A National Evaluation of GoGuardian Beacon and Youth Suicide Trends

Xiaoyue Zhu, Ph.D,[1] **Karen Wood Ph.D**,[1] **Rachel Ahrens**,[1] **Rajeev Damani**,[1] **Manoj Rawat**,[1] **Benjamin Batorsky Ph.D.**,[1] **Holly C. Wilcox, Ph.D**[2,3,*]

[1] GoGuardian, Los Angeles, CA
[2] Department of Mental Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA
[3] Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA
[*] Correspondence: Xiaoyue Zhu, xiaoyuezhuu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the association between youth suicide rates and the implementation of GoGuardian Beacon, a digital monitoring tool used in K-12 schools to identify students at risk of self-harm or suicide. Employing a difference-in-differences framework, we analyzed county-level suicide data from 2018 to 2022, comparing trends in 65 counties with sustained Beacon use to 1,236 control counties. Suicide rates were similar before the COVID-19 pandemic, but from 2021 to 2022, treatment counties saw a 26.4% lower average rate – a difference that remained significant after adjusting for demographic and regional covariates. While causal inferences are limited, these results suggest that digital monitoring tools may enhance broader suicide-prevention strategies. This study contributes to the growing evidence on technology-driven, school-based mental health interventions and underscores the need for continued evaluation of their implementation and impact.

INTRODUCTION

In October 2021, the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP), and the Childrens Hospital Association (CHA) declared a national state of emergency in childrens mental health, calling for strategic action to increase access to quality care for children and families.[1] Despite these efforts, suicide remains a leading cause of death among young people: in 2023, it was the second leading cause of death for those aged 10-14 and 15-24 in the United States.[2] A recent analysis of the U.S. National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS) found that most youth who died by suicide had no history of mental health treatment, and fewer than one-third were receiving treatment in the months prior to their death.[3] This highlights a critical gap in our ability to identify and intervene during periods of acute suicide risk, a gap that persists largely because we lack tools capable of detecting risk and delivering clinical resources in real time.

Digital technology, particularly when coupled with advances in machine learning and natural language processing, offers a promising avenue for continuous suicide-risk measurement and timely intervention. Given that the majority of suicides occur on an individuals first attempt,[4] sectors serving children, such as school systems, must establish clear and robust pathways for risk identification and response. Schools play a pivotal role in addressing youth mental health: in 2022, 2,098 school-aged children (5-18 years) died by suicide, and suicide rates among 10-18-year-olds rose steadily from 2007 through 2018, with fluctuations thereafter through 2022.[5,6] Moreover, in 2023, 22% of high school students reported seriously considering suicide, and 10% reported attempting it.[7]

The last decade, especially the COVID-19 pandemic, has seen a dramatic increase in student use of school-issued computing devices, spurring interest in digital tools that can identify atrisk students and connect them with support. GoGuardian Beacon is one such tool, designed to detect online activity on school-managed devices, including search queries, web browsing, email, and web applications that may indicate potential risk of suicide, self-harm, or harm to others. Schools using Beacon receive alerts regarding flagged activity to designated staff members, who can then determine appropriate follow-up actions.

This study examines trends in youth suicide rates from 2018 to 2022 across U.S. counties where Beacon was implemented versus those without Beacon. While this analysis does not establish causality, it offers an initial exploration of potential associations between digital suicide-risk monitoring in schools and county-level suicide rates. The findings contribute to the broader conversation on school-based suicide prevention strategies and highlight the need for further research into the role of digital tools in youth mental health interventions.

RESULTS

Figure 1 presents the distribution of suicide rates across counties within each timeframe. Prior to the pandemic (February 2018 - February 2020), suicide rates were similar between the treatment and control counties (treatment = 0.504 ± 0.052, control = 0.505 ± 0.018, $p = 0.494$, t-test). In the post-pandemic adjustment timeframe (January 2021 - December 2022), treatment counties had 26.4% lower suicide rates on average (treatment = 0.357 ± 0.042, control = 0.484 ± 0.017, $p < 0.01$, Table 1).

After adjusting for county-level demographic and regional characteristics in a difference-in-differences Poisson GLM, the interaction term between the post-pandemic timeframe and Beacon implementation remained statistically significant ($p = 0.036$). This suggests that the observed differences in suicide rates between treatment and control counties persisted even after accounting for underlying demographic and regional differences. These findings should be considered in context, as this study examines associations rather than causal relationships. Differences in suicide rates between counties may be influenced by unmeasured factors, including variations in county-level mental health policies, school-based interventions, and broader social and economic determinants of health.



Figure 1: Youth suicide rate per 100,000 averaged over each timeframe per county. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean. Treatment counties (n=65) are in red, control counties (n=1,236) in blue.

Timeframe	Control $n = 1,236$	Treatment $n = 65$	p value
Pre-pandemic Baseline (February 2018 - February 2020)	0.505 ± 0.018	0.504 ± 0.052	0.494
Peak Pandemic (March 2020 - July 2020)	0.453 ± 0.035	0.343 ± 0.084	0.245
Back-to-school Transition (August 2020 - December 2020)	0.487 ± 0.034	0.450 ± 0.130	0.404
Post-pandemic Adjustment (January 2021 - December 2022)	0.484 ± 0.017	0.357 ± 0.042	0.003**

Table 1: Comparison of average youth suicide rates (per 100,000 per month per county) between control and treatment groups across four timeframes. Values represent the mean ± standard error of the mean (SEM). P values are obtained from independent t-tests. Asterisks indicate statistical significance.

DISCUSSION

This study provides an initial examination of associations between youth suicide rates and the adoption of a digital suicide risk monitoring tool in school settings. While suicide rates increased nationally in 2021,[8] counties that had implemented GoGuardian Beacon exhibited lower average suicide rates compared to those that had not. This difference persisted after adjusting for demographic and regional characteristics, suggesting that further investigation into the relationship between digital monitoring tools and suicide prevention efforts is warranted.

It is important to note that this study does not establish a causal link between Beacon adoption and changes in suicide rates. Multiple factors contribute to youth suicide trends, including differences in mental health policies, access to care, school-based prevention programs, and broader socioeconomic conditions. The presence of Beacon in a county may be one component of a larger suicide prevention strategy, and the observed patterns may reflect the combined effects of multiple interventions rather than the direct impact of any single tool.

As one of the first large-scale, quantitative analyses examining digital suicide risk monitoring in school settings, this study serves as a foundation for future research. Additional work is needed to better understand the mechanisms through which such tools are implemented and utilized and their roles within comprehensive prevention frameworks. Future research should explore how schools respond to alerts, the extent to which these responses lead to intervention, and whether certain implementation models yield more consistent outcomes. Moreover, while this study controlled for key demographic and socioeconomic factors, unmeasured differences between counties may still influence the findings. Longitudinal studies with more granular data on school- and district-level implementation practices, student mental health outcomes, and intervention effectiveness could provide greater insight into the potential benefits and limitations of digital monitoring as part of suicide prevention efforts.

These findings contribute to the ongoing discussion about the role of technology in student mental health and highlight the need for continued evaluation of school-based suicide prevention strategies. By advancing our understanding of these tools, future research can help ensure that digital interventions are used effectively, ethically, and in ways that maximize student support and well-being.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data Sources

This study utilizes restricted county-level suicide mortality data for youths aged 5-19, obtained from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for all U.S. counties from 2018 to 2022. The dataset includes county Federal Information Processing System (FIPS) codes, youth suicide rates (expressed as the number of suicides per 100,000), and county-level population data.

Beacon implementation data were obtained from internal GoGuardian enterprise sources that track product usage. These data include the number of Beacon licenses purchased, the number of students actively monitored, and aggregated counts of alerts related to suicide risk. These variables were linked to the CDC dataset at the county level using FIPS codes to examine patterns in suicide rates relative to Beacon adoption.

Additional data sources were integrated for Generalized Linear Model (GLM) fitting and county-specific covariate analysis. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2016 - 2018) include county-level demographic variables for this period (see Table 2). Additionally, counties were classified into one of eight regions: New England, Mideast, Great Lakes, Plains, Southeast, Southwest, Rocky Mountain, or Far Westbased on the Bureau of Economic Analysis Regional Classifications.

County Selection and Treatment Classification

Counties with fewer than 3,000 youths were excluded from the analysis to reduce variability in suicide rate estimates due to small sample sizes. Counties were classified as having implemented Beacon if they met predefined usage thresholds, which were established to ensure meaningful exposure to the tool. These criteria included:

- Reaching the 5th percentile or higher in total reported alerts categorized as "awareness" (i.e., action taken on an alert) within three months of initial Beacon purchase.
- Maintaining usage for at least 24 months, with no more than 25% of months classified as inactive. Given the nature of school years, it is expected that there will be a dormant period in which most schools are not in session.
- Implementing Beacon between July 2020 and December 2020, ensuring that both pre-implementation and post-implementation suicide rate data were available. This period was chosen as a reasonable midpoint within the CDC data range from 2018 to 2022.

Thus, treated counties began monitoring students with Beacon between August and December 2020 and maintained usage for at least 75% of the months between January 2021 and December 2022 (n=65). Counties that did not implement Beacon before January 2023 were classified as controls. These definitions were applied to ensure that comparisons were made between counties with sustained Beacon usage and those without documented exposure to the tool (n=1,236).

Temporal Framework and COVID-19 Context

To account for potential confounding effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, we segmented the study period into four distinct timeframes. In our difference-in-differences framework (see Statistical Analyses), the intervention variable is defined by the post-pandemic period (January 2021 - December 2022), which reflects the broader societal changes following the peak of COVID-19 disruptions, rather than Beacon adoption per se. The timeframes are defined as follows:

1. **Pre-pandemic baseline (February 2018 - February 2020)**: Provides a reference period before COVID-19 disruptions.
2. **Peak pandemic (March 2020 - July 2020)**: Captures the initial phase of widespread uncertainty and social disruption.
3. **Back-to-school transition (August 2020 - December 2020)**: Reflects the period when many schools resumed in-person or hybrid learning.
4. **Post-pandemic adjustment (January 2021 - December 2022)**: Represents the longer-term period following the pandemic's peak effects.

This segmentation allows for an examination of whether trends in suicide rates differed between counties that implemented Beacon and those that did not, while accounting for broader societal changes.

Statistical Analyses

Monthly youth suicide rates between treatment and control counties in different timeframes were first examined using two-sample independent t-tests (with SciPy's `ttest_ind`). A one-sided alternative hypothesis was specified. We assessed the equality of variances using Levene's test at a significance level of 0.05. For timeframes where Levene's test produced a p-value greater than 0.05, we assumed equal variances and applied the standard two-sample t-test. Conversely, if the p-value was less than 0.05, indicating unequal variances, we used Welchs t-test to account for the difference in variances. The goal here was to account for imbalance between the treatment and control counties.

To account for county-level demographic and regional differences between counties, a Poisson generalized linear model (GLM) was used within a difference-in-differences framework to estimate associations between Beacon implementation and youth suicide rates. Standard errors were clustered by county to account for within-county correlation. Using a log link function, we modeled the natural logarithm of the expected suicide rate as a linear function of the predictors:

$$\text{Suicide Rate}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{hasBeacon}_i} + \beta_{\text{Post}_t} + \beta_{\text{hasBeacon}_t \times \text{Post}_t} + \sum_{j=1}^{J} \gamma_j X_{ij} + \epsilon \tag{1}$$

- Suicide Rate$_{it}$: The youth suicide rate per 100,000 for county i at time t.
- Beacon Implementation (hasBeacon$_i$): A binary indicator for whether a county i implemented Beacon given the criteria listed above.
- Post-Intervention Period (Post$_t$): A binary indicator for the post-pandemic adjustment period (January 2021 - December 2022).
- Interaction Term (hasBeacon$_i$ $\times$ Post$_t$): Captures the interaction term between Beacon implementation and the post period.
- County-Level Variables (X_{ij}): Includes demographic and socioeconomic variables, such as racial and ethnic composition, population size, median household income, poverty rate and unemployment rate. See table 2 for a complete list of the variables.
- ϵ is the error term

Table 2: List of county-level demographic variables and their sources.

Variable	Years Averaged	Source
Fraction of Population of Different Races / Ethnicities	2017-2018	US Census Bureau
Population	2017-2018	US Census Bureau
Median Household Income	2017-2018	US Census Bureau
Percent of Families below Poverty Line	2017-2018	US Census Bureau
Unemployment Rate	2017-2018	US Census Bureau
Largest District Size	2016-2018	National Center for Education Statistics
Fraction of Students on Free or Reduced Price Lunches	2016-2018	National Center for Education Statistics
Urbanicity	2013	US Census Bureau
Region	N/A	Bureau of Economic Analysis

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Conceptualization: Karen Wood, Xiaoyue Zhu, Rajeev Damani, Holly C. Wilcox

Methodology Analysis: Karen Wood, Xiaoyue Zhu, Benjamin Batorsky

Writing: Xiaoyue Zhu, Rachel Ahrens, Karen Wood, Holly C. Wilcox

Editing: Rachel Ahrens, Rajeev Damani, Manoj Rawat

AUTHOR COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

REFERENCES

[1] AAP-AACAP-CHA declaration of a national emergency in child and adolescent mental health.
[2] Sally Curtin and Matthew Garnett. Suicide and homicide death rates among youth and young adults aged 1024: United states, 20012021.
[3] Cynthia A. Fontanella, Xueting Xia, John V. Campo, Danielle L. Steelesmith, Jeffrey A. Bridge, and Donna A. Ruch. Characteristics associated with mental health treatment prior to suicide among youth in the united states.
[4] J. Michael Bostwick, Chaitanya Pabbati, Jennifer R. Geske, and Alastair J. McKean. Suicide attempt as a risk factor for completed suicide: Even more lethal than we knew. 173(11):1094–1100. Publisher: American Psychiatric Publishing.
[5] CDC WISQARS - web-based injury statistics query and reporting system.
[6] Sally C. Curtin, Matthew F. Garnett, and Farida B. Ahmad. Provisional estimates of suicide by demographic characteristics: United states, 2022.
[7] CDC. 2023 youth risk behavior survey results.
[8] Deborah M. Stone. Notes from the field: Recent changes in suicide rates, by race and ethnicity and age group united states, 2021. 72.