Socio-Spatial Patterns of Suicide Mortality in the United States

Kushagra Tiwari[1], M. Amin Rahimian[1*], Marie-Laure Charpignon[2*], Philippe J. Giabbanelli[3], Praveen Kumar[4]

[1]Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
[2]Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Pleasanton, CA;
Departments of Biostatistics and Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA
Computational Health Informatics Program, Boston Children's Hospital, Boston, MA;
Institut Pierre Louis d'Epidémiologie et de Santé Publique, Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Paris, France
[3]Virginia Modeling, Analysis, and Simulation Center (VMASC), Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA
[4]Department of Health Policy and Management, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA;
Public Health Dynamics Laboratory, School of Public Health, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA
* Correspondence: rahimian@pitt.edu and mariecharpignon@berkeley.edu

Abstract

Suicides cause more than 49,000 deaths per year in the United States, including 55% associated with the use of a firearm. Across states and counties in the US, suicide mortality exhibits substantial geographical and sociodemographic heterogeneity. However, the role of large-scale social networks in shaping this variation remains underexplored. To assess how both the risk of suicide mortality and the effect of firearm restriction policies propagate through inter-county social ties, we integrate data on county-level suicide mortality (2010–2022) and the Facebook Social Connectedness Index (SCI), a continuous measure of the strength of social ties between counties used to derive weighted averages of neighboring counties' outcomes. First, using two-way fixed effects regression models with sociodemographic, economic, and spatial controls, we find that a one-standard-deviation increase in the SCI-weighted average suicide mortality rate of connected counties is associated with an increase of 2.78 suicide deaths per 100,000 people in the focal county (95% CI: 1.06-4.50). Second, we examine Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPOs), state-level policies that allow temporary restriction of firearm access for individuals at risk of self-harm. Using a similar statistical approach, we show that counties with stronger social ties to counties located in ERPO-implementing states experience reductions in suicide mortality, even without local policy enactment. Specifically, we find that a one-standard-deviation increase in ERPO social exposure is associated with a decrease of 0.214 suicide deaths per 100,000 people in the focal county (95% CI: 0.0866-0.342). Such a protective association persists when adjusting for geographical proximity and including state-by-year fixed effects that capture time-varying state-level factors. In sum, our findings suggest that social networks can facilitate the diffusion of both harmful exposures and protective interventions. This

socio-spatial structuring of suicide mortality underscores the need for prevention strategies that incorporate social network topology, alongside more traditional approaches based on geographical targeting.

INTRODUCTION

Suicide mortality is a persistent public health crisis in the United States (US). In 2023, suicide was the eleventh leading cause of death in the US, accounting for an estimated 49,000 fatalities [1]. However, this statistic fails to capture substantial heterogeneity by age. Adolescents and working-age adults in particular are the most vulnerable. Among individuals aged 10–34 and 35–44, suicide was the second and fourth leading cause of death, respectively [1]. To better understand and address these differences across demographics, the social ecological framework provides a valuable lens, categorizing risk factors and preventive measures for suicide at the individual, community, or societal level [2]. Examples of risk factors include social isolation [3], mental health and substance use disorders [4, 5], bullying and cyberbullying [6], and access to lethal means—particularly firearms [7]. Further, knowing someone who died by suicide [8] or being exposed to suicide-related information through social media increases the risk of suicide [9].

In this paper, we focus on the effect of social networks, which span the individual level (close interpersonal connections) and the community level (broader, possibly more distant, social ties). Social networks can either amplify or mitigate the risk of suicide, depending on their structure and nature. For instance, social isolation or interaction with certain peers may influence an individual toward unhealthy coping mechanisms, such as substance use. In addition, exposure to suicide death can increase suicidal ideation and trigger violent action. As an example, exposure to suicide by specific means (e.g., firearm, poison) can precipitate one's decision to end their life in the same manner [10]—a phenomenon termed *suicide contagion* [11, 12, 13]. Durkheim [14] posit that suicide mortality rates in a given population are affected by the degree of social integration, with elevated death rates under conditions of social disconnection. Building on this foundational theory, empirical studies have demonstrated that the risk of suicide mortality increases following exposure to suicidal acts within one's social network [15]. In sum, theoretical and empirical studies suggest that suicidal behaviors can propagate through both interpersonal and community networks [16, 17, 13]. The role of such social exposures is especially prominent among adolescents and young adults who frequently encounter suicide-related content via digital media [18, 19]. Despite these negative influences, social ties can also be protective: greater connectedness within the family, at school, at work, and among peers in the community is associated with lower rates of suicidal ideation and attempt [20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. Further, interventions aimed at fostering social connections (e.g., caring contacts) can reduce suicide risk [25]. Given the established role of social ties in suicide risk, adopting a

network science perspective to examine suicide mortality offers a valuable interdisciplinary approach to understand this complex public health issue [26].

Until recently, efforts to assess population-level associations between social networks and suicide mortality were limited by data constraints. Researchers relied on small samples or qualitative studies due to the lack of high-resolution social network data. The 2018 release of the social connectedness index (SCI) by Meta has enabled the quantification of social ties among geographical regions using aggregated Facebook friendship data [27]. The SCI measures the relative probability that a Facebook user in region i is a friend of a Facebook user in region j, accounting for the number of active Facebook users in each region. This formulation allows comparisons of social connectedness between pairs of regions (e.g., counties), where higher SCI values indicate stronger interpersonal ties. Constructed from billions of anonymized friendship links and periodically updated, the SCI provides a scalable proxy for real-world social connectedness, facilitating the study of how network structure relates to spatial patterns in behavioral and health outcomes. Bailey et al. [27] demonstrated the empirical relevance of the SCI by showing that it correlates with inter-county migration patterns, trade volumes, job search behavior, specific public health outcomes, and even patent citations. The availability of SCI data has enabled studies examining how behavioral and health outcomes propagate across socially-connected regions. For instance, Charoenwong et al. [28] found that counties socially connected to the areas first affected by COVID-19 outbreaks exhibited earlier reductions in mobility. Holtz et al. [29] showed that compliance with public health mandates during the COVID-19 pandemic was strongly correlated with SCI-based social proximity to counties with more stringent policies. Similarly, Tiwari et al. [30] demonstrated that opioid overdose death rates in socially-connected counties were positively associated with rates in the focal county. Together, these findings highlights the utility of the SCI in capturing the diffusion of behavioral and health outcomes across social networks.

Further, research shows that social network structure is a modifiable target for suicide prevention. Specifically, increasing the number and intensity of ties to supportive peers, disrupting clusters of high-risk individuals, and leveraging prosocial central connectors (e.g., gatekeeper programs) can shift norms and facilitate help-seeking behavior, thereby reducing suicidal ideation, attempts, and deaths [31, 32]. However, most studies have been restricted to small samples or specific settings (e.g., school-based cohorts, military units, clinically high-risk youth) and have not evaluated whether geographical variation in suicide mortality or the diffusion of preventive policies correlates with large-scale inter-county friendship networks across the US. As a result, the broader socio-spatial dynamics of suicide risk–particularly the indirect transmission of protective interventions through social ties–remain insufficiently understood. One prominent example of a socially-mediated preventive intervention is the implementation of Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPOs), also known as "red flag laws." ERPOs are civil court orders that allow temporary restriction of firearm access from individuals deemed to pose a risk to themselves or others [33].

This socially-mediated approach uses interpersonal networks to identify and minimize suicide risks proactively [34]. Specifically, it enables law enforcement, family members, and friends to file petitions based on observed behaviors that indicate a high risk of suicide, which may result in temporarily restricting firearm access. Given that concerned individuals often initiate ERPO interventions within a person's social network, they offer one potential avenue to examine how social ties influence suicide prevention efforts. Empirical evidence from multiple states shows the effectiveness of ERPOs in reducing suicide mortality. In Connecticut, the issuance of 762 ERPOs between 1999 and 2013 has been estimated to prevent 10 to 20 suicide deaths, with individuals targeted by these orders initially exhibiting suicide rates approximately 40 times higher than the general population [34]. These features make ERPOs a useful case to examine in our study, where we assess whether exposure to such policies through social connectedness is associated with lower suicide mortality rates.

The contributions of our study, which integrates data on county-level suicide mortality and social connectedness, are three-fold:

1. We define and quantify county-level social exposure and spatial exposure to suicide mortality.
2. We estimate associations between county-level suicide mortality and social exposure, with and without adjustment for spatial exposure.
3. We evaluate whether suicide mortality rates are reduced in non-ERPO-implementing counties that are more socially connected to counties located in ERPO-implementing states.

We test two hypotheses to evaluate whether and how socially-mediated exposures are associated with county-level suicide mortality in the US:

H1 a one-standard-deviation increase in the SCI-weighted average suicide death rate in socially-connected counties is positively associated with the focal county's suicide death rate, controlling for spatial exposure.

H2 a one-standard-deviation increase in social exposure to firearm restriction policy is negatively associated with the focal county's suicide death rate.

We estimate county–month panel models with county and state–year fixed effects, controlling for time-varying sociodemographic covariates. Although the associations identified in our study do not establish causality, they highlight how social networks can function as pathways for both detrimental socio-spatial influence and beneficial dissemination of preventive policies. In conclusion, our findings underscore the role of social networks in suicide mortality and support the integration of network-based approaches into the design of public health interventions.

RESULTS

Socio-spatial patterns of suicide mortality in the US (H1)

We analyzed county-level suicide death data from the US National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) Multiple Cause of Death files for the 2010–2022 period, encompassing 40,794 county-year observations nationwide. Our primary outcome was the overall suicide mortality rate per county (expressed as the number of deaths per 100,000 people), across all age groups. Our primary objective was to assess whether a higher rate of suicide mortality in socially-connected counties was positively associated with a higher rate of suicide mortality in the focal county (**H1**). To test whether the association between suicide mortality and inter-county social connectedness was confounded by geographical distance, we compared two approaches, with and without controlling for spatial proximity.

To estimate these associations, we used two-way fixed effects regression models with county and year indicators, effectively controlling for time-invariant county characteristics and for annual patterns common to all counties. For individuals living in county i, exposure to suicide mortality outcomes in other counties than i (denoted by $-i$) was captured through two metrics. The first, denoted by s_{-it}, corresponds to "deaths in social proximity." It is defined as the weighted average of suicide mortality rates in year t in counties other than the focal county i, where the weight of a given county is equal to its SCI with the focal county. The second, denoted by d_{-it}, corresponds to "deaths in spatial proximity". It is defined as the weighted average of suicide mortality rates in year t in counties other than the focal county i, where the weight of a given county is equal to the inverse of the geographical distance between its centroid and the focal county's centroid. Detailed mathematical formulae appear in equations 1 and 2 in the *Methods* section.

We first estimated the relation between suicide mortality in the focal county and "deaths in social proximity" without controlling for spatial proximity (Model 1). A one-standard-deviation (1-SD) increase in "deaths in social proximity" was associated with an increase of 3.34 suicides per 100,000 people in the focal county (cluster-robust 95% CI: [1.76, 4.93], $p < 0.01$; Fig. 1, in red). Since the strength of social connectedness is often correlated with geographical distance, we next evaluated whether this observed population-level association was confounded by spatial proximity.

To that end, we built a model that included both variables, i.e., "deaths in social proximity" and "deaths in spatial proximity", to disentangle their independent associations with suicide mortality (Model 2). The association between the suicide mortality rate in the focal county and "deaths in social proximity" remained statistically significant and substantial (2.78 suicides per 100,000 people, cluster-robust 95% CI: [1.06, 4.50], $p < 0.01$; Fig. 1, in blue). The suicide mortality rate in the focal county was also positively associated with "deaths in spatial proximity", albeit at a smaller magnitude (0.77 suicides

per 100,000 people, cluster-robust 95% CI: [0.136, 1.42], $p < 0.05$). This finding, robust to the choice of model specification, suggests that social ties independently influence the risk of suicide mortality, beyond spatial proximity.

Full regression results, including the effects of population density, age structure, racial/ethnic composition, median household income, unemployment, educational attainment, and English proficiency, appear in Table 1. All continuous variables (i.e., population density, median household income, deaths in social proximity, and deaths in spatial proximity) were standardized to have mean zero and unit variance, thus facilitating the interpretation of estimated coefficients. Consistent with both national- and county-level analyses, higher population density, higher median household income, and higher proportions of Asian and Hispanic individuals were associated with lower suicide mortality rates. These associations remained statistically significant in Model 2 (all $p < 0.05$), strengthening confidence in our model specification [35, 36, 37].

To test the robustness of these associations to outcome definition, we fitted the two models again, using *age-adjusted* rather than *crude* suicide mortality rates as the outcome variable to account for differences in age structure among counties. These sensitivity analyses (see Supplementary Table S1) also yielded a positive association between the suicide mortality rate in the focal county and the suicide mortality rate in socially-connected counties, although the estimated magnitudes were $\sim$60% smaller than when using *crude* suicide mortality rates as the outcome variable. Such an attenuation was expected, as adjustment for a county's age structure removes demographic variability in the baseline risk of suicide of its population. Nevertheless, the consistency of the positive association, irrespective of outcome definition (i.e., with or without age adjustment), underscores the robustness of our findings.

The subsequent section examines whether exposure to firearm restriction policies similarly propagates through socio-spatial channels (**H2**).

Direct and indirect exposures to ERPO policies through social networks (H2)

Using staggered implementation of ERPOs to assess the role of social networks in suicide mortality. In this section, we investigate whether indirect exposure to firearm access restrictions, through social network connections, is associated with reductions in suicide mortality. A county is deemed *directly exposed* if the corresponding state has enacted an ERPO; a county is deemed *indirectly exposed* if it is socially connected to counties located in states that have enacted ERPOs despite being located in a state that has not. We hypothesize that counties with greater social connectedness to counties located in ERPO-implementing states have lower suicide mortality rates, even in the absence of local ERPO implementation (**H2**).



Figure 1: Role of social ties in county-level suicide mortality. Estimated regression coefficients ($\hat{\zeta}_1$) for suicide mortality rates in socially-connected counties (s_{-it}) in two models. Model 1 (red): without adjustment for deaths in spatial proximity (d_{-it}). Model 2 (blue): with adjustment for deaths in spatial proximity (d_{-it}). Horizontal lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). The vertical dashed line indicates the null hypothesis ($\zeta_1 = 0$). Point estimate in model 1: 3.34 (cluster-robust 95% CI: [1.76, 4.93]); point estimate in model 2: 2.78 (cluster-robust 95% CI: [1.06, 4.50]). Both models include county and year fixed effects and sociodemographic control variables (see Table 1).

Table 1: Estimates of socio-spatial correlates of county-level suicide mortality obtained via two-way fixed effects regressions. In Model (1), county-level suicide mortality rates are regressed on standardized deaths in social proximity (s_{-it}). Model (2) additionally controls for standardized deaths in spatial proximity (d_{-it}) to disentangle the role of social ties from that of geographical proximity. Both models include county and year fixed effects and adjust for time-varying county-level characteristics: population density, age distribution (percent aged 0–17, 18–44 and 45–64), racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, and percent with less than high school education. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

	Outcome variable: county-level crude suicide mortality rate	
	Model 1	Model 2
Deaths in social proximity s_{-it}	3.343^{***}	2.782^{***}
	(0.789)	(0.858)
Deaths in spatial proximity d_{-it}		0.777^{**}
		(0.319)
Population density	-1.181^{***}	-0.989^{**}
	(0.374)	(0.376)
Percent aged 0-17	-0.191	-0.183
	(0.347)	(0.340)
Percent aged 18-44	0.325	0.131
	(0.544)	(0.536)
Percent aged 45-64	-0.816^{***}	-0.851^{***}
	(0.296)	(0.285)
Percent Asian	-0.838^{***}	-0.822^{***}
	(0.293)	(0.290)
Percent Black	-1.372^{*}	-1.407^{*}
	(0.743)	(0.763)
Percent Other	0.370^{**}	0.308^{*}
	(0.181)	(0.163)
Percent Hispanic	-3.704^{***}	-3.586^{***}
	(0.795)	(0.803)
Median household income	-0.698^{***}	-0.692^{***}
	(0.166)	(0.169)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.067	-0.036
	(0.075)	(0.072)
Percent unemployed	0.017	0.028
	(0.158)	(0.150)
Percent with less than high school education	-0.013	-0.023
	(0.124)	(0.123)
Observations	40,794	40,794
R^2	0.946	0.946
Adjusted R^2	0.941	0.941

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

To test hypothesis (**H2**), we first constructed a standardized metric of ERPO social exposure using the SCI. We subsequently estimated the association between ERPO social exposure and suicide mortality using a two-way fixed effects regression, accounting for county- and time-specific patterns. Finally, to disentangle the role of ERPO social exposure from that of geographical distance, we implemented two distinct regressions, with and without controlling for spatial proximity.

In what follows, we report the empirical effectiveness of ERPOs, provide estimates of their direct and indirect effects on suicide mortality, and comment on the robustness of our results to confounding by spatial proximity. In the Supplementary Materials, we provide more details about ERPOs and refer to recent literature relevant to the topic [38, 39, 40].

Direct effects of ERPOs on suicide mortality. We found a statistically significant association between ERPO implementation and suicide mortality rates. On average, counties located in ERPO-implementing states had lower suicide mortality rates. ERPO implementation was associated with a decrease of $\widehat{\psi} = -0.528$ suicide deaths per 100,000 people (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-0.93, -0.126], $p < 0.01$). Full results of the direct effect model with county and year fixed effects appear in Table 2. Additional information about model specification appears in *Methods* (see Equation 4).

Indirect effects of ERPOs on suicide mortality. Beyond the direct effect of ERPO implementation on suicide mortality, we investigated its indirect effect, through social networks. To that end, we defined the $ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it}$ metric. It quantifies the share of social ties in the focal county i directed toward counties located in ERPO-implementing states in year t (see Equation 5 in *Methods*). To test hypothesis **(H2)** that ERPO social exposure is negatively associated with the suicide mortality rate of the focal county, we implemented a two-way fixed-effects regression (see Equation 6 in *Methods*).

Empirically, we found sufficient spatial heterogeneity in the change (Δ) in ERPO Social Exposure between 2010 and 2022 (Figure 2), allowing evaluation of the indirect effects of ERPO implementation on suicide mortality. Generally, counties located in ERPO-implementing states (e.g., CA, FL, MA, NY, WA) had large Δ values due to a substantial increase in the proportion of their social ties with counties located in other ERPO-implementing states after 2010. Additionally, several counties within states that did not enact ERPOs but share borders or strong social ties with counties located in ERPO-implementing states demonstrated large Δ values (e.g., selected counties in NV, PA, VT).

We found a statistically significant negative association between social connectedness to counties located in ERPO-implementing states and suicide mortality, accounting for state-by-year fixed effects (Figure 3). Specifically, a one-standard-deviation increase in ERPO exposure through out-of-state social ties with counties located in ERPO-implementing states was associated with a decrease of $\widehat{\delta}_1 = -0.214$ suicide deaths per 100,000 people (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-0.342, -0.0866], $p < 0.01$). Full regression results appear in



Figure 2: County–level change in ERPO social exposure, 2010–2022. Colors show the change (Δ) in standardized ERPO Social Exposure between 2010 and 2022, measured in within–sample standard–deviation units. Positive (yellow) values indicate that a county's social ties have become more concentrated in states that enacted ERPOs, whereas positive (purple) values indicate declining exposure. Although the underlying analysis covers *all* US counties, the map shows only the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia; Alaska, Hawaii, and US territories are not shown.

Table 2.

Robustness to confounding by geographical proximity. To assess the robustness of this indirect effect of ERPO implementation on suicide mortality and disentangle the role of social networks from that of geographical proximity, we introduced a second variable: ERPO spatial exposure. Similar to $ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it}$, $ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure_{it}$ quantifies the share of spatial ties between the focal county i and alter counties located in ERPO-implementing states in year t. A formal description of this metric appears in Equation 7 in *Methods*. Even when accounting for spatial proximity (see Equation 8 in *Methods*), our prior finding of a statistically significant negative association between indirect exposure to ERPOs through social networks and suicide mortality persisted (Figure 3). A one-standard-deviation increase in ERPO social exposure was associated with a decrease of $\widehat{\theta}_1 = -0.298$ suicide deaths per 100,000 people (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-0.475, -0.12], $p < 0.01$). Full regression results appear in Table 2.

Robustness to confounding by age structure. To evaluate the robustness of our findings to outcome definition, we estimated the indirect effect of ERPO implementation using *age-adjusted* rather than *crude* suicide mortality as the outcome variable. In both models, with and without adjustment for spatial proximity, we again found a negative association between indirect exposure to ERPOs through social networks and suicide mortality (see **Supplementary Figure S2** and **Table S2**). In addition, to assess robustness to potential residual confounding from correlated suicide mortality patterns across the social network, we controlled for suicide deaths in social proximity. Whether using crude or age-adjusted suicide mortality rates as outcomes, the association between indirect exposure to ERPOs and suicide mortality through social networks persisted (see Supplementary Figure S3 and Tables S3 and S4). Through these analyses, we show the existence of a robust negative association between social ties and suicide-related events. This investigation validates our hypothesis that ERPO social exposure is negatively associated with suicide mortality. We posit that these indirect protective effects stem from the reduced diffusion of information on suicidal ideation and death events within social networks.

DISCUSSION

Our study is the first to provide evidence that county-level suicide mortality in the US exhibits socio-spatial structuring: namely, the risk of suicide death in a given county varies not only with geographical location but also with the strength of its social ties to other counties and states (**H1**). Using two-way fixed effects regression models, we found that a one-standard-deviation increase in the suicide mortality rates of socially-connected counties was associated with an increase of 2.78 and 3.34 suicide deaths per 100,000 people in the focal county, with and without controlling for spatial proximity, respectively.



Figure 3: Estimated coefficients ($\hat{\delta}_1$, $\hat{\theta}_1$) for ERPO social exposure in two specifications. Red point indicates estimate from the baseline model without spatial exposure ($\hat{\delta}_1 = -0.214$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.342, -0.0866]$); blue point indicates estimate from the specification controlling for *ERPO Spatial Exposure*$_{it}$ ($\hat{\theta}_1 = -0.298$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.475, -0.120]$). Horizontal lines denote 95% confidence intervals; vertical dashed line denotes the null hypothesis ($\delta_1 = 0$). Both models include county and state–year fixed effects (ϕ_i, γ_{st}) and sociodemographic controls ($\overline{X}_{it}$). Consistent negative and statistically significant estimates indicate the association between suicide mortality and indirect social exposure to ERPO policies is robust to spatial confounding.

Table 2: Estimated effects of ERPO policy exposure on county-level crude suicide mortality rates (expressed in terms of the number of deaths per 100,000 people). Column (1) reports direct effects of local ERPO implementation with county and year fixed effects. Column (2) reports indirect effects of ERPO social exposure, measured through inter-county social ties, estimated with county and state–year fixed effects. Column (3) reports results from the indirect social exposure model, with an additional control for ERPO spatial exposure as well as county and state–year fixed effects. All models adjust for population density, age distribution (percent aged 0–17, 18–44 and 45–64), racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, percent with less than high school education and political affiliation. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

	Outcome variable: county-level crude suicide mortality rate		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
ERPO	-0.528^{**}		
	(0.200)		
ERPO social exposure		-0.214^{***}	-0.298^{***}
		(0.064)	(0.088)
ERPO spatial exposure			0.507
			(0.313)
Population density	-1.453^{***}	-0.598	-0.639
	(0.373)	(0.600)	(0.577)
Percent aged below 18	-0.103	-0.218	-0.201
	(0.361)	(0.375)	(0.377)
Percent aged 18-44	0.441	-0.214	-0.134
	(0.559)	(0.545)	(0.541)
Percent aged 45-64	-0.956^{***}	-0.573	-0.513
	(0.331)	(0.387)	(0.399)
Percent Asian	-1.010^{***}	-0.649^{**}	-0.629^{**}
	(0.338)	(0.285)	(0.270)
Percent Black	-1.323^{*}	-2.878^{***}	-2.792^{***}
	(0.722)	(0.687)	(0.679)
Percent Other	0.474^{**}	-0.109	-0.116
	(0.198)	(0.281)	(0.284)
Percent Hispanic	-3.913^{***}	-2.697^{***}	-2.816^{***}
	(0.983)	(0.844)	(0.880)
Median household income	-0.658^{***}	-0.629^{***}	-0.597^{***}
	(0.166)	(0.172)	(0.180)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.087	-0.034	-0.052
	(0.077)	(0.132)	(0.128)
Percent unemployed	0.010	-0.116	-0.101
	(0.163)	(0.124)	(0.126)
Percent with less than high school education	0.004	-0.046	-0.054
	(0.144)	(0.124)	(0.123)
Political affiliation	-0.095	0.156	0.134
	(0.167)	(0.159)	(0.159)
Observations	40,794	40,794	40,794
R^2	0.946	0.947	0.947
Adjusted R^2	0.941	0.941	0.941

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

The directionality and magnitude of this association are consistent with research on suicide contagion in adolescent peer networks. For example, Mueller and Abrutyn analyzed longitudinal friendship data from a national adolescent study and identified a contagion phenomenon at the individual level [17]. If a teenager *knew* that a close friend had attempted suicide, their odds of suicidal ideation were ∼72% higher than if they did not have such exposure and their odds of attempting suicide within one year were ∼65% higher. While this study had examined micro-level contagion in a specific youth network, ours suggests that such a pattern holds at the population level as well, nationwide and across age groups. Specifically, we show the existence of associations in the suicide mortality rates of socially-connected counties, which corroborates our hypothesis of a similar contagion mechanism operating at a larger scale. Our results remained robust to additional adjustment for deaths in spatial proximity, suggesting that social influence may amplify the risk of suicide mortality beyond geographical boundaries.

Beyond the direct effects of social connectedness on suicide mortality, we sought to understand the potential spillover effects of firearm access restriction policies to states that did not implement such policies. We identified a robust, indirect effect of Extreme Risk Protection Orders (ERPOs) among counties located in non-ERPO-implementing states, likely mediated by social ties: a one-standard-deviation increase in social exposure to counties located in ERPO-implementing states was associated with a small but statistically significant reduction of 0.21 suicide deaths per 100,000 people.

The associations identified in our study indicate that suicide risk and its mitigation depend on the topology of inter-county social ties. The magnitude of the estimated direct and indirect effects of both social connectedness and ERPO exposures reflects the importance of the structure and strength of connectivity (i.e., distribution of county weights), the nature of the exposures (i.e., social or spatial proximity), and county-level characteristics (see Table 1).

Current suicide prevention strategies often target counties based on their sociodemographic characteristics or socioeconomic deprivation indicators. Our results suggest that new prioritization schemes could benefit from combining such geography-based targeting with decentralized, locally adaptive coordination among socially-connected counties—a direction already reflected in some local policy agendas. For example, the Suicide Prevention Council of San Diego County has adopted a network-informed multi-stakeholder approach by convening municipalities, behavioral health providers, and faith-based institutions to foster an integrated response system [41].

Network-informed infrastructures are critical for three operational reasons: (1) targeted resource allocation (e.g., gatekeeper training, telepsychiatry expansion and school-based referrals) in structurally-central counties can maximize indirect impact; (2) socially-connected populations enable faster diffusion of norms, including help-seeking behaviors and firearm safety practices; and (3) early warning systems built on socially-connected

surveillance networks can detect emerging suicide clusters before geographical clustering becomes apparent [42, 43, 40].

Going forward, prevention strategies should rely on existing frameworks, such as the Suicide Prevention Resource Center [44] and the CDC's Community-Based Suicide Prevention programs [45], to strengthen cross-sectoral coordination, local coalitions, and mental health infrastructure at the county level. Indeed, our findings suggest that strategically implementing interventions in counties that serve as "social hubs" could amplify the benefits of social policies via network spillovers and be highly effective at mitigating suicide risk.

Limitations and Avenues for Future Research

A central component of our study is the use of the SCI to quantify indirect exposure to both suicide mortality and firearm restriction policies, through inter-county social ties that go beyond geographical boundaries. The SCI captures the strength of Facebook friendship ties between any two US counties, providing a scalable and validated measure of population-level social connectedness [27, 46]. Research has shown that the SCI accurately predicts a range of real-world outcomes, including migration flows, economic mobility, and infectious disease spread, underscoring its utility as a proxy for underlying social networks [27, 46]. Moreover, the SCI matrix is nearly complete: all US county pairs have non-zero SCI values, enabling comprehensive analysis of spatially distributed social influence. In our setting, this fact allowed estimating the effects of exposure to suicide mortality and to firearm restriction policies through social ties with non-neighboring counties, by leveraging the broad geographical coverage and county-level granularity of the SCI.

However, the SCI's reliance on Facebook user data introduces several limitations. Because the SCI is defined based on the activity of Facebook users only, it does not reflect the interactions of individuals who are not on the platform. This results in the underrepresentation of older adults and people with lower socioeconomic status or limited internet access [47]. For instance, only 50% of US adults aged 65 and older report using Facebook, compared to 73% of individuals aged 18–29. Moreover, Facebook membership is lower among individuals with less than a high school education and those residing in rural areas. Consequently, the SCI-derived exposure metrics used in our models may disproportionately reflect the social interactions of younger, more urban, and digitally connected populations, potentially missing or misrepresenting the extent of social influence in other population subgroups. Although this fact does not compromise the structural completeness of the SCI network, it affects the generalizability of the estimated indirect effects, through social diffusion. To alleviate this limitation, future work should consider integrating auxiliary data sources to validate findings in age group- or cohort-specific

social networks (e.g., the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent to Adult Health, commonly known as the "Add Health" dataset).

An additional consideration in interpreting our two-way fixed effects estimates is the reflexive nature of social influence among counties. Although our approach identifies robust associations between direct or indirect exposure to policy interventions and suicide rates in socially-connected counties, we cannot ascertain the directionality of social influence, i.e., determine which specific counties affect others. The bidirectional nature of social ties implies that a county can simultaneously influence and be influenced by counties to which it is socially connected. Although the existence of such reflexivity does not undermine our finding of network-like, social structuring in suicide mortality, we refrain from formulating any causal hypotheses about the nature of underlying influence mechanisms at play.

Our current specification defines social proximity weights w_{ij} through a parametric kernel based on the SCI and population scaling. This pre-specified structure imposes a fixed functional form on how social influence decays across counties. Although the current model incorporates a dynamic specification for social exposure by adjusting the strength of social influence based on suicide rates, the overall structure of the social proximity weights remains pre-specified and fixed. Albeit transparent and computationally efficient, this parametric formulation may not reflect the true extent and heterogeneity of influence processes, particularly in settings where socially-central counties serve as "social hubs," exerting disproportionate or nonlinear effects on others. Going forward, these limitations could be addressed by adopting a fully Bayesian hierarchical framework in which social influence weights are not assumed *a priori*, but are instead learned from data. For example, one could introduce latent county interaction structures or flexible prior distributions that allow the strength and topology of social ties to vary across space and time. These statistical frameworks would enable context-sensitive modeling of influence propagation through social networks. In the future, advancing toward data-driven Bayesian inference, either semi-parametric or fully nonparametric, represents a rigorous path for improving the fidelity and generalizability of network-based models of suicide mortality in population health research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study integrates multiple county-level datasets to construct time-varying measures of suicide mortality, socio-spatial influence associated with social ties, social and spatial exposures to firearm restriction policies, as well as sociodemographic and socioeconomic covariates.

Suicide mortality

Data on suicide deaths were obtained from the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS), managed by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS). We extracted county-level counts of suicide deaths that occurred between 2010 and 2022 using the following International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes: `X60`–`X84` and `Y87.0`. These codes are conventionally used to identify deaths due to intentional self-harm. For confidentiality and consistency, all death counts were aggregated by year and standardized per 100,000 people using county-level population denominators from the US Census Bureau. We considered both crude and age-adjusted mortality rates. Age adjustment was performed using the 2000 projected US population.

Social connectedness index (SCI)

The Social Connectedness Index (SCI) was obtained from the Meta Data for Good program. It quantifies the relative strength of Facebook friendship ties between any two US counties, normalized by population size. Specifically, SCI_{ij} reflects the likelihood of a Facebook user living in county i being friend with another Facebook user living in county j. This measure provides a high-resolution, empirical proxy for social ties among US counties. Formally, the SCI between any two counties i and j is defined as follows [27]:

$$\text{SCI}_{ij} = \frac{\text{Facebook Connections}_{ij}}{\text{Facebook Users}_i \times \text{Facebook Users}_j}.$$

Here, Facebook Users_i represents the number of Facebook users living in county i.

$\text{Facebook Connections}_{ij}$ is the total number of Facebook friendship connections between individuals in counties i and j. Friendship data were released by Meta in 2018 and was last updated in 2021. Here, we used the most recent friendship data from year 2021.

Socioeconomic covariates

Time-varying, county-level sociodemographic characteristics were drawn from two sources. First, we used data provided by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to derive yearly community-level indicators, including educational attainment, unemployment, median household income, and racial/ethnic composition, for 2010–2020. Second, for years not covered by AHRQ, we accessed the American Community Survey (ACS) via the `tidycensus` package in `R`, using 5-year estimates for all US counties. The final list of harmonized covariates includes population density, age structure, median household income, educational attainment, unemployment rate, and proportion of residents with limited English proficiency.

Political leaning

County-level political leaning was obtained from the MIT Election Data and Science Lab [48] for the 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020 presidential elections. Political leaning was operationalized as a binary indicator, coded as Republican-leaning (1) if the Republican candidate received a majority of votes and as Democratic-leaning (0) otherwise. For non-election years, we assigned political leaning values based on the most recent preceding election (by carrying forward the latest value). For Alaska counties with incomplete county-level election reporting (n=27 counties), political leaning values were assigned based on district-level returns when available (n=39 observations across 3 counties; FIPS codes 02013, 02016, 02020) or imputed based on statewide voting patterns for the remaining counties in the corresponding year (n=312 observations across 24 counties).

Socio-spatial influence metrics

To quantify the role of suicide mortality in socio-spatially connected counties, we considered two metrics: *social proximity to suicide deaths* (s_{-it}) and *spatial proximity to suicide deaths* (d_{-it}). These are formally defined as:

$$s_{-it} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_{jt}, \; d_{-it} = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij} y_{jt}, \tag{1}$$

where y_{jt} denotes the suicide death rate in county j at time t. The weights w_{ij} and a_{ij} represent social and spatial proximity, respectively, and are defined as:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{n_j \mathrm{SCI}_{ij}}{\sum_{k \neq i} n_k \mathrm{SCI}_{ik}}, \quad a_{ij} = \frac{1/d_{ij}}{\sum_{k \neq i} (1/d_{ik})}, \tag{2}$$

where n_j is the population of county j, SCI_{ij} is the social connectedness index between counties i and j, and d_{ij} is the great-circle distance between them. Consistent with the literature [46], we account for the correlation between these two metrics—due to the spatial clustering of social networks—by including both terms jointly in the model specification.

To examine the association between socio-spatial influence metrics and suicide mortality in the focal county, we estimate the following two-way fixed effects regression model:

$$y_{it} = \zeta_1 s_{-it} + \zeta_2 d_{-it} + \overline{\zeta}_3^T \overline{X}_{it} + \mu_i + \phi_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{3}$$

where y_{it} denotes the suicide death rate in the focal county i in year t; the 13-dimensional vector $\overline{X}_{it}$ includes socioeconomic and demographic covariates (e.g., age distribution,

racial/ethnic composition, median household income, educational attainment, unemployment rate, proportion of residents with limited English proficiency); μ_i and ϕ_t correspond to county and year fixed effects, respectively. Model estimation was conducted using population-weighted ordinary least squares (OLS) and standard errors were clustered at the state level to account for within-state correlation in the error structure.

Direct and indirect exposures to ERPO policies

To assess the direct association between Extreme Risk Protection Order (ERPO) policies and suicide mortality at the county level, we estimated a two-way fixed effects model. The baseline model specification is as follows:

$$y_{it} = \psi_1 ERPO_{it} + \overline{\psi}_2^T \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{4}$$

where y_{it} denotes the suicide death rate per 100,000 people in county i and year t and $ERPO_{it}$ is a binary indicator equal to 1 if the ERPO policy has already been enacted by year t in the state corresponding to county i. The 13-dimensional vector $\overline{X}_{it}$ includes socioeconomic and demographic covariates (e.g., age distribution, racial/ethnic composition, median household income, educational attainment, unemployment rate, proportion of residents with limited English proficiency). ϕ_i and γ_t correspond to county and year fixed effects (controlling for unobserved, time-invariant heterogeneity and national temporal shocks), respectively. In this model, we do not include state-by-year fixed effects, since values of $ERPO_{it}$ vary at the state–year level. Model estimation was performed using population-weighted OLS and standard errors are clustered by state (51 clusters), providing conservative inference that is robust to within-state correlation.

To quantify the indirect association between ERPO policies and suicide mortality, through social networks, we define the following metric:

$$ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it} = \sum_{s(i) \neq s(j)} \mathbb{1}(\text{ERPO in state } s(j))_t \times \frac{SCI_{ij}}{\sum_h SCI_{ih}}, \tag{5}$$

where for each county i, the state to which it belongs is denoted by $s(i)$, SCI_{ij} denotes the social connectedness index between counties i and j and the indicator function reflects ERPO policy implementation in other states than that corresponding to county i (i.e., $s(j) \neq s(i)$) in year t. This standardized metric, coined "ERPO social exposure", captures the share of social ties that county i has with counties located in ERPO-implementing states.

To estimate the association between ERPO social exposure and suicide mortality at the county level, we estimated the following model:

$$y_{it} = \delta_1 ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it} + \overline{\delta}_3^T \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{6}$$

where ϕ_i and γ_{st} represent county and state-by-year fixed effects, respectively. This model specification accounts for unobserved county-specific characteristics that do not change over time and for unobserved time-varying factors that change at the state level. For example, the enactment of an ERPO policy in a given state may not result in the same on-the-ground implementation across all counties in that state; ϕ_i would capture part of this heterogeneity, averaged over the study period. The model was estimated using population-weighted OLS, with standard errors clustered at the state level to allow for arbitrary correlation within states. The inclusion of state-by-year fixed effects enables the identification of the indirect effects of ERPO exposure, from variation in out-of-state ERPO policies among socially-connected counties, while controlling for their time-varying capacity to implement ERPOs, evolving socioeconomic context, and other latent shocks at the state level.

As a robustness check, we define a *spatial exposure* metric that captures geographical proximity to states where ERPOs have been implemented:

$$ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure_{it} = \sum_{j:s(j)\neq s(i)} \mathbb{1}(\text{ERPO in state } s(j))_t \times \left(\frac{1/d_{ij}}{\sum_{k\neq i}(1/d_{ik})} \right) \tag{7}$$

where d_{ij} denotes the great-circle distance between counties i and j, excluding counties in the same state $s(i)$. This additional metric will help determine whether ERPO implementation in geographically close counties is associated with suicide mortality in the focal county, through spatial diffusion.

To evaluate the joint association between indirect social and spatial exposures to ERPOs, through social networks and geographical proximity, and suicide mortality in the focal county, we estimate the following model:

$$y_{it} = \theta_1 ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it} + \theta_2 ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure_{it} + \overline{\theta}_3^T \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it}, \tag{8}$$

where ϕ_i and γ_{st} denote county and state-by-year fixed effects, respectively, and the 13-dimensional vector $\overline{X}_{it}$ includes socioeconomic and demographic covariates (e.g., age distribution, racial/ethnic composition, median household income, educational attainment, unemployment rate, proportion of residents with limited English proficiency). This model specification allows for simultaneous estimation of the independent associations between social vs. spatial exposure to ERPOs and suicide mortality in the focal county. To ensure

inference is robust to differential population sizes and intra-state dependence in error terms, model estimation was performed using population-weighted OLS and standard errors were clustered at the state level.

Code Availability

The full code is available at https://github.com/kut97/suicide-sci and can be used to reproduce all the figures and tables in this paper.

Data Availability

Mortality data was obtained from NVSS, managed by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) [49]. Due to confidentiality concerns, this data set is not publicly accessible, but can be requested from NCHS at https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/nvss-restricted-data.htm. Social determinants of health (SDOH) covariates for 2010–2020 were obtained from the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) SDOH Database (https://www.ahrq.gov/sdoh/data-analytics/sdoh-data.html); for 2020–2022, SDOH covariates were constructed from US Census Bureau products (American Community Survey [ACS] 5-year estimates; see https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/data.html). County-level political affiliation data were obtained from the MIT Election Data and Science Lab, County Presidential Election Returns 2000-2024, available through Harvard Dataverse at https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VOQCHQ [48]. The social connectedness index (SCI) is available through Facebook (Meta) Data for Good at https://dataforgood.facebook.com/dfg/tools/social-connectedness-index. For age-adjusted suicide mortality, annual population denominators stratified by 18 five-year age groups were drawn from CDC WONDER Bridged-Race Postcensal Population Estimates (https://wonder.cdc.gov/single-race-population.html).

Acknowledgment

We express our sincere gratitude to Dr. David Brent for his invaluable guidance and inspiration in shaping this study. His insights into the role of Extreme Risk Protection Order (ERPO) policy within the context of social network dynamics were instrumental in refining the direction of our research. His thoughtful feedback significantly strengthened this manuscript. We also extend our appreciation to Professor Jeffrey Shaman, whose work "Quantifying Suicide Contagion at Population Scale" served as a key motivation for pursuing this line of research. His thoughtful guidance and feedback have been invaluable in strengthening our study.

References

[1] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Provisional mortality data — united states, 2023 (2024). Accessed July 22, 2025.

[2] V. Prades-Caballero, J.-J. Navarro-Pérez, A. Carbonell, Factors associated with suicidal behavior in adolescents: An umbrella review using the socio-ecological model, *Community Mental Health Journal* **61**, 612 (2025).

[3] J. T. Cacioppo, S. Cacioppo, The growing problem of loneliness, *The Lancet* **391**, 426 (2018).

[4] National Institute of Mental Health, Suicide statistics (2024). Accessed July 22, 2025.

[5] Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction, Intersections of substance use and suicide: Evidence and key take-aways (2024). Accessed July 22, 2025.

[6] S. Hinduja, J. W. Patchin, Connecting adolescent suicide to the severity of bullying and cyberbullying, *Journal of School Violence* **18**, 333 (2018).

[7] M. Miller, D. Azrael, C. Barber, Suicide mortality in the united states: The importance of access to lethal means, *The New England Journal of Medicine* **387**, 1454 (2022).

[8] S. A. Swanson, I. Colman, Association between exposure to suicide and suicidality outcomes in youth, *CMAJ* **185**, 870 (2013).

[9] J. Pirkis, *et al.*, Public health measures related to the transmissibility of suicide, *The Lancet Public Health* **9**, e807 (2024).

[10] S. Calvo, *et al.*, Does suicide contagion (werther effect) take place in response to social media? a systematic review, *Spanish Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health* (2024). In press.

[11] M. S. Gould, Suicide and the media, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* **1008**, 200 (2003).

[12] T. e. a. Niederkrotenthaler, Association of increased youth suicides with a u.s. television series portraying suicide, *JAMA Psychiatry* **77**, 236 (2020).

[13] J. Shaman, *et al.*, Quantifying suicide contagion at population scale, *Science advances* **10**, eadq4074 (2024).

[14] R. A. Jones, *Emile Durkheim: An introduction to four major works* (Sage Publ., 1987).

[15] M. S. Gould, A. M. Lake, The contagion of suicidal behavior, *Contagion of violence: Workshop summary* (Institute of Medicine and National Research Council Washington, DC, 2013), pp. 68–73.

[16] D. P. Phillips, The influence of suggestion on suicide: Substantive and theoretical implications of the werther effect, *American Sociological Review* **39**, 340 (1974).

[17] A. S. Mueller, S. Abrutyn, Suicidal disclosures among friends: using social network data to understand suicide contagion, *Journal of health and social behavior* **56**, 131 (2015).

[18] F. Arendt, S. Scherr, D. Romer, Effects of exposure to self-harm on social media: Evidence from a two-wave panel study among young adults, *New Media & Society* **21**, 2422 (2019).

[19] T. Niederkrotenthaler, *et al.*, The role of suicide-related media content in suicide contagion: a systematic review, *The Lancet Psychiatry* **7**, 629 (2020).

[20] D. Janiri, *et al.*, Risk and protective factors for childhood suicidality: a us population-based study, *The Lancet Psychiatry* **7**, 317 (2020).

[21] J. V. Verlenden, Mental health and suicide risk among high school students and protective factors—youth risk behavior survey, united states, 2023, *MMWR supplements* **73** (2024).

[22] M. E. Marraccini, Z. M. Brier, School connectedness and suicidal thoughts and behaviors: A systematic meta-analysis., *School psychology quarterly* **32**, 5 (2017).

[23] A. Arango, *et al.*, Social connectedness and adolescent suicide risk, *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry* **65**, 785 (2024).

[24] E. M. Kleiman, R. T. Liu, Social support as a protective factor in suicide: Findings from two nationally representative samples, *Journal of affective disorders* **150**, 540 (2013).

[25] J. A. Motto, A. G. Bostrom, A randomized controlled trial of postcrisis suicide prevention, *Psychiatric services* **52**, 828 (2001).

[26] B. A. Pescosolido, A network frame offers a promising transdisciplinary tool for understanding complex health and health care system problems like suicide, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **121** (2024).

[27] M. Bailey, R. Cao, T. Kuchler, J. Stroebel, A. Wong, Social connectedness: Measurement, determinants, and effects, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **32**, 259 (2018).

[28] B. Charoenwong, A. Kwan, V. Pursiainen, Social connections with COVID-19–affected areas increase compliance with mobility restrictions, *Science Advances* **6**, eabc3054 (2020).

[29] D. Holtz, *et al.*, Interdependence and the cost of uncoordinated responses to COVID-19, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **117**, 19837 (2020).

[30] K. Tiwari, M. A. Rahimian, M. S. Roberts, P. Kumar, J. M. Buchanich, Measuring network dynamics of opioid overdose deaths in the united states, *Scientific Reports* **14**, 29563 (2024).

[31] I. Cero, M. De Choudhury, P. A. Wyman, Social network structure as a suicide prevention target, *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology* (2023).

[32] A. B. Defayette, S. M. Silverstein, A. R. Pisani, Social network structure as a biopsychosocial suicide prevention target for young people at clinical high-risk for psychosis, *Schizophrenia Research* **270**, 63 (2024).

[33] M. Miller, Y. Zhang, D. M. Studdert, S. Swanson, Updated estimate of the number of extreme risk protection orders needed to prevent 1 suicide, *JAMA network open* **7**, e2414864 (2024).

[34] J. W. Swanson, *et al.*, Implementation and effectiveness of connecticut's risk-based gun removal law: does it prevent suicides?, *Law and Contemporary Problems* **80**, 179 (2017).

[35] A. L. Cammack, Vital signs: suicide rates and selected county-level factors—united states, 2022, *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* **73** (2024).

[36] D. L. Steelesmith, *et al.*, Contextual factors associated with county-level suicide rates in the united states, 1999 to 2016, *JAMA network open* **2**, e1910936 (2019).

[37] M. F. Garnett, S. C. Curtin, Suicide mortality in the united states, 2001–2021, *NCHS Data Brief 464*, National Center for Health Statistics, Hyattsville, MD (2023).

[38] A. J. Kivisto, P. L. Phalen, Effects of risk-based firearm seizure laws in connecticut and indiana on suicide rates, 1981–2015, *Psychiatric Services* **69**, 855 (2018).

[39] J. W. Swanson, *et al.*, Suicide prevention effects of extreme risk protection order laws in four states, *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law* **52**, 327 (2024).

[40] A. M. Zeoli, *et al.*, Use of extreme risk protection orders to reduce gun violence in oregon, *Criminology & public policy* **20**, 243 (2021).

[41] County of San Diego Health and Human Services, San diego county suicide prevention council annual report (2015). https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/hhsa/programs/bhs/documents/SPC-Annual-Report.pdf.

[42] B. Klimes-Dougan, D. Klingbeil, D. Mroczek, Gatekeeper training as a suicide prevention strategy: A systematic review, *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* **51**, 322 (2021).

[43] O. Bernal, A. Mueller, R. Kessler, Public health surveillance of suicide: recommendations for a comprehensive approach, *American Journal of Public Health* **112**, 579 (2022).

[44] Suicide Prevention Resource Center, Strategic planning framework for suicide prevention (2020). https://sprc.org/sites/default/files/resource-program/SPRC-Strategic-Planning-Framework.pdf.

[45] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Comprehensive suicide prevention program (2022). https://www.cdc.gov/suicide/programs/csp/index.html.

[46] T. Kuchler, D. Russel, J. Stroebel, JUE insight: The geographic spread of COVID-19 correlates with the structure of social networks as measured by facebook, *Journal of Urban Economics* **127**, 103314 (2022).

[47] Pew Research Center, Social media use in 2021 (2021). Accessed: 2025-08-02.

[48] MIT Election Data and Science Lab, County presidential election returns 2000–2024, Dataset (2018). County-level presidential election results; accessed 2025.

[49] National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), National vital statistics system (nvss) mortality, restricted-use detailed microdata, 2010–2022, Restricted-use microdata; access by request (2025). Multiple cause-of-death files with state and county geography; accessed 2025-08-29.

Supplementary Materials for
Socio-Spatial Patterns of Suicide Mortality in the United States

Tiwari, Kushagra et al.
Correspondence to: rahimian@pitt.edu and mariecharpignon@berkeley.edu

This document includes the following:

- Supplementary Materials and Methods
- Supplementary Text
- Supplementary Figures S1 to S3
- Supplementary Tables S1 to S4

Supplementary Materials and Methods

Data Description

All analyses used death counts aggregated at county level for years 2010 to 2022. Suicide mortality data were obtained from the National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) Multiple Cause-of-Death files, restricted to death records with an underlying cause-of-death corresponding to ICD-10 codes X60–X84 or Y87.0. The annual population size of each county was used to calculate mortality rates. Annual population sizes were drawn from the CDC Bridged-Race Postcensal Population Estimates and extracted for a total of 18 five-year age groups (0–4, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–24, 25–29, 30–34, 35–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59, 60–64, 65–69, 70–74, 75–79, 80–84, 85+). These estimates are harmonized for intercensal consistency and aligned with official age groupings. Demographic and socioeconomic variables used for adjustment, including median household income, racial/ethnic composition, educational attainment, unemployment rate, and limited English proficiency, were derived from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates. Political affiliation was obtained from the MIT Election Data and Science Lab. We considered county-level presidential election returns for 2008, 2012, 2016, and 2020, and defined a binary indicator based on plurality vote share. For non-election years, the value was assigned based on the most recent preceding election. Social connectedness metrics were calculated using the 2018 version of Meta's Social Connectedness Index (SCI). Geospatial coordinates and land area were sourced from the US Census Bureau's TIGER/Line shapefiles. All datasets were merged using 5-digit FIPS county codes.

Supplementary Analysis Using Age-Adjusted Suicide Mortality Rates

We evaluated the robustness of our findings to different outcome specifications. Our primary analysis used crude mortality rates as outcomes and included three variables characterizing the age composition of a given county in a given year as regressors (i.e., the share of the county's population aged below 18, 18–44, and 45–64). In a supplementary analysis, we evaluated whether the associations reported in the main manuscript were robust to the use of age-adjusted suicide mortality rates rather than crude suicide mortality rates. To that end, we re-estimated all models using age-adjusted suicide mortality rates, enabling the comparison of county-level outcomes standardized to the same reference population. In these models, we removed the three variables related to a given county's age structure and listed above from the set of regressors.

Age Standardization of Suicide Mortality Rates

Age-adjusted suicide mortality rates were derived using direct standardization with the *2000 US Standard Population*. Death counts and population sizes were derived using NVSS age recodes (27-category), harmonized to the following **18 age groups**: 0–4, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–24, 25–29, 30–34, 35–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59, 60–64, 65–69, 70–74, 75–79, 80–84, 85+.

Let $d_{it}^{(a)}$ and $p_{it}^{(a)}$ denote the number of suicide deaths and the population size of age group a in county i and year t. Let $w^{(a)}$ denote the population share corresponding to age group a in the 2000 US Standard Population. The age-adjusted suicide mortality rate $\tilde{y}_{it}$ is given by:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = 100{,}000 \times \sum_{a} w^{(a)} \frac{d_{it}^{(a)}}{p_{it}^{(a)}} \tag{S1}$$

Following CDC guidelines, estimates were suppressed for any county-year pair with fewer than 10 suicide deaths to ensure reliability and confidentiality.

Alternative Outcome Definitions and Model Specifications to Learn Socio-spatial Patterns of Suicide Mortality in the US

As mentioned above, we conducted a supplementary analysis by re-estimating the models presented in the main manuscript with *age-adjusted suicide mortality rates* ($\tilde{y}_{it}$) as outcomes. This adjustment accounts for the heterogeneity in the age composition of US counties. Age-standardization was performed using direct standardization over 18 age groups: 0–4, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–24, 25–29, 30–34, 35–39, 40–44, 45–49, 50–54, 55–59, 60–64, 65–69, 70–74, 75–79, 80–84, 85+, as defined in NVSS age recodes (27-category). Age-adjusted suicide mortality rates are expressed as the number of suicide deaths per 100,000 people.

Similarly to the analysis presented in the main manuscript, we estimated two-way fixed effects regression models, incorporating county and year fixed effects to account for unmeasured time-invariant county characteristics and nationwide temporal shocks. The first model specification included "deaths in social proximity" ($\tilde{s}_{-it}$) as the main exposure. The second model specification additionally included "deaths in spatial proximity" ($\tilde{d}_{-it}$) as a control to disentangle the role of social connectedness from that of geographical proximity. Demographic and socioeconomic covariates included population density, racial composition (shares of Asian, Black, and Other subgroups), ethnic composition (share of Hispanic population), median household income, unemployment rate, limited English proficiency, and educational attainment. The three variables related to a given county's age structure were removed from the set of of regressors.

Using age-adjusted suicide mortality rates ($\tilde{y}_{jt}$), we recomputed the two proximity-based exposure metrics:

$$\tilde{s}_{-it} = \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \tilde{y}_{jt} \tag{S2}$$

$$\tilde{d}_{-it} = \sum_{j \neq i} a_{ij} \tilde{y}_{jt} \tag{S3}$$

where w_{ij} and a_{ij} represent SCI-based and inverse-distance-based weights, respectively, defined identically to those in the main manuscript.

The model estimating the association between the suicide mortality rate of a given focal county and those in socially connected and spatially proximal counties was specified as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \eta_1 \tilde{s}_{-it} + \eta_2 \tilde{d}_{-it} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_3^\top \overline{X}_{it} + \mu_i + \phi_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{S4}$$

Here, $\tilde{y}_{it}$ denotes the age-adjusted suicide mortality rate in county i and year t; $\tilde{s}_{-it}$ represents the standardized suicide mortality rate in counties socially connected to county i according to Facebook's SCI; $\tilde{d}_{-it}$ represents the inverse-distance-weighted suicide mortality rate in spatially proximal counties; $\overline{X}_{it}$ is a vector of county- and year-specific demographic and socioeconomic covariates; μ_i and ϕ_t denote county and year fixed effects, respectively; and ε_{it} is the error term.

In a first model, we estimated the association between $\tilde{y}_{it}$ and $\tilde{s}_{-it}$ without controlling for spatial exposure. A one-standard-deviation increase in the suicide mortality rate of socially connected counties was associated with an increase of 1.29 deaths per 100,000 people in a focal county (cluster-robust 95% CI: [0.87, 1.70], $p < 0.01$; Fig. S1, red point). The magnitude of this association is sizable, relative to the average suicide mortality rate across US counties over the study period.

In a second model, we included deaths in spatial proximity ($\tilde{d}_{-it}$) as part of the regressors. Under this second specification, the association between the suicide mortality rate of a focal county and that of socially connected counties remained statistically significant, albeit of smaller magnitude than under the first specification (1.09 (95% CI: [0.66, 1.52], $p < 0.01$; Fig. S1, blue point). Compared to the results of the main analysis presented in Table 1, where the point estimates for the first and second models were 3.34 and 2.78 respectively, the effect sizes estimated using age-adjusted suicide mortality rates as outcomes are attenuated by approximately 60%. This attenuation likely owes to differences in outcome definitions: while crude suicide mortality rates cannot be compared among counties with differing age composition, age-adjusted suicide mortality rates can be compared since they reflect the burden in a population whose age composition has been aligned with the 2000 US Standard Population.

Despite this attenuation, the direction and statistical significance of the estimated associations are consistent across outcome definitions and model specifications, providing evidence for the robustness of the relation between social exposure and suicide mortality. Full regression results are provided in Table S1. Overall, our findings suggest that suicide risk is shaped by social connectedness among counties, beyond the role of spatial proximity and age structure.

ERPO Exposure: Related Evidence and Sensitivity Analyses

Prior evaluations of the impact of intensified ERPO enforcement following high-profile violent incidents found significant reductions in firearm-related suicide mortality, from 7.5% in Indiana to 13.7% in Connecticut (Kivisto et al., 2018). A recent study examining responses from 4,583 ERPO respondents across California, Connecticut, Maryland, and Washington estimated that 17 to 23 ERPOs could prevent one suicide (Swanson et al., 2024). Further, effectiveness was even greater when the petitions explicitly documented suicidal behavior, with only 13 to 18 ERPOs required to prevent one suicide. Additionally, county-level evidence from Oregon highlights the social aspects of ERPO effectiveness, indicating that approximately 73% of petitions explicitly mentioned concerns about suicidal behavior (Zeoli et al., 2021).

To assess the robustness of our findings to outcome specification, we re-estimated the models evaluating the effect of ERPO exposure using *age-adjusted suicide mortality rates* ($\tilde{y}_{it}$) as outcomes. This alternative outcome definition accounts for demographic heterogeneity across counties and helps disentangle variation in suicide risk from variation in age structure. Age standardization was performed using direct standardization across 18 age groups defined by the NVSS age recode system, as explained above. Age-adjusted suicide mortality rates were expressed in terms of the number of suicide deaths per 100,000 people.

Table S1: **Estimates of socio-spatial correlates of county-level suicide mortality obtained via two-way fixed effects regressions, using *age-adjusted* death rates**. In Model (1), county-level age-adjusted suicide mortality rates ($\tilde{y}_{it}$) are regressed on standardized deaths in social proximity ($\tilde{s}_{-it}$). Model (2) additionally controls for standardized deaths in spatial proximity ($\tilde{d}_{-it}$) to disentangle the role of social ties from that of geographical proximity. Both models include county and year fixed effects and adjust for time-varying county-level characteristics: population density, racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, and percent with less than high school education. Age distribution variables are excluded, as the dependent variable is already adjusted for population structure. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

	Outcome variable: county-level age-adjusted suicide mortality rate	
	Model 1	Model 2
Deaths in social proximity $\tilde{s}_{-it}$	1.287^{***}	1.089^{***}
	(0.207)	(0.213)
Deaths in spatial proximity $\tilde{d}_{-it}$		0.537^{**}
		(0.238)
Population density	-1.190^{***}	-1.082^{**}
	(0.400)	(0.413)
Percent Asian	-0.766^{***}	-0.764^{***}
	(0.196)	(0.190)
Percent Black	-1.222^{**}	-1.291^{**}
	(0.577)	(0.604)
Percent Other	0.134	0.093
	(0.176)	(0.170)
Percent Hispanic	-3.284^{***}	-3.313^{***}
	(0.817)	(0.773)
Median household income	-0.748^{***}	-0.727^{***}
	(0.148)	(0.149)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.065	-0.051
	(0.077)	(0.076)
Percent unemployed	0.164	0.154
	(0.162)	(0.153)
Percent with less than high school education	0.029	0.021
	(0.102)	(0.102)
Observations	40,794	40,794
R^2	0.566	0.566
Adjusted R^2	0.529	0.530

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01



Figure S1: **Role of social ties in county-level suicide mortality, with and without controlling for geographical proximity.** Estimated regression coefficients ($\hat{\eta}_1$) for suicide mortality rates in socially connected counties ($\tilde{s}_{-it}$) in two models, using age standardization. Model 1 (red): without adjustment for deaths in spatial proximity ($\tilde{d}_{-it}$). Model 2 (blue): with adjustment for deaths in spatial proximity ($\tilde{d}_{-it}$). Horizontal lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). The vertical dashed line indicates the null hypothesis ($\eta_1 = 0$). Point estimate in model 1: 1.29 (95% CI: [0.87, 1.70]); point estimate in model 2: 1.09 (95% CI: [0.66, 1.52]). All models include county and year fixed effects as well as time-varying county-level demographic and socioeconomic control variables (see Table S1).

We estimated three fixed effects models. The first model considered the direct effect of ERPO implementation. The second model considered the indirect effect of social exposure to ERPOs, through social ties. The third model included both social and spatial ERPO exposure as regressors. The first model specification included county (ϕ_i) and year (ϕ_t) fixed effects, while the second and third model specifications included county fixed effects and state-by-year fixed effects (γ_{st}).

The specification for the first model is as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \kappa_1 ERPO_{it} + \boldsymbol{\kappa}_2^\top \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{S5}$$

The specification for the second model is as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \tau_1 ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it} + \boldsymbol{\tau}_2^\top \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{S6}$$

The specification for the third model is as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_{it} = \omega_1 ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it} + \omega_2 ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure_{it} + \boldsymbol{\omega}_3^\top \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{S7}$$

Where $\tilde{y}_{it}$ is the age-adjusted suicide mortality rate in county i and year t; $ERPO\ Social\ Exposure_{it}$ represents the standardized share of social ties to counties located in ERPO-implementing states; $ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure_{it}$ corresponds to the inverse-distance-weighted spatial exposure to counties located in ERPO-implementing states; and $\overline{X}_{it}$ represents county- and year-specific demographic and socioeconomic control variables.

Direct effects of ERPO implementation. Using the first model, we estimated that ERPO implementation in a given state was associated with a reduction of $\widehat{\kappa} = -0.6112$ (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-1.00, -0.22]) deaths per 100,000 people at the county level. Such a reduction is substantial and highlights the potential population-level benefits of expanding the implementation of ERPOs to other states. Of note, because the ERPO variable varies at the state–year level, we clustered standard errors by state to ensure conservative inference.

Indirect effects of ERPO implementation through social ties. Using the second model, we estimated that a one-standard-deviation increase in social connectedness to counties located in ERPO-implementing states was associated with a reduction of $\widehat{\tau}_1 = -0.218$ (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-0.313, -0.123]) deaths per 100,000 people in a given focal county. This finding suggests that greater social proximity to counties with active ERPO policies is associated with measurable reductions in age-adjusted suicide mortality, independently of local legislation.

Effects of social and spatial exposures to ERPO implementation. When additionally controlling for geographical proximity to counties located in ERPO-implementing states in the third model, we estimated a reduction of $\widehat{\omega}_1 = -0.253$ (cluster-robust 95% CI: [-0.394, -0.111]) deaths per 100,000 people for a one-standard-deviation increase in social connectedness to counties located in ERPO-implementing states. Such robustness in the estimated indirect effect of social exposure to ERPOs suggests that social networks play a protective role, beyond geographical proximity to ERPO-implementing states.

Comparison between results from main versus supplementary analyses. The magnitude of the estimated indirect effects of ERPO implementation, through social ties, was slightly attenuated in our supplementary analyses using age-adjusted rather than crude suicide mortality rates; yet the directionality and significance of the results remained consistent with the main analysis. In sum, our findings were robust to alternative outcome definitions and model specifications, reinforcing that both direct and indirect exposure to ERPO implementation can contribute to reductions in suicide mortality.



Figure S2: **Indirect effects of ERPO implementation on suicide mortality, through social ties, with and without controlling for geographical proximity.** Estimated regression coefficients ($\hat{\tau}_1$, $\hat{\omega}_1$) for *ERPO Social Exposure* in two models. Baseline model (red): without controlling for *ERPO Spatial Exposure*. Alternative model (blue): controlling for *ERPO Spatial Exposure*. Point estimate in baseline model: ($\hat{\tau}_1 = -0.218$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.314, -0.123]$); point estimate in alternative model: ($\hat{\omega}_1 = -0.253$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.394, -0.111]$). Horizontal lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). The vertical dashed line indicates the null hypothesis ($\tau_1 = 0$). Both models included county and state–year fixed effects (ϕ_i, γ_{st}) as well as demographic and socioeconomic control variables ($\overline{X}_{it}$).

Table S2: **Estimated effects of ERPO policy exposure on county-level *age-adjusted* suicide mortality rates (expressed in terms of the number of deaths per 100,000 people).** Column (1) reports direct effects of local ERPO implementation with county and year fixed effects. Column (2) reports indirect effects of ERPO social exposure, measured through inter-county social ties, estimated with county and state–year fixed effects. Column (3) reports results from the indirect social exposure model, with an additional control for ERPO spatial exposure as well as county and state–year fixed effects. All models adjust for population density, racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, percent with less than high school education, and political affiliation. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

	Outcome variable: county-level age-adjusted suicide mortality rate		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
ERPO	-0.611^{***}		
	(0.195)		
ERPO social exposure		-0.218^{***}	-0.253^{***}
		(0.047)	(0.070)
ERPO spatial exposure			0.276
			(0.267)
Population density	-1.553^{***}	-0.639	-0.671
	(0.422)	(0.532)	(0.516)
Percent Asian	-1.355^{**}	-2.411^{***}	-2.344^{***}
	(0.528)	(0.614)	(0.600)
Percent Black	-0.929^{***}	-0.507^{***}	-0.491^{***}
	(0.226)	(0.172)	(0.170)
Percent Other	0.213	-0.048	-0.062
	(0.191)	(0.188)	(0.191)
Percent Hispanic	-3.460^{***}	-1.546^{***}	-1.585^{***}
	(0.989)	(0.555)	(0.562)
Median household income	-0.729^{***}	-0.635^{***}	-0.611^{***}
	(0.166)	(0.224)	(0.221)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.092	-0.151^{*}	-0.157^{**}
	(0.082)	(0.076)	(0.073)
Percent unemployed	0.181	-0.102	-0.099
	(0.171)	(0.135)	(0.136)
Percent with less than high school education	0.057	-0.077	-0.094
	(0.124)	(0.109)	(0.109)
Political affiliation	0.036	0.140	0.124
	(0.164)	(0.152)	(0.154)
Observations	40,794	40,794	40,794
R^2	0.565	0.575	0.577
Adjusted R^2	0.528	0.532	0.534

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

Robustness Test: Controlling for Deaths in Social Proximity

To further validate our findings, we conducted a robustness test by building a model that additionally controls for deaths in socially connected counties. This alternative specification helps address potential confounding emanating from correlated suicide mortality rates across the social network. Specifically, social connectedness may serve as a proxy for shared environmental characteristics prone to elevated suicide risk or common cultural and structural determinants of suicide that operate independently of ERPO policies. Without accounting for these baseline correlations in suicide mortality, the estimated effects of ERPO social exposure could reflect pre-existing social network-level patterns rather than true policy impacts.

We estimated two fixed effects models. The first model considered crude suicide mortality rates as outcomes, while the second model considered age-adjusted mortality rates as outcomes. Both models included standardized social and spatial ERPO exposure variables. Additionally, both models included county fixed effects (ϕ_i) and state-by-year fixed effects (γ_{st}), with standard errors clustered at the state level. The control variables for deaths in social proximity (s_{-it} in the first model and $\tilde{s}_{-it}$ in the second model) correspond to the SCI-weighted average of contemporaneous suicide mortality in socially connected counties, excluding the focal county itself. By adjusting for these network-level suicide mortality patterns, we can isolate the effect of ERPO social exposure.

The regression equation for the first model is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} = \alpha_1\, \mathit{ERPO\ Social\ Exposure}_{it} + \alpha_2\, \mathit{ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure}_{it} \\ + \alpha_3\, s_{-it} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_4^\top\, \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it}. \end{aligned} \tag{S8}$$

The regression equation for the second model is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{y}_{it} = \vartheta_1\, \mathit{ERPO}\ \widetilde{\mathit{Social}}\ \mathit{Exposure}_{it} + \vartheta_2\, \mathit{ERPO}\ \widetilde{\mathit{Spatial}}\ \mathit{Exposure}_{it} \\ + \vartheta_3\, \tilde{s}_{-it} + \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_4^\top\, \overline{X}_{it} + \phi_i + \gamma_{st} + \varepsilon_{it}. \end{aligned} \tag{S9}$$

Where y_{it} is the crude suicide mortality rate in county i and year t (expressed in terms of the number of deaths per 100,000 people); $\tilde{y}_{it}$ is the corresponding age-adjusted suicide mortality rate; $\mathit{ERPO\ Social\ Exposure}_{it}$ and $\mathit{ERPO\ Spatial\ Exposure}_{it}$ are social and spatial ERPO exposure variables; s_{-it} is the SCI–weighted average of *crude* suicide deaths in socially connected counties ($j \neq i$); $\tilde{s}_{-it}$ is the corresponding *age-adjusted* variable; and $\overline{X}_{it}$ denotes time-varying county-level demographic and socioeconomic control variables. All specifications include county fixed effects (ϕ_i) and state-by-year fixed effects (γ_{st}); inference uses robust standard errors clustered by state.

The negative association between suicide mortality in a given focal county and ERPO social exposure remained robust after controlling for contemporaneous suicide mortality in socially connected counties. As shown in Figure S3 and Tables S3 and S4, estimated coefficients for the ERPO social exposure variable were consistently negative and statistically significant, irrespective of whether crude suicide mortality rates ($\hat{\alpha}_1 = -0.304$, 95% CI: $[-0.472, -0.136]$) or age-adjusted suicide mortality rates ($\hat{\vartheta}_1 = -0.270$, 95% CI: $[-0.420, -0.120]$) were used as outcomes. Notably, the association between suicide mortality in a given focal county and deaths in social proximity was statistically significant in the model using age-adjusted suicide mortality rates ($\hat{\vartheta}_3 = -0.428$, $p < 0.05$) but not in the model using crude suicide mortality rates. This divergence likely reflects the role of the age standardization procedure, which removes heterogeneity in county-level age composition and can thus help better reveal underlying correlations in suicide mortality across socially connected counties that may otherwise be masked by differing age structures. Critically, the inclusion of this control variable did not materially alter the magnitude or significance of the association

between suicide mortality and ERPO social exposure under any model specification. The robustness of our findings suggests that indirect exposure to ERPOs through social ties independently explains reductions in suicide mortality in counties located in non-implementing states.



Figure S3: **Role of social ties in county-level suicide mortality, with and without age standardization.** Estimated regression coefficients ($\hat{\alpha}_1$, $\hat{\vartheta}_1$) for *ERPO Social Exposure* in two models, both controlling for deaths in social proximity. Baseline model (red): without age standardization. Alternative model (blue): with age standardization. Point estimate in baseline model: ($\hat{\alpha}_1 = -0.304$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.472, -0.136]$); point estimate in alternative model: ($\hat{\vartheta}_1 = -0.270$, cluster-robust 95% CI: $[-0.420, -0.120]$). Horizontal lines denote 95% confidence intervals (CI). The vertical dashed line indicates the null hypothesis. Both models include county and state-by-year fixed effects (ϕ_i, γ_{st}), demographic and socioeconomic control variables ($\overline{X}_{it}$), and a variable characterizing deaths in social proximity (s_{-it} or $\tilde{s}_{-it}$).

Table S3: **Estimated effects of ERPO policy exposure on county-level crude suicide mortality rates (expressed in terms of the number of deaths per 100,000 people).** The estimated effects includes county and state–year fixed effects. The model adjusts for deaths in social proximity s_{-it}, population density, age distribution (percent aged 0–17, 18–44 and 45–64), racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, percent with less than high school education, and political affiliation. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Outcome variable: county-level crude suicide mortality rate (per 100,000 people)	
ERPO social exposure	-0.304^{***}
	(0.084)
ERPO spatial exposure	0.514
	(0.312)
Deaths in social proximity s_{-it}	-0.491
	(1.149)
Population density	-0.652
	(0.587)
Percent aged 0-17	-0.186
	(0.370)
Percent aged 18-44	-0.121
	(0.556)
Percent aged 45-64	-0.514
	(0.402)
Percent Asian	-0.646^{**}
	(0.254)
Percent Black	-2.790^{***}
	(0.681)
Percent Other	-0.122
	(0.280)
Percent Hispanic	-2.876^{***}
	(0.826)
Median household income	-0.603^{***}
	(0.186)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.050
	(0.129)
Percent unemployed	-0.098
	(0.125)
Percent with less than high school education	-0.052
	(0.124)
Political affiliation	0.138
	(0.156)
Observations	40,794
R^2	0.947
Adjusted R^2	0.941

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01

Table S4: **Estimated effects of ERPO policy exposure on county-level age-adjusted suicide mortality (expressed in terms of the number of deaths per 100,000 people).** The model includes county and state–year fixed effects. The model adjusts for deaths in social proximity $\widetilde{s}_{-it}$ population density, racial composition (percent Asian, Black, and Other racial subgroups), ethnic composition (percent Hispanic), median household income, percent with limited English proficiency, percent unemployed, percent with less than high school education, and political affiliation. Standard errors are clustered at the state level.

Outcome variable: county-level age-adjusted suicide mortality rate (per 100,000 people)	
ERPO Social Exposure	-0.270^{***}
	(0.075)
ERPO Spatial Exposure	0.275
	(0.280)
Deaths in social proximity $\tilde{s}_{-it}$	-0.428^{**}
	(0.205)
Population density	-0.702
	(0.534)
Percent Asian	-2.361^{***}
	(0.609)
Percent Black	-0.529^{***}
	(0.173)
Percent Other	-0.073
	(0.195)
Percent Hispanic	-1.666^{***}
	(0.597)
Median household income	-0.621^{***}
	(0.221)
Percent with limited English proficiency	-0.159^{**}
	(0.074)
Percent unemployed	-0.094
	(0.137)
Percent with less than high school education	-0.094
	(0.110)
Political Affiliation	0.131
	(0.154)
Observations	40,794
R^2	0.577
Adjusted R^2	0.534

Robust standard errors in parentheses. * p<0.1; ** p<0.05; *** p<0.01