged From an Emergency Department After a Suicide Attempt: A 5-Year Follow-Up Study in a Spanish Population. *Crisis*. 2015;36(5):345-352. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000331

53. Cedereke M, Monti K, Ojehagen A. Telephone contact with patients in the year after a suicide attempt: does it affect treatment attendance and outcome? A randomised controlled study. *Eur Psychiatry*. 2002;17(2):82-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0924-9338(02)00632-6

54. Christensen H, Farrer L, Batterham PJ, Mackinnon A, Griffiths KM, Donker T. The effect of a web-based depression intervention on suicide ideation: secondary outcome from a randomised controlled trial in a helpline. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(6):e002886. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002886

55. Comtois KA, Kerbrat AH, DeCou CR, *et al*. Effect of Augmenting Standard Care for Military Personnel With Brief Caring Text Messages for Suicide Prevention: A Randomized Clinical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

Trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(5):474-483. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2018.4530

56. Exbrayat S, Coudrot C, Gourdon X, *et al*. Effect of telephone follow-up on repeated suicide attempt in patients discharged from an emergency psychiatry department: a controlled study. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2017;17(1):96. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-017-1258-6
57. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, Wasserman D, *et al*. Effectiveness of brief intervention and contact for suicide attempters: a randomized controlled trial in five countries. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2008;86(9):703-709. https://doi.org/10.2471/blt.07.046995
58. Gabilondo A, Aristegi E, Gonzalez-Pinto A, *et al*. Prevention of Suicidal Behavior with Telemedicine in Patients with a Recent Suicide Attempt: Is a 6-month Intervention Long Enough?. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*. 2020;50(1):211-219. https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12576
59. Goñi-Sarriés A, Yárnoz-Goñi N, López-Goñi JJ. Psychiatric Hospitalization for Attempted Suicide and Reattempt at the One-Year Follow-Up. *Psicothema*. 2022;34(3):375-382. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2021.455
60. Hassanzadeh M, khajeddin N, Nojomi M, Fleischmann A, Eshrati T. Brief Intervention and Contact after Deliberate Self-Harm: An Iranian Randomized Controlled Trial. *Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci*. 2010;4(2):5-12.
61. López-Goñi JJ, Goñi-Sarriés A. Effectiveness of a telephone prevention programme on the recurrence of suicidal behaviour. One-year follow-up. *Psychiatry Res*. 2021;302:114029. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114029
62. Malakouti SK, Nojomi M, Ghanbari B, Rasouli N, Khaleghparast S, Farahani IG. Aftercare and Suicide Reattempt Prevention in Tehran, Iran. *Crisis*. 2022;43(1):18-27. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000754
63. Messiah A, Notredame CE, Demarty AL, Duhem S, Vaiva G; AlgoS investigators. Combining green cards, telephone calls and postcards into an intervention algorithm to reduce suicide

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

reattempt (AlgoS): P-hoc analyses of an inconclusive randomized controlled trial. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(2):e0210778. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0210778

64. Miller IW, Camargo CA Jr, Arias SA, *et al*. Suicide Prevention in an Emergency Department Population: The ED-SAFE Study. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2017;74(6):563-570. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.0678
65. Mouaffak F, Marchand A, Castaigne E, Arnoux A, Hardy P. OSTA program: A French follow up intervention program for suicide prevention. *Psychiatry Res*. 2015;230(3):913-918. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.11.024
66. Mousavi SG, Zohreh R, Maracy MR, Ebrahimi A, Sharbafchi MR. The efficacy of telephonic follow up in prevention of suicidal reattempt in patients with suicide attempt history. *Adv Biomed Res.* 2014;3:198. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9175.142043
67. Mousavi SG, Amini M, Mahaki B, Bagherian-Sararoudi R. Effect of phone call versus face-to-face follow-up on recurrent suicide attempts prevention in individuals with a history of multiple suicide attempts. *Adv Biomed Res*. 2016;5:184. https://doi.org/10.4103/2277-9175.190990
68. O'Connor RC, Smillie S, McClelland H, *et al*. SAFETEL: a pilot randomised controlled trial to assess the feasibility and acceptability of a safety planning and telephone follow-up intervention to reduce suicidal behaviour. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2022;8(1):156. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-022-01081-5
69. Plancke L, Amariei A, Danel T, *et al*. Effectiveness of a French Program to Prevent Suicide Reattempt (VigilanS). *Arch Suicide Res*. 2021;25(3):570-581. https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2020.1735596
70. Riblet NB, Kenneally L, Stevens S, *et al*. A virtual, pilot randomized trial of a brief intervention to prevent suicide in an integrated healthcare setting. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2022;75:68-74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.genhosppsych.2022.02.002

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

71. Vaiva G, Vaiva G, Ducrocq F, *et al*. Effect of telephone contact on further suicide attempts in patients discharged from an emergency department: randomised controlled study. *BMJ*. 2006;332(7552):1241-1245. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7552.1241

72. Vaiva G, Berrouiguet S, Walter M, *et al*. Combining Postcards, Crisis Cards, and Telephone Contact Into a Decision-Making Algorithm to Reduce Suicide Reattempt: A Randomized Clinical Trial of a Personalized Brief Contact Intervention. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2018;79(6):17m11631. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.17m11631

73. Ward-Ciesielski EF, Tidik JA, Edwards AJ, Linehan MM. Comparing brief interventions for suicidal individuals not engaged in treatment: A randomized clinical trial. *J Affect Disord*. 2017;222:153-161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2017.07.011

74. Wei S, Liu L, Bi B, *et al*. An intervention and follow-up study following a suicide attempt in the emergency departments of four general hospitals in Shenyang, China. *Crisis*. 2013;34(2):107-115. https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000181

75. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, *et al*. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71

76. Andrés AM, Marzo PF. Delta: a new measure of agreement between two raters. *Br J Math Stat Psychol*. 2004;57:1-19. https://doi.org/10.1348/000711004849268

77. Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ PsycholMeas*. 1960; 20: 37-46.

78. De Leo D, Scocco P, Marietta P, *et al*. Physical illness and parasuicide: evidence from the European Parasuicide Study Interview Schedule (EPSIS/WHO-EURO). *Int J Psychiatry Med*. 1999;29(2):149-163. https://doi.org/10.2190/E87K-FG03-CHEE-UJD3

79. Beck AT, Kovacs M, Weissman A. Assessment of suicidal intention: the Scale for Suicide Ideation. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1979;47(2):343-352. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-006x.47.2.343

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

80. Gibbons P, de Arévalo HF, Mónico M. Assessment of the factor structure and reliability of the 28-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28) in El Salvador. Int. J. Clin. Health Psychol. 2004;4(2):389-398.

81. Linehan M, Comtois KA. Suicide Attempt and Self-Injury Count (SASI-Count) [online]. 1996. http://depts.washington.edu/uwbrtc/wp-content/uploads/L-SASI-Count.pdf (accessed 28 April 2024)

82. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, De Leo D, Wasserman D. Instruments used in SUPRE-MISS: The WHO Multisite Intervention Study on Suicidal Behaviours. In: Wasserman D, Wasserman C, eds. *Oxford Textbook of Suicidology and Suicide Prevention*. 1th ed. Oxford, OED: Oxford Textbooks; 2009. https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780198570059.003.0042

83. Posner K, Brown GK, Stanley B, *et al*. The Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale: initial validity and internal consistency findings from three multisite studies with adolescents and adults. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2011;168(12):1266-1277. https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2011.10111704

84. Beck AT, Schuyler D, Herman I. Development of suicidal intent scales. In: Beck AT, Resnik HLP, Lettieri DJ, eds. *The prediction of suicide*. Bowie, MD: Charles Press; 1974:45–56.

85. Beck AT, Steer RA. *Beck scale for suicide ideation: Manual*. Psychological Corporation; 1993.

86. Goñi-Sarriés A, Zandio-Zorrilla M. Suicide: The Challenge of Prevention. *Anales Sis San Navarra*. 2017;40(3):335–8. https://dx.doi.org/10.23938/assn.0122

87. Hunt IM, Kapur N, Webb R, *et al*. Suicide in recently discharged psychiatric patients: a case-control study. *Psychol Med*. 2009;39(3):443-449. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708003644

88. Andersen B, Bille-Brahe U. Aftercare of suicide attempters. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H, Eds. 4th European Symposium on Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention project. Intervention and Prevention*. Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 177-84.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.05.21.24306868; this version posted May 21, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license .

89. Borg S. Active intervention and comprehensive services following suicide attempts: a community-based program. In: Bille-Brahe U, Schiödt H, Eds. 4th European Symposium on Suicidal Behaviour. *The Odense suicide prevention project. Intervention and prevention*. Odense: University Press; 1994. p. 159-67.

90. Motto J, Boström AG. Post-crisis suicide preventing without therapy. *Alcohol Dis*. 1993; 5: 564-7.

91. O'Brien G, Holton AR, Hurren K, Watt L, Hassanyeh F. Deliberate self-harm and predictors of out-patient attendance. *Br J Psychiatry*. 1987; 150: 246-7.

92. Corry M, Clarke M, While AE, Lalor J. Developing complex interventions for nursing: a critical review of key guidelines. *J Clin Nurs*. 2013;22(17-18):2366-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jocn.12173

93. Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D, O'Connor RC, Oquendo MA, Pirkis J, *et al*. Suicide and suicide risk. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;5(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0

94. Serrano-Gimeno V, Diestre A, Agustin-Alcain M, Portella MJ, de Diego-Adeliño J, Tiana T, Cheddi N, Distefano A, Dominguez G, Arias M, Cardoner V, Puigdemont D, Perez V, Cardoner N. Non-fatal suicide behaviours across phases in the COVID-19 pandemic: a population-based study in a Catalan cohort. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2024; 11(5):348-358. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(24)00065-8