

Psychosocial Interventions for People Who Self-Harm: Methodological Issues Involved in Trials to Evaluate Effectiveness

Katrina Witt, Ellen Townsend, Ella Arensman, David Gunnell, Philip Hazell, Tatiana Taylor Salisbury, Kees Van Heeringen & Keith Hawton

To cite this article: Katrina Witt, Ellen Townsend, Ella Arensman, David Gunnell, Philip Hazell, Tatiana Taylor Salisbury, Kees Van Heeringen & Keith Hawton (2019): Psychosocial Interventions for People Who Self-Harm: Methodological Issues Involved in Trials to Evaluate Effectiveness, Archives of Suicide Research, DOI: [10.1080/13811118.2019.1592043](https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2019.1592043)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13811118.2019.1592043>



[View supplementary material](#)



Accepted author version posted online: 07 Apr 2019.
Published online: 10 Jul 2019.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 214



[View Crossmark data](#)



Psychosocial Interventions for People Who Self-Harm: Methodological Issues Involved in Trials to Evaluate Effectiveness

Katrina Witt, Ellen Townsend, Ella Arensman, David Gunnell, Philip Hazell, Tatiana Taylor Salisbury, Kees Van Heeringen, and Keith Hawton

We have assessed the methodological quality of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of interventions to prevent self-harm repetition and suicide. Trials were identified in two systematic reviews of RCTs of psychosocial treatments following a recent (within six months) episode of self-harm indexed in any of five electronic databases (CCDANCTR-Studies and References, CENTRAL, Medline, Embase, and PsycINFO) between 1 January, 1998 and 29 April, 2015. A total of 66 trials were included, 55 in adults and 11 in children and adolescents. While evidence for efficacy of some approaches has grown, there were few trials from low-to-middle income countries, little information on interventions for males, information on the control condition was often limited, data on suicides were often not reported, and, while trials have increased in size in recent years, most have included too few participants to detect clinically significant results. There are major limitations in many trials of interventions for individuals who self-harm. Improved methodology, especially with regard to study size, provision of details of control therapy, and evaluation of key outcomes, would enhance the evidence base for clinicians and service users.

Keywords self-harm, attempted suicide, suicide, methodology, outcome

BACKGROUND

Self-harm [defined as intentional self-injury or self-poisoning irrespective of type of motivation or degree of suicidal intent; (Hawton, Zahl, & Weatherall, 2003)]

represents a significant public health burden worldwide (Haagsma et al., 2016). The term self-harm as used in the United Kingdom (UK) and several other countries includes behavior that in the United States of America (USA) would be categorized as

non-suicidal self-injury (NSSI) and suicidal behavior disorder (attempted suicide), but also non-suicidal (as well as suicidal) self-poisoning. Self-harm, and particularly self-poisoning, is an extremely common reason for presentation to health-care facilities. In the UK alone, for example, there are now more than 200,000 hospital presentations for self-harm each year (Hawton, Bergen et al., 2007). Self-harm is associated with numerous adverse outcomes. For example, between 16.3% (Carroll, Metcalfe, & Gunnell, 2014) and 30% (Perry et al., 2012) of those who present to hospital for self-harm will re-present to hospital following a repeat episode within one year. There will also be further episodes of self-harm which do not result in hospital representation (Guthrie et al., 2001). The risk of suicide is also elevated; over a one year period following an episode of self-harm between 1.0% (Beckman et al., 2016) and 1.6% (Carroll et al., 2014) of those presenting to hospital will die by suicide.

Given the prevalence of self-harm, the frequency with which it is repeated, and its association with completed suicide it is important that effective treatment interventions are developed and rigorously evaluated for their effectiveness. This has led in recent decades to a proliferation of therapeutic interventions to reduce self-harm repetition and suicide. A Cochrane Collaboration systematic review and meta-analysis, published in 1998, for example, identified 19 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of psychosocial interventions to reduce repetition of self-harm in adults, and only one for children and adolescents specifically (Hawton et al., 1998), whereas a recent update of this review identified 66 RCTs of psychosocial interventions; 55 for adults and 11 for

children and adolescents (Hawton et al., 2015b; 2016b).

Emerging evidence from meta-analysis of these RCTs suggests cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) based psychotherapy shows promise in reducing the proportion of adults repeating self-harm and that dialectical behavior therapy may reduce frequency of repetition of self-harm in both adults and adolescents (Hawton et al., 2016a, 2016b). However, there remains limited evidence about the effectiveness of other psychosocial interventions for self-harm repetition (Hetrick, Robinson, Spittal, & Carter, 2016). This is partly because most RCTs are underpowered to detect clinically significant effects (Arensman et al., 2001).

We previously undertook a review of the methodological quality of randomized controlled trials of psychosocial and pharmacological interventions for the prevention of self-harm repetition, finding that, in general, most trials included too few participants to detect clinically important differences in rates of repeated self-harm (Arensman et al., 2001). We also found that information on the method of randomization, content of the intervention and control arms, and information on the representativeness of patients in these RCTs was typically lacking (Arensman et al., 2001). We therefore recommended that investigators should include power calculations to justify their sample size, that specific subgroups of patients, in particular those engaging in self-cutting or with alcohol and other drug use comorbidity, should be included to provide greater sample representativeness, and that authors should provide more details on the experimental intervention and control conditions (Arensman et al., 2001).

We have investigated the methodological quality of RCTs of psychosocial

interventions for people who self-harm based on our recent update of the treatment literature on the effectiveness of psychosocial interventions for self-harm in adults and children and adolescents (Hawton et al., 2015b, 2016a, 2016b). The aim of the current study was to provide updated guidance for investigators conducting trials in this area.

METHODS

Search Strategy

We searched for randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of psychosocial treatments following a recent (within six months) episode of SH indexed in any of five electronic databases (CCDANCTR-Studies and References, CENTRAL, Medline, Embase, and PsycINFO) between January 1, 1998 and April 29, 2015 using the electronic search strategy outlined in *Supplementary Appendix 1*. Further hand searches were made of the reference lists of 44 major review papers, 10 English language specialist suicidology, and more general psychiatric journals. We also contacted researchers active in the field to identify unpublished literature.

Inclusion Criteria

Trials were eligible for inclusion provided they met the following criteria: (1) used random allocation to assign participants to the intervention and control groups; (2) all participants had engaged in self-harm no more than six months prior to randomization; and (3) the trial evaluated the effectiveness of any psychosocial therapy relative to treatment as usual (TAU), enhanced usual care (EUC), treatment by expert, or other standard forms of

psychotherapy. Non-English language trials were eligible for inclusion and were translated by native speakers.

Trials were screened independently for inclusion by KW and one of either TTS, EA, DG, PH, ET, or KvH. Disagreements were resolved following discussion with KH. Where insufficient information was recorded in the study report to determine eligibility, study authors were contacted to provide additional clarification.

Appraising Methodological Quality

Given the focus of this article, we rated the quality of the included studies with regards to our previous recommendations for improving the quality of RCTs of interventions for self-harm (Arensman et al., 2001). Specifically, KW and one of TTS, EA, DG, PH, ET, and KvH rated each included trial with regards to: (1) how representative the sample was of people who present to clinical services following self-harm; (2) clear definition of the intervention, including use of clearly specified and manualized interventions; (3) clear definition of the treatment(s) received by participants allocated to the control condition; (4) use of standardized outcome measures both for the primary outcome measure as well as any secondary outcomes reported; (5) whether hypothesized mechanisms of change were investigated; and (6) adequacy of the sample size and use of power calculations to justify the sample size.

Risk of Bias Assessment

For each study, we also assessed risk of bias using the approach favored by the Cochrane Collaboration (Higgins, Deeks, & Altman, 2008). Specifically, this tool

assesses bias according to seven domains, including: (7) adequacy of the random sequence generation; (8) allocation concealment; (9) blinding of participants, clinical personnel and outcome assessors; (10) incomplete data bias as well as the adequacy of information on the proportion of participants who withdrew from the trial together with reasons for withdrawing; (11) selective outcome reporting bias; and (12) other biases including details on the use of intention-to-treat analyses for all measured outcomes. Each study was rated as at high, unclear, or low risk of bias across each of these seven domains.

RESULTS

The systematic search outlined in [Supplementary Appendix 1](#) retrieved a total of 23,830 citations. An additional 10 trials ongoing at the time of the systematic search were identified through hand searching. This figure was reduced to 16,799 following de-duplication. A total of 16,538 were excluded following screening, while a further 245 were excluded after reviewing the full text, including seven trials that were excluded from the present review as they evaluated the effectiveness of a pharmacological intervention ([Hawton et al., 2015a](#)).

A total of 66 independent RCTs were therefore included in the present article, comprising 55 trials of psychosocial interventions for self-harm in adults (aged 18 years of age and older), and 11 in children and adolescents (up to 18 years of age) ([Figure 1](#)).

Study Characteristics

Full methodological details of these 66 trials are provided in [Table 1](#). Briefly, the

included trials comprised a total of 18,256 participants (17,117 in trials in adults and 1,139 in trials of children and adolescents). All participants had engaged in at least one episode of self-harm in the six months prior to randomization.

The largest number of trials had been conducted in the United Kingdom (UK; 23 trials; 34.9%), followed by the United States of America (USA; 13 trials; 19.7%). Fewer studies were conducted in New Zealand (5 trials; 7.6%), Australia (3 trials; 4.6%), Canada (2 trials; 3.0%), Denmark (2 trials; 3.0%), France (2 trials; 3.0%), Germany (2 trials; 3.0%), The Netherlands (2 trials; 3.0%), and the Republic of Ireland (2 trials; 3.0%). One trial was conducted in each of the following countries: Belgium, China, Finland, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, and Sweden. One study was a multicenter study set in a number of different countries.

Study Representativeness

Since the publication of our original commentary in 2001 ([Arensman et al., 2001](#)), an increasing number of trials have been conducted in low-to-middle income countries, including: Brazil, China, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka. However, in line with previous research ([Gholamrezaei, De Stefano, & Heath, 2017](#)), we found that most trials to date, including more recent ones, have been conducted in high income Western countries; particularly the UK and USA.

Sample Representativeness

In all trials, at least one exclusion criterion was specified ([Table 1](#)). Age was the




FIGURE 1. PRISMA flow diagram of included and excluded studies for this version of the review.

commonest reason for participant exclusion, reported in 55 (83.3%) trials, followed by intellectual disability and/or diagnosis of organic cognitive disorders (38 trials; 57.6%), residing outside of the study catchment area and/or homelessness (29 trials; 43.9%), and insufficient language ability (19 trials; 28.8%).

A number of trials also excluded potential participants on the basis of a diagnosis for any major mental illness (35 trials; 53.0%). Most commonly, this was for a diagnosis of psychosis and/or psychotic symptoms (35 trials; 53.0%), followed

by bipolar disorder (12 trials; 18.2%). Potential participants with alcohol and other drug dependence and/or intoxication were also excluded from a number of these trials (21 trials; 31.8%). In several trials participants were also excluded because they were currently receiving or had been referred for psychiatric treatment (24 trials; 36.7%), including where treatment had been legally mandated (2 trials; 3.0%).

With regards to gender, males were specifically excluded from six trials while in a seventh, although males were eligible for participation, no males were ultimately

TABLE 1. Methodological characteristics and risk of bias for the 66 studies included in this version of the review.

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age INV C/I (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		Country	INV C/I					Control	Outpatient		
ADULTS											
Allard, Marshall, and Paine (1992)	Canada	76	74	55.3	Patients presenting to hospital following a suicide attempt.	• Currently receiving treatment through another service	Intensive outpatient therapy: Comprising a schedule of visits including at least one home visit. Either written report supplemented by and/or telephone reminders were sent to participants in the case of Treatment use: missed appointments.	Repetition of SH: Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report and/or hospital records.	Repetition of SH: Self-report. Unclear if random sequence was adequately generated.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Unclear if outcome assessors blind to treatment allocation. Data on 24 participants lost to follow-up not reported and reasons for participant attrition not provided.	
Bateman and Fonagy (2009)	UK	71	63	88.4	Consecutive referrals to one of two community outpatient psychiatric facilities, one of which specializes in the treatment of personality disorder.	• Aged less than 18 or older than 65	Mentalization-based therapy: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
YOUTH											
Barlow et al. (2004)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 12–17 years old.	• Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms	Structured case management: Comprising three monthly individual and group therapy sessions based on a counseling model involving a supporting approach combined with	Repetition of SH: Hospital records, including duration of hospital admission, perceptions for any psychotropic medication, Global Symptom Index (GSI), and Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 12–17 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
SENIORS											
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 60 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
GENERAL POPULATION											
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 60 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
MENTAL HEALTH											
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 60 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
CRIMINAL JUSTICE											
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 60 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
GENERAL											
Beardslee et al. (2000)	USA	100	100	14.0	Patients aged 60 years old.	• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or	Functional skills training: Comprising weekly individual and group psychotherapy sessions. Participants were also prescribed psychotropic medication as required.	Assessment of Functioning (GAF).	Repetition of SH: Hospital records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	

	Study	Country	Design	Participants	Interventions	Outcomes	Notes	(Continued)	
								Exclusions	Inclusion
Beautrais, Gibb, Faulkner, Ferguson, and Mulder (2010)	153 174 33.6 (NS)	New Zealand	66.1	Patients admitted to a psychiatric emergency service following an episode of self-harm or attempted suicide.	• Aged less than 16; • Insufficient language ability.	Postcards: Series of six postcards mailed at 2 and 6 weeks and again at 3, 6, 9, and 12 months post- discharge. Postcards offered outreach, encouraging participants to make contact with the service in times of distress.	Repetition of SH: Medical records and hospital records at 2 and 6 months post-discharge. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Participants not blind to allocation. Imbalance between intervention and control groups for number with prior admissions for self-harm. Adjusting for this reduced effect on repetition of self-harm to non- significance.	Problem-Solving: Inventory of Interpersonal Problems, circumflex version. Social Adjustment: Social Adjustment Scale-self report. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.
Bennewith, Stocks, Gunnell, Peters, Evans, and Sharp (2002)	964 968	UK	58.8	Patients presenting to hospital following an episode of self-harm and who are registered with one of the participating primary care practices.	• Aged less than 16 • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness; and • Residing in prison and/or custodial environment.	Letter to general practitioner: Comprising a letter from the patient's treating general practitioner inviting the patient to a consultation. TAU: Could comprise ongoing general practitioner care, referral for psychiatric treatment, and/or other referrals.	Repetition of SH: Medical records.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Additionally, no information on outcome assessor blinded provided.	
Brown et al. (2005)	60 60 35.0 (10.3)	USA	60.8	Patients presenting to hospital following a suicide attempt.	• Aged less than 16 • Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ suicide attempt.	CBT-based psychotherapy: Comprising 10 sessions of manualized cognitive- behavioral therapy.	Repetition of SH: Self- report.	Participants, clinical personnel, and outcome Depression, BDI and	

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		INV	CTL								
Carter et al. (2005)	Australia	378	394	NS	67.9	Patients presenting to a hospital-based toxicology service following an episode of intentional self-poisoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> or unable to provide informed consent; Insufficient language ability; and Presence of physical illness and/or disability that would preclude attendance at follow-up appointments. 	Control conditions: behavioral therapy. Intervention: TAU; No details provided.	Outcome ascertainment: Hamilton Rating Scale for Depression (HRSd). Risk of bias: Hopelessness Scale (BHS).	assessors not blind to treatment allocation.	
Cedercren, Moni, and Ojehagen (2002)	Sweden	107	109	66.2	Patients treated in general hospitals following a suicide attempt.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient language ability; and • No telephone connection. 	Control conditions: Comprising two telephone calls (20-45 minutes) at 4 and 8 months post-discharge encouraging participants to receive treatment at times of distress.	Intervention: Self-report. Outcome ascertainment: GAF.	Nature of the trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Additionally, no information on outcome assessor blinded provided.	
Clarke et al. (2002)	UK	220	247	33.0 (NS)	56.3	Patients presenting to hospital following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16; 	Control conditions: TAU; No details provided.	Intervention: Hospital records. Outcome ascertainment: Self-report.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on assessment, development	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently enrolled in full-time secondary education; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness. 	<p>of a negotiated care plan, and referral to a case manager who helped the patient identify and access suitable services as required.</p> <p>TAU: Could involve triage, referral for medical and/or psychosocial assessment, and treatment as required.</p>	<p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p> <p>suicides had to be requested from authors, suggesting selective reporting bias may have been present.</p>	<p>Brief alcohol counseling: Comprising a one-off (30 minute) appointment with an alcohol treatment nurse specialist Session involved assessment and discussion of both current and previous drinking behaviors, provision of a health information leaflet on the damaging effects of excessive alcohol consumption, ability; and</p> <p>Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: hospital records</p> <p>Alcohol use: Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT).</p> <p>Mental health: General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12).</p> <p>Personality disorder: Assessment of Personality – Abbreviated Scale.</p> <p>Suicide: Collateral informant report.</p>	<p>Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data on suicides had to be requested from authors, suggesting selective reporting bias may have been present.</p>		
Crawford et al. (2010)	UK	51	52	48.5	<p>Consecutive admissions to an emergency department following an episode of self-harm and who were diagnosed with alcohol misuse according to scores on the Paddington Alcohol Test.</p> <p>Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent;</p> <p>Insufficient language ability; and</p> <p>Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness.</p>	<p>Currently receiving AOD treatment through another service and/or those who requested a referral for AOD treatment;</p> <p>or on the Paddington Alcohol Test.</p>	<p>Treatment satisfaction: Client Satisfaction Questionnaire.</p> <p>Participants could also be referred to individual counseling or detoxification services as required.</p> <p>TAU: Comprising a health information leaflet advising on the damaging effects of excessive alcohol consumption, and the contact details of a nationally-based alcohol misuse help line.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age INV CTR (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Davidson, Brown, James, UK Kirk, and Richardson (2014)		14	6 NS	Not reported.		Patients admitted to the medical receiving ward of the local accident and emergency department following an episode of self-harm.	• Aged less than 18 or older than 65; and • Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent.	CBT-based psychotherapy: Manualized CBT comprising psychoeducation to help participants understand self-harm, potential alternative behaviors, and referral to further mental health care where necessary.	Repetition of SH: Self-report according to Acts of Deliberate Self-Harm Inventory.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
Dubois et al. (1999)	France	51	51 22.3(5.8)	79.4	Patients attending any emergency department following self-harm	• Currently receiving treatment through another service.	• Aged less than 15 or older than 34;	CBT-based psychotherapy: Manualized CBT comprising 5 sessions delivered during the first month post-discharge.	Repetition of SH: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Less than two-thirds of participants in the intervention group attended all three treatment sessions.	

Evans (1999a)	UK	417 410	55.4	Patients admitted to general hospitals following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/ or misuse; • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness; and • Violence risk. 	Emergency card: Comprising Repetition of SH: Hospital records, offering a 24-hour service for crisis telephone consultation with an on-call psychiatrist at times of distress. TAU: no details provided.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.
Evans (1999b)	UK	18 16 NS	61.8	Patients admitted to one of two general hospitals following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16 or older than 50; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and • Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ or unable to provide informed consent. 	CBT-based psychotherapy: Comprising between 2 and 6 sessions of manualized assisted CBT including sessions on basic cognitive techniques, Anxiety: HADS, problem-solving, emotion Depression: HADS, regulation training, and relapse prevention in those diagnosed with personality disorders. TAU: could involve contact with social workers (25.0%), psychiatrists (31.3%), community mental health teams (18.9%), 12.5% of the TAU group did not receive any form of treatment, whilst the remaining 12.3% was not recorded.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Five participants in the intervention group did not see a therapist and instead received bibliotherapy whilst one further participant received no intervention. Authors undertook <i>per protocol</i> analyses only, as data from 2 participants who dropped out following randomization and treatment allocation were not analyzed.

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTRL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Flischmann et al. (2008)	Multinational	922 945	58.2	Patients presenting to emergency care settings following an episode of self-harm or self-poisoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnosed with any physical illness and/or disability and/or any mental illness that would preclude assessment and/or attendance at follow-up appointments; • Insufficient language ability; • Refusal to provide informed consent; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness. 	<p>Support: Comprising one-off information session on suicidal behavior as a signal of distress, risk and protective factors for suicide, basic epidemiology, information on repetition risk, alternatives to suicidal behaviors, and referral options. Participants could also elect to receive telephone or home visits to provide referral support.</p> <p>TAU: Typically involved acute treatment for medical complications following self-harm/self-poisoning without further treatment or support.</p>	<p>Brief information and support: Self-report Nature of trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding provided. No data on reasons for participant attrition provided, nor were analyses conducted according to intention-to-treat principles. Some evidence of selective outcome reporting bias as information on treatment adherence, depression, hopelessness, impulsivity, suicidal intent, have been published for some (i.e., China, India, and the Islamic Republic of Iran) but not all (i.e., Australia, Vietnam) study sites.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.</p>	
Gibbons, Butler, Urwin, UK and Gibbons (1978)	200 200 NS	71.0	Patients presenting to accident and emergency departments following an episode of deliberate self-poisoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 17; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Engaged in self-injury only; • Refusal to provide informed consent; and • Residing in prison and/or custodial environment. 	<p>CBT-based psychotherapy: Crisis-oriented problem-solving based treatment provided in the home with additional emotional regulation treatment elements.</p> <p>TAU: Could include referral to general practitioners (54.0%), psychiatric treatment services (33.0%), or another, unspecified treatment service (13.0%).</p>	<p>Depression: BDI:</p> <p>Problem-solving: Self-reported problems.</p> <p>Treatment use: Hospital and/or medical and/or social welfare records.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Hospital and/or medical records.</p>	<p>Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.</p>	

Gratz and Gunderson (2006)	USA	13	11	100.0	Clinician referrals or self-referrals to a specialist personality disorder treatment service for women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 60; • Attended a DBT skills program within the past 6 months; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; • Males; and • Suicide risk. 	Emotion-regulation group psychotherapy: Involved weekly emotion-regulation group-based therapy and individual emotion regulation therapy sessions. Depression: DASS. Emotion regulation: designed to develop awareness and understanding of self-harming behavior, skills to engage in goal-directed behaviors whilst inhibiting impulsive behaviors without experiencing negative emotions, and developing confidence in using situationally appropriate strategies to moderate either the intensity or duration of negative emotions, and gaining a sense of acceptance of negative emotional states. TAU: Could include referral to individual emotion regulation therapy sessions and/or group-based psychotherapy (not emotion-focused).	Repetition of SH: self-report No information on allocation concealment was provided. Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Additionally, outcome assessors not blind to treatment allocation. Authors undertook <i>per protocol</i> analyses only, as data from 2 participants who dropped out following randomization and treatment allocation were not analyzed.	Emotion-regulation group psychotherapy: Involved weekly emotion-regulation group-based therapy and individual emotion regulation therapy sessions. Depression Anxiety Stress Scale (DASS): DASS. Emotion regulation: Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale (DERS). Experiential Avoidance: Acceptance and Action Questionnaire (AAQ). Personality disorder: Borderline Evaluation of Severity over Time (BEST). Stress: DASS. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Repetition of SH: self-report No information on allocation concealment was provided. Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.
Gratz et al. (2014)	USA	31	31	100.0	Clinician referrals or self-referrals to a specialist personality disorder treatment service for women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 60; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; 	Emotion-regulation group psychotherapy: Involved weekly emotion-regulation group-based therapy and individual emotion regulation therapy sessions. Depression: BDI and DASS. Emotion regulation: DERS. Experiential Avoidance: Experiential Avoidance.	Repetition of SH: self-report No information on allocation concealment was provided. Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.		

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL	Age Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
			INV	CTL					
Guthrie et al. (2001)	UK	58	61	31.2 (1.5)	55.5	Patients presenting to hospital following an episode of deliberate self-poisoning.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 65; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Insufficient language ability; • Not registered with a GP; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness. 	<p>Repetition of SH: self-report</p> <p>CBT-based psychotherapy: weekly (50 minute) sessions of individual, home-based psychodynamic interpersonal therapy.</p> <p>TAU: Typically this involved assessment by the treating doctor in the emergency department, referral to outpatient psychiatric treatment, addiction services, or general practitioner management.</p>	<p>Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Although outcome assessors blind to allocation, data on repetition of SH obtained from self-report.</p> <p>Treatment satisfaction: 10-point idiosyncratic scale.</p> <p>Treatment use: Medical records.</p>
							<p>Social Functioning: Sheehan Disability Scale.</p> <p>Stress: DASS.</p> <p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p>		

Hamed, Korslund, and USA Linahan (2014)	19	7	100.0	Patients seeking treatment from a specialist service for suicidal women with comorbid borderline personality disorder and post-traumatic stress disorder.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 60; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent; • Legally mandated to a specific form of psychiatric treatment; and • Males. 	<p>DBT (prolonged exposure): Weekly individual psychotherapy sessions, group skills training, and telephone counseling as required. The prolonged exposure protocol enabled Dissociation experiences: Dissociative Experiences Scale-Taxon.</p> <p>DBT (regular exposure): DBT delivered according to the original exposure protocol. Involved weekly individual psychotherapy sessions, group skills training, and telephone counseling as required.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report using the Suicide Attempt Self-Injury Interview (SASI).</p> <p>Anxiety: HADRS.</p> <p>Depression: HADRS.</p> <p>Mental health: GSI and Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI).</p>	<p>Post-traumatic stress disorder: PTSD Symptom Scale-Interview.</p> <p>Shame: Experiences of Shame Scale.</p> <p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p>	<p>Treatment satisfaction: Client Satisfaction Questionnaire-8.</p>	<p>Trauma cognitions: Trauma-Related Guilt inventory.</p>
Hassanian-Moghadam, Islamic Republic of Iran Sarjami, Kolahi, and Carter (2011)			66.4	Admissions to a specialist poisons hospital.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 12; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent; • Insufficient language ability; • Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness; and 	<p>Postcards: Series of eight postcards sent 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 12 months post-discharge encouraging participants to make contact with the investigators during times of distress.</p>	<p>Suicidal Ideation: Self-report.</p> <p>Suicide: Collateral informant report supplemented by official death records.</p>	<p>TAU: Correspondence with study authors revealed that follow-up care in the Islamic Republic of Iran is typically poor. Contact</p>	<p>Treatment use: Self-report.</p>	

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Hatcher et al. (2011)	New Zealand	253	299 33.7 (12.9)	68.8	Patients admitted to hospital following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Violence risk. • Aged less than 16; Attended a DBT skills program and/or other specific treatment for borderline personality disorder; • Currently enrolled in full-time secondary education; and • Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ or unable to provide informed consent. 	CBT-based psychotherapy: Involved problem-solving therapy with sessions focused on problem orientation, problem listing, definition, brainstorming alternative coping strategies, and development of a crisis plan. TAU: Involved a one-off psychosocial assessment conducted by a mental health professional.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records Anxiety: HADRS. Depression: HADRS. Hopelessness: BHS. Problem-solving: Social Problem Solving Inventory-Revised. Suicidal Ideation: BSSI. Suicide: Coroner's records.	Use of Zeelen's post-consent design suggests participants not blind to allocation. Nature of the trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data on suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of selective outcome reporting bias.
Hatcher et al. (2015)	New Zealand	327	357	67.8	Patients admitted to hospital following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 17; • Currently enrolled in full-time secondary education; • Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ or unable to provide informed consent; and 	Multimodal intervention: Between 4 and 6 sessions of problem-solving therapy, series of eight postcards sent 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 months post-discharge; between 1 and Multi-Ethnic	Repetition of SH: Self-report Use of Zeelen's post-consent supplemented by hospital and medical records. Anxiety: HADRS. Cultural identity: Sense of Belonging Instrument-P and Multi-Ethnic	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-identity as having Maori ancestry (these patients were eligible for inclusion in Hatcher et al. 2016). 	<p>and 2 face-to-face or telephone support sessions, improved access to primary care through the provision of a voucher that could be used to access one free consultation with a general practitioner, development of a risk management strategy, and a cultural assessment.</p> <p>TAU: Could involve referral to multidisciplinary treatment teams for psychiatric risk/needs assessment, psychiatric intervention, or both, referral to a crisis team, or referral to community-based alcohol and drug treatment teams as required.</p>	<p>Identity.</p> <p>Depression: HADS.</p> <p>Hoplessness: BHS.</p> <p>Quality of life: EuroQual-5D.</p> <p>Treatment use: Self-report supplemented by medical records.</p>	<p>Social Functioning: Social Functioning Questionnaire-36.</p>	<p>Suicidal Ideation: BSSI.</p> <p>Suicide: Coroners records.</p>	<p>on suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of selective outcome reporting bias.</p>		
Hatcher et al. (2016)	New Zealand	95	72	65.3	<p>Patients admitted to hospital following an episode of self-harm and who self-identify as having Maori ancestry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aged less than 17; Currently enrolled in full-time secondary education; and Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent. 	<p>Culturally-adapted multimodal intervention: Between 4 and 6 sessions of problem-solving therapy, series of eight postcards sent 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, and 12 months post-discharge, between 1 and 2 face-to-face or telephone support sessions, improved access to primary care through</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report Use of Zelen's post-consent design suggests participants not blind to allocation. Nature of the trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data on suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of selective outcome reporting bias.</p> <p>Depression: HADRS.</p> <p>Hoplessness: BHS.</p> <p>Quality of life: EuroQual</p>

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		INV	CTL							
Hawton (1981)	UK	48	48	69.8	Patients admitted to general hospitals following an episode of deliberate self-poisoning.	• Aged less than 16; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment;	Home-based psychotherapy: Repetition of SH; self-report. Nature of the trial suggests Series of home-based, therapy sessions with a flexible schedule delivered according to the treating therapists' assessment of risk/needs. Open telephone access to the local general hospital was also available.	Repetition of SH; self-report. Nature of the trial suggests Series of home-based, Mood Scale sub-scale. Depression: Lorr and McNair Mood Scale subscale.	No information on whether participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Participant attrition was 6/96 (6.2%) at post-treatment and 15/96 (15.6%) at the 6-month follow-up assessments. No information on whether	5/10.
						• Currently receiving AOD treatment and/or referred for AOD treatment;	Social Adjustment: Modified version of the Social Adjustment Scale.	Suicidal Ideation:		

Hawton et al. (1987)	UK	41	39 29.3 (NS)	66.3	Patients admitted to a general hospital following an episode of self-poisoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaged in self-injury only; Refusal to provide informed consent; Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness; and Suicide risk. <p>Aged less than 16;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaged in self-injury only; Not in need of ongoing psychiatric treatment; Not registered with a GP; and Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness. 	<p>TAU: Weekly outpatient therapy sessions delivered at the local general hospital.</p> <p>CBT-based psychotherapy: Up to 8 sessions (up to 45 minutes) of problem-solving therapy.</p> <p>TAU: General practitioner-led Mental health: General care which could include individual support, marriage counseling, and referral for psychiatric treatment, as required.</p> <p>Adjustment Scale.</p> <p>Suicide Intent: BSIS.</p> <p>Suicide Risk: Buglass Risk of Repetition Scale.</p> <p>Suicide: Collateral informant report.</p> <p>Treatment satisfaction: Scores on an idiosyncratic scale of attitudes towards treatment.</p>
Husain et al. (2014)	Pakistan	108	113 23.1 (5.5)	68.8	Patients admitted to the medical unit of a university hospital following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aged less than 16 or older than 64; Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; 	<p>CBT-based psychotherapy: Manualized, culturally-adapted, problem-solving therapy involving sessions on evaluating the self-harm attempt, development of crisis management skills, training in the use of</p> <p>Repetition of SH: Self-report Participants and clinical personnel not blind using the (SASII).</p> <p>Depression: BD1</p> <p>Hoplessness: BHS.</p> <p>Quality of life: EuroQual-5D.</p> <p>Problem-solving: Coping Resource Inventory.</p> <p>Suicidal ideation: BSSI</p>

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Risk of Bias
Hvid et al. (2011)	Denmark	69	64.37.1 (17.9)	84.1	Patients admitted to an emergency or clinical department following an episode of self-harm.	• Aged less than 12; Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ or unable to provide informed consent; and Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness.	• Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; Intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder and/ or unable to provide informed consent; and Insufficient language ability.	• Delivered Repetition of SH: Hospital records according to the Bielum model. Sessions involved solution-focused problem- solving therapy; adherence therapy; therapist continuity; Assertive outreach via home visits, telephone calls, email measures, text messages, was also used to improve treatment adherence.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.	
										TAU: General practitioner-led management with referral to further psychiatric or psychological treatment as required.

Kapur et al. (2013)	UK	33	33 NS	Not reported. Admissions to emergency departments following an episode of self-harm.	• Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment;	Postcards: Series of letters mailed at 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12 months post-discharge; mailing of an information leaflet listing both local and national sources of support, and two semi-structured telephone calls all designed to facilitate referral to appropriate sources of specialist treatment as required.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records	No information on allocation concealment provided.
					• No telephone connection; and	Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.	
					• Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness.			
Kawanishi et al. (2014)	Japan	460	454 42.3 (14.9)	56.2	Admissions to emergency departments following a suicide attempt.	Aged less than 20; Diagnosed with any personality disorder without any comorbid axis one mental disorder; Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent;	Case management: Involving Repetition of SH: Unclear contact with patients at week 1 and months 1, 2, 3, 6, 12, and 18 post-discharge. Sessions were designed to collect information on treatment status, identify any problems that could interfere with adherence, and to coordinate referral to psychiatric treatment, general practitioners, social services, and other treatment services as needed. Participants also received access to a dedicated website designed to provide further information and resources.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on some pre-specified outcomes (i.e., number of repeat self-harm episodes, hopelessness scores) are yet to be published. Selective outcome reporting bias: therefore cannot be ruled out at present. Additionally, the sample was biased towards more compliant patients.
					• Insufficient language ability;	All cause mortality: Mortality register.		
					• Residing outside catchment area and/or homelessness; and	Hoplessness BHS: Hoplessness BHS.		
					• Unable to commit to schedule of regular face-to-face in-hospital appointments.	Quality of life: SFQ-36.		
						Suicide: Mortality register.		
						Treatment use: Medical records.		

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		12	12					100.0	Referrals to a personality disorder service	• Aged less than 18 or older than 45;	
Liberman and Eckman (1981)	USA	66.7	Referrals from psychiatric emergency services and/or accident and emergency departments following an episode of self-harm.	• Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and • Intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent.	Sessions covered social skills training, anxiety management, and family therapy. Patients were treated in a therapeutic milieu with a token economy. Aftercare was arranged through a community mental health center and/or a private therapist as required.	Assertiveness: Assertiveness Questionnaire. Depression: Zung Depression Rating Scale; BDI, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory, depression subscale (MMPI-D).	Repetition of SH: Self-report.	No information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding provided. Four participants who dropped out of treatment were not included in subsequent analyses suggesting <i>per protocol</i> analyses were undertaken.	No information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding provided. Four participants who dropped out of treatment were not included in subsequent analyses suggesting <i>per protocol</i> analyses were undertaken.	No information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of trial suggests clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding provided. Four participants who dropped out of treatment were not included in subsequent analyses suggesting <i>per protocol</i> analyses were undertaken.	
Linehan, Armstrong, Suarez, Allmon, and Herd (1991)	USA	31	100.0	Referrals to a personality disorder service	• Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with substance TAU; Referral to alternative dependency and/or misuse; and	DBT: Weekly sessions of individual therapy (1 hour), group skills training (2.5 hours), telephone consultation as required, and weekly therapist team meetings.	Repetition of SH: Self-report.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data from 24/63 (38.1%) participants omitted from 24 month follow-up assessment suggesting analyses were based on <i>per protocol</i> principles.	using the Linehan Parasuicide History Interview.	Depression: BDI. Hopelessness: BHS and the Reasons for Living Inventory (reverse scored)	Suicidal Ideation: Schoult Scale for Suicidal Ideators.

Linchan et al. (2006)	USA	52	49	100.0	Clinical referrals to inpatient units, emergency rooms, and outpatient clinics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent. • Aged less than 18 or older than 45; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent; • Legally mandated to a specific form of psychiatric treatment; and Males. 	<p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p> <p>Treatment use: Self-report using the Treatment History Interview.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report. No information on allocation using the SASIL.</p> <p>Depression: HRS-D, 17 item</p> <p>Hoplessness: Reasons for telephone consultation as required, and weekly therapist team meetings.</p> <p>Treatment by expert: Therapists were free to decide on the type, duration, intensity, and dose of therapy they believed was most suited to the patient (minimum of 1 individual therapy session per week).</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Unclear</p> <p>Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on repetition of self-harm, suicide attempts, and suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of significant selective outcome reporting bias.</p>
Marasinghe, Edirippulige, Kavanagh, Smith, and Jiffy (2012)	Sri Lanka	34	34	50.0	Admissions to a general hospital following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 15 or older than 74; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; and • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent. 	<p>Brief mobile-telephone-based psychotherapy: Up to 10 sessions of problem-solving therapy, social support, alcohol/drug counseling, and medication delivered over mobile telephone.</p> <p>Participants also received a series of up to 26 text messages designed to encourage participants to practice these techniques.</p> <p>Waitlist: Participants waited 6 months and then received the intervention.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Unclear</p> <p>Up to 10 sessions of problem-solving therapy, social support, alcohol/drug dependency, Severity of Dependence Scale, and the Drug Check Problem List.</p> <p>Depression: BDI.</p> <p>Social support: Medical Outcomes Study.</p> <p>Suicidal ideation: BSSI.</p>	<p>Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on repetition of self-harm, suicide attempts, and suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of significant selective outcome reporting bias.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		INV	CTL								
McAuliffe (2014)	Republic of Ireland	222	211	33.5 (11.8)	63.0	Admissions to emergency department or an acute psychiatric unit.	Aged less than 18 or older than 64; Diagnosed with any physical illness and/or disability that would preclude assessment and/or attendance at appointments; Diagnosed with psychosis TAU; Could involve and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent; Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless and custodial environment.	Group CBT-based psychotherapy: Manualized sessions of problem-solving skills training and interpersonal Anxiety Beck Anxiety Inventory (BAI). Depression: BDI. Hopelessness: BHS. Impulsiveness: Barratt Impulsivity Scale (BIS). Problem-solving: Self-Rated Problem-Solving Scale (SRPSS), Means-Ends Problem-Solving Procedure (MEPS), Optional Thinking Test (OTT), and the Current Problems List. Self-efficacy: Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale. Social Functioning: Social Life Scale. Suicidal Ideation: BSSI. Suicide: Hospital records.	Repetition of SH: Self-report participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Analyses were based on <i>prior protocol</i> principles.		
McLeavey, Daly, Lutgate, and Murray (1994)	Republic of Ireland	19	20	74.3	Admissions to the accident and emergency department following an episode of self-poisoning.	Aged less than 15 or older than 45; Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment;	Interpersonal problem-solving skills training: Manualized sessions involving instruction, active discussion, reflective listening, modeling, formulating alternative coping strategies, role playing, sentence	Repetition of SH: Collateral informant report. Hopelessness: BHS. Problem-solving: MEPS, OTT, SRPSS, Awareness of Consequences Test, and Problems Questionnaire. Self-concept: Self-Perception		Random sequence generation may have led to selection bias as an open numbers table was used. Treatment allocation also could not be concealed as a consequence. Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not	

(Continued)

McMain et al. (2009)	Canada	90 90 30.4 (9.9)	86.1	Referrals to specialist Center for Additional and Mental Health, as well as presentations to general hospitals following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder and/or unable to provide informed consent; and Engaged in self-injury only. 	<p>Diagnosed with psychosis completion, and prompting exercises.</p> <p>Brief problem-solving therapy: Sessions focus on patients' current problems, and aim to prove patients gain insight into the causes and consequences of these problems. Patients do not receive any form of specific skills training.</p> <p>DBT: Manualized sessions of weekly individual therapy using the SASLI.</p> <p>Anger: State-Trait Anger Inventory (STA).</p> <p>Depression: BDI.</p> <p>Mental health: SCL-90.</p> <p>Personality disorder: Zanarini Rating Scale for Borderline Personality Disorder (ZRS-BPD).</p> <p>Problem-solving: Inventory of Interpersonal Problems-64.</p> <p>Quality of life: EQ-5D.</p> <p>Suicide: unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p> <p>Treatment adherence: Reasons for Early Termination from Treatment Questionnaire.</p> <p>Treatment use: self-report using the Treatment History Interview.</p>

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
		INV	CTL								
Morgan, Jones, and Owen (1993)	UK	101	111	25.0	Admissions to general hospitals following a first recorded episode of self-harm.	• No history of self-harm prior to the index episode (unclear how this was ascertained); and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless.	Emergency card: Provision of Repetition of SH: Medical records. Treatment use: Available by telephone and could be contacted during times of distress.	• A card that outlined a doctor was always available by telephone and could be contacted during times of distress.	TAU: Referral to general practitioners, primary psychiatric outpatient treatment, or impatient admission as required.	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding provided.	
Morthorst et al. (2012)	Denmark	123	120	30.8 (13.2)	Admissions to acute emergency units, intensive care, pediatric units or psychiatric emergency rooms.	• Aged less than 12; currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Currently receiving outreach through social services;	Case management: Case manager facilitated sessions of crisis intervention, problem-solving therapy, and assertive outreach based on motivational support. All cause mortality: Mortality register. Suicide: Mortality register. Treatment use: Medical records.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.			
						• Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with major depression;	Participants were also assisted to attend these sessions to improve adherence.	TAU: Referral to a range of different treatments depending on diagnostic, clinical, and social needs.			

Pasiokas and Clum (1985)	USA	10	5	Admissions to a psychiatric ward.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; Residing in prison and/or custodial environment; and Residing in other institutional environments. 	<p>Treatment could include substance abuse treatment, psychological therapy, general practitioner referral, and pharmacological treatment as required.</p> <p>No information on allocation concealment provided.</p> <p>Nature of trial suggests participants and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. As same therapist delivered intervention and control therapies, clinical personnel also not blind to allocation.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: N/A.</p> <p>Cognitive Flexibility: Up to 10, 1-hour sessions of cognitive restructuring.</p> <p>Hopelessness: BHS.</p> <p>Problem-solving: MEFS.</p> <p>Suicidal ideation: Self-report, about suicidal behavior, problems, and daily life.</p> <p>Monitoring of Suicidal Ideation and BSSI.</p>	<p>No information on allocation concealment provided.</p>
Priebe et al. (2012)	UK	40	40 32.2 (10.8)	87.5 Referrals to a specialist DBT treatment service.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aged less than 16; Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; Did not meet criteria for any personality disorder; Insufficient language ability; and Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	<p>DBT: Sessions of individual and group-based cognitive behavioral therapy, mindfulness, validation, supportive therapy, and skills training. Out of hours telephone skills training was also available as required.</p> <p>Personality disorder: ZRS-BPD.</p> <p>Mental health: BPRS and the BSI.</p> <p>Quality of life: Manchester Short Assessment of Quality of Life.</p> <p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome agency where the outcome was ascertained.</p>	<p>No information on allocation concealment provided.</p> <p>Participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on repetition of self-harm and suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of significant</p>	
								(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%) Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias	
Salkowskis, Atha, and Stoer (1990)	UK	12	8 27.2 (6.7)	50.0	Referrals from the duty psychiatrist following an episode of self-poisoning, involving antidepressants that necessitated admission to the accident and emergency department.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16 or older than 65; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	CBT-based psychotherapy: Up to 1 hour sessions of home-based cognitive-behavioral and problem-solving therapy. TAU: No information on content provided.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records. Depression: BDI. Hoplessness: BHS. Mental health: Profile of Mood States. Problem-solving: Personal Questionnaire Rapid Scaling Technique. Suicidal Ideation: BSSI. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Data on suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of selective outcome reporting bias.
Slee, Gamefiski, Van der Nederlands Ledden, Arensman, and Spinhoven (2008)	Netherlands	40	42 24.7 (5.5)	93.9	Admissions to emergency departments or mental health centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 15 or older than 35; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; 	CBT-based psychotherapy: Up to 12 sessions of manualized CBT. Anxiety: SCL-90, anxiety sub-scale. Depression: BDI.	Participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Of the 90 participants randomized, eight did not receive the hospital treatment, and/or Problem-solving: Coping	

Stewart, Quinn, Plever, and Emmerson (2009)	23	9	53.1	Admissions to hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Insufficient language ability; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	<p>Inventory for Stressful Situations.</p> <p>Self-esteem: Robson Self-Concept Questionnaire, 8-item.</p> <p>Suicidal Ideation: SCS.</p> <p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p> <p>may have introduced bias. Data on suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of selective outcome reporting bias.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias	
		INV	CTL									
Tapola, Lappalainen, and Wahlström (2010)	Finland	9	73.2 (NS)	100.0	Admissions to emergency department.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 65; • Insufficient language ability; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	CBT-based psychotherapy: Sessions of acceptance and commitment therapy, solution-focused brief therapy, meditation, problem-solving therapy, frustration tolerance exercises, and identity assimilation exercises. TAI: Psychiatric outpatient treatment in the form of supportive sessions with a mental health nurse in addition to pharmacological management as required.	Repetition of SH: Self-report using the SASI. Anxiety: BAI. Depression: BDI. Emotion Regulation: DERS. Experiential Avoidance: AAQ. Quality of life: Health-Related Quality of Life-15D.	Self-report: Nature of trial suggests participants and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Outcome assessor not blind to allocation. Data only collected on treatment completers suggesting analyses based on <i>per protocol</i> principles. Data on repetition of self-harm and suicides had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of significant selective outcome reporting bias.	No information on allocation concealment provided.	Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. A greater number of participants in the control arm dropped out of treatment compared to the number in the experimental arm.	No information on whether analyses were conducted according to intention-to-treat principles provided.
Torhorst et al. (1987)	Germany	68	73	63.1	Admissions to hospital following a suicide attempt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; and • Engaged in self-injury only. 	Treatment adherence: Brief inpatient admission followed by sessions of outpatient psychotherapy led by the same treating clinician as referred to in the hospital. Sessions consisted of motivational interviewing.	Repetition of SH: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Treatment Adherence: Number of therapy sessions attended.	Self-report: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Additionally, the authors	

Tonhost, Möller, Kurz, Schmid-Bode, and Lauter (1988)	Germany	40	40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admissions to a general hospital following an episode of deliberate self-poisoning who were referred to the liaison service of the toxicological ward. Diagnosed with psychiatric treatment; or organic disorder; Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	<p>• Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for</p> <p>• Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder;</p> <p>• Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences</p> <p>• Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; and</p> <p>• Residing outside catchment area and/ or homeless.</p>	<p>Long-term therapy: One session per month over a period of 12 months in addition to a brief crisis intervention session delivered within 3 days of admission.</p> <p>Short-term therapy: 12 weekly therapy sessions delivered over a period of 3 months in addition to a brief crisis intervention session delivered within 3 days of admission.</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report.</p> <p>Social Adjustment: SAS.</p> <p>Treatment adherence: Number of therapy sessions attended.</p>	<p>No information on allocation concealment provided.</p> <p>Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Of the 80 participants, data on 50-67% were available at 3 months, and data on 97.5% were available at 12 months. Unclear whether analyses were according to intention-to-treat principles, however. Data on depression scores had to be obtained from study authors, suggesting the presence of significant selective outcome reporting bias.</p>
Turner (2000)	USA	12	12	79.2	<p>Admissions to hospital following a suicide attempt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; and 	<p>• Currently receiving AOD treatment and/or referred for AOD treatment;</p> <p>• Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder;</p>	<p>Repetition of SH: Self-report.</p> <p>Anxiety: BAL.</p> <p>Depression: HRSD and BDI.</p> <p>Mental health: BPRS.</p> <p>Problem-solving: Target Behavior Ratings.</p> <p>Suicidal Ideation: BSSI.</p>	<p>No information on allocation concealment provided.</p> <p>Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation.</p>
							(Continued)	

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias	
Tyler et al. (2003)	UK	239	241 32.0 (11.0)	67.9	Admissions to hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did not meet criteria for a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder. 	Client-centered therapy: Up to 6 sessions of interpersonal skills training and client-centered therapy based on Carkhuff's emphatic understanding model. Treatment also included a no-suicide contract.	CBT-based psychotherapy: Sessions of manual-assisted CBT including sessions on cognitive techniques for emotion regulation, negative thinking management, and the development of relapse prevention strategies. Sessions on crisis skills problem-solving therapy were also provided.	Repetition of SH: Self-report Nature of trial suggests supplemented by medical records. Anxiety: HADS and BAI. Depression: HADS and Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS). Quality of life: EuroQol. Personality: Quick Personality Assessment Schedule (PAS-Q).	Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Of the 480 participants randomized, study authors could not obtain 12-month data for 78 (16.2%) participants for the following reasons: i) could not be traced ($n = 27$); ii) refused follow-up assessment ($n = 19$); iii) did not attend follow-up assessment ($n = 9$); iv) died ($n = 8$); v) withdrew ($n = 4$); vi) other reasons ($n = 11$). No information on whether analyses were based on intention-to-treat principles was provided, however.

Van Dier Sande et al. (1997)	Netherlands	140	134	65.7	Admissions to hospital following a suicide attempt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 15; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; • Engaged in habitual self-cutting only; • Insufficient language ability; • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	Brief inpatient admission: Inpatient admission for a period of between 1–4 days. Participants then offered referral to outpatient problem-solving therapy.	Repetition of SH: Hospital admissions; Self-report	Nature of trial suggests participants not blind to allocation.
Vaiva et al. (2006)	France	293	312	72.9	Presentations to general hospitals following an intentional drug overdose.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 18 or older than 65; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; • Engaged in self-injury only; • Not registered with a GP; • No telephone connection; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. 	Telephone contact: At least one telephone call to encourage participants to adhere to their discharge treatment plan. TAU: Referral to the general practitioner. Suicide: Collateral informant report supplemented by hospital, medical, or mortality records.	Repetition of SH: self-report	Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Of the 605 participants, 89 (14.7%) did not complete the intervention, and 121 (20.0%) were lost to follow-up at 13 months for the following reasons: i) died; ii) unsated reasons. No information on whether analyses were based on intention-to-treat principles was provided; however, principles was

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Control Conditions	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Van Heeringen	Belgium	258	258	56.6	Admissions to the accident and emergency department following a suicide attempt.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 15; • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless; and • Residing in prison and/or custodial environment. 	Compliance enhancement: Series of home visits to participants to encourage them to keep scheduled outpatient psychiatric treatment appointments.	Repetition of SH: Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report.	Random sequence generation may have led to selection bias as an open numbers table was used. Treatment allocation also could not be concealed as a consequence. Of the 516 participants, 125 (24.2%) were lost to follow-up.	
Waterhouse and Platt (1990)	UK	38	39		Admissions to the accident and emergency department following an episode of self-harm.	Treatment use: Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report.	TAU: Referral for outpatient psychiatric treatment.	Repetition of SH: Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report.	Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report.	

Reasons given for dropouts included:

- i) refused follow-up
- ii) moved from catchment area without leaving a forwarding address (n = 22);
- iii) death following a somatic illness (n = 2);
- iv) admitted to hospital with a terminal illness (n = 2);
- v) imprisoned (n = 2). No information on whether analyses were based on intention-to-treat principles was provided, however.

Anxiety: Psychiatric Status Schedule, sub-scale.

Depression: Psychiatric Status Schedule, sub-scale.

• Engaged in self-injury only; and	Discharge: Participants discharged from hospital as soon as medically stable.	Hoplessness: BHII.	Functioning: Psychiatric Status Schedule.	Treatment user: General Practitioner Questionnaire, supplemented with medical records.	Repetition of SH: Self-report. Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation.
• Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless.	Social Functioning: Social Behavior Assessment Schedule.	CBT-based psychotherapy: Sessions of cognitive therapy.	Quality of life: idiosyncratic scale.	Depression: HDRS.	Suicidal ideation: BSSI.
		Telephone contact: Psychological support via telephone.	Telephone contact: Psychological support via telephone.	Collateral informant report:	Suicide: Collateral informant report.
		TAU: No intervention.	TAU: No intervention.	Treatment user: Self-report.	
Wei et al. (2013)	China	162 77.31.8 (12.9)	76.1 Admissions to emergency department.	• Aged less than 15; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Insufficient language ability; and • Without at least two contact persons (to facilitate attendance at follow-up appointments).	CBT-based psychotherapy: Up to 6 sessions of manualized cognitive therapy; crisis skills training, problem-solving skills training, emotion regulation, negative thinking management, and relapse prevention training.
Weinberg, Gunderson, USA Hennen, and Cutler (2006)		15 15.28.2 (8.2)	100.0 Community referrals.	• Aged less than 18 or older than 40; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse;	Repetition of SH: Self-report. Nature of trial suggests using the SASI. Suicidal ideation: Suicide Behaviors Questionnaire, ideation sub-scale. Treatment user: Treatment Utilization Intervention, Follow-Along Version. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.
				• Did not meet criteria for TAU: No information provided.	
				• Males; and • Suicide risk	

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Welt (1977)	USA	63	57		Admissions to the hospital	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16; • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless; and • Residing in other institutional environments. 	Outreach: Weekly/bi-weekly community mental health team contact. TAU: Psychiatric consultation on request of the treating physician and referral for a next day appointment at the community mental health center.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records. Alcohol use: Self-report. Drug use: Self-report.	No information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of trial suggests participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Of the 120 participants, 6 (9.3%) in the experimental arm and 26 (45.6%) in the control arm were lost to follow-up for unstated reasons.
CHILDREN & ADOLESCENTS									
Cooney, Davis, Thompson, Wharewera-Milka, and Stewart (2010)	New Zealand	14	15	75.9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 13 or older than 19; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Insufficient language ability; • No history of self-harm prior to the index episode (unclear how this was ascertained); and • No adult caregiver willing and/or able to attend family therapy sessions. 	DBT-A: Comprising weekly individual therapy sessions (50–60 minute), weekly group skills training (110 minutes) and family therapy and telephone counseling as required. TAU: Comprising individual and family sessions provided by a multidisciplinary treatment team, medication management, and hospital or respite care as required.	Repetition of SH: self-report using the SASII and according to hospital records. Alcohol and/or drug use: Substances And Choices Scale (SACS). Error regulation: DERS. Hoplessness: Reasons for Living Inventory for Adolescents (reverse scored).	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.
								Suicidal ideation: BSII. Treatment use: Number of therapy sessions attended.	

Cogrove, Zimsky, Black, and Weston (1995)	UK	47	58	84.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless. <p>TAU; referral for standard follow-up, including treatment from a specialist clinic or child psychiatry department as required.</p>	Emergency card: Comprising Repetition of SH: hospital records, one card that could be used, on demand, to allow re-admission to a pediatric ward at the local hospital at times of distress.	Treatment use: Collateral informant report.	An open numbers table was used to generate the random sequence, leading to possible bias in the random sequence generation and allocation concealment.
						Additionally, the nature of the trial suggests participants and outcome assessors not blind to allocation. Also, unclear if outcome assessors were blind to treatment allocation. Five participants in one center either received their emergency card after a delay of several weeks, or not at all. It is unclear whether and how data from these participants were analyzed. Finally, the authors claim this intervention as effective even when comparison of repetition rates (the primary outcome) was not significant.		
Donaldson, Spirito, and USA Esposito-Smythers (2005)		21	18	82.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients presenting to a general pediatric emergency department or inpatient unit of an affiliated child psychiatric hospital after a suicide attempt. 	Skills-based, problem-solving treatment: Up to 12 sessions of problem-solving and affective management therapy, including cognitive restructuring, and relaxation.	Repetition of SH: Self-report Not information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of trial suggests participants not blind to treatment allocation. Additionally, as the same therapies provided both the intervention and control	(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N		Age (SD)	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions		Risk of Bias
		INV	CTL							
Green et al. (2011)	UK	183	183	88.5	Patients presenting to local child and adolescent services with a history of at least two episodes of self-harm within the previous 12 months.	• Aged less than 12 or older than 16 years, 11 months;	Therapy: Up to 12 sessions of unstructured therapy, including exploratory questioning, encouraging affect, connecting affect to events, and reviewing changes obtained by therapy. Participants were not taught any specific therapeutic techniques.	Control Conditions: Problem Solving Inventory-Revised, and the MEPS.	Problem Solving Inventory-Revised, and the MEPS.	treatments, clinical personnel blinding could not be achieved.
					• Diagnosed with anorexia nervosa (and with severe low body mass);	• Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms;	Group-based psychotherapy: Repetition of SH; self-report Developed by Wood using a standardized interview. (2001), this is a manualized developmental Depression: Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (MFQ).	Functioning: Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children and Adolescents (HoNOSCA).	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Not all participants included in analyses for primary and secondary outcomes, although the authors claim to have used an intention-to-treat approach. Attrition bias therefore cannot be ruled out.	
					• Enrolled in a school for students with intellectual disabilities;	• Insufficient language ability;	TAU: Comprising any form of therapy with the exception of any group-based intervention, recommended by the adolescents' child and adolescent mental health service team.	Suicidal ideation: SIQ.	Treatment use: Medical and social services records.	
					• No history of self-harm prior to the index episode (unclear how this was ascertained); and	• Residing in prison and/or custodial environment.				

Hartington et al. (1998) UK	85 77	89.5	Patients referred to mental health teams from one of four hospitals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 16; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Engaged in self-injury only; • No adult caregiver willing and/or able to attend family therapy sessions; and • Suicide risk. 	<p>Home-based family therapy: Repetition of SH: Self-report Nature of trial suggests participants not blind to allocation. Additionally, clinical personnel not blind to treatment</p> <p>Comprising a manualized family therapy intervention involving one Family Functioning: Family assessment session and up to four home visits.</p> <p>Hoplessness: Hoplessness Questionnaire.</p> <p>Problem-solving: STS1 generation of alternative solutions subscale.</p> <p>Suicidal Ideation: SIQ.</p> <p>Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.</p>	<p>Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data analyzed according to intention-to-treat principles, however, method used last observation carried forward which may introduce bias.</p>
Hazell et al. (2009) Australia		35 37	90.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patients referred to a child and adolescent mental health service who had reported at least two episodes of SH in the past year, with one of these in the past three months. 	<p>Group-based psychotherapy: Repetition of SH: Self-report Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data analyzed according to intention-to-treat principles, however, method used last observation carried forward which may introduce bias.</p> <p>Developed by Wood (2001), this is a manualized developmental Alcohol and/or drug use: K-SADS scores.</p> <p>Depression: MFQ and the Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children (K-SADS).</p> <p>Functioning: Children's Global Assessment Scale, Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, and the HoNOSCA.</p>	<p>Suicidal Ideation: SIQ.</p> <p>Suicide: Medical records.</p> <p>Treatment use: Medical records.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE I. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL	Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
Mehlum et al. (2014)	Norway	39	38	88.3	Patients referred to a child and adolescent mental health service who reported at least two episodes of self-harm in the past year, with one of these in the past 16 weeks.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 12 or older than 18; • Diagnosed with bipolar disorder; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Did not meet criteria for a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder and/or borderline traits; and • No history of self-harm prior to the index episode (unclear how this was ascertained). 	DBT-A: Comprising weekly individual therapy sessions, weekly group skills training, weekly multifamily skills training, weekly family therapy, Hoplessness: BHS, and telephone counseling Personality disorder: as required. EUC: No less than one weekly individual therapy session.	Repetition of SH: Self-report and hospital records. Depression: Short Mood and Feelings Questionnaire (SMFQ) and MADRS. Borderline Symptom List: 23 item. Suicidal ideation: SIQ. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation.
Ougrin et al. (2011)	UK	35	35	80.0	Patients admitted to emergency departments following an episode of self-harm.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aged less than 12 or older than 18; • Currently receiving treatment through another service and/or referred for psychiatric treatment; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; 	Therapeutic assessment: Manualized assessment involving standard psychosocial history and suicide risk assessment, identification of reciprocal roles, core pain, and maladaptive behaviors based on a cognitive analytic therapy paradigm. Treatment use: Medical records supplemented by collateral informant report.	Repetition of SH: Hospital records. Functioning: Children's Global Assessment Scale, and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.	Participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. Data analyzed according to intention-to-treat principles, however, method used last observation carried forward which may introduce bias.

Rosso and Fonagy (2012) UK	40	40	85.0	<p>Patients presenting to community health services or acute hospital accident and emergency departments following an episode of self-harm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diagnosed with substance dependency and/or misuse; • Insufficient language ability; • Suicide risk; and • Violence risk. <p>which is sent to parents summarizing these steps which is sent to parents.</p> <p>TAU: Standard psychosocial history and suicide risk assessment based on NICE principles.</p>

(Continued)

TABLE 1. (Continued).

Study and Year of Publication	Country	N	Age INV CTL	Age Female (%)	Participant Source	Exclusion Criteria	Intervention and Control Conditions	Outcome Ascertainment	Risk of Bias
			INV CTL	(SD)					
Spirito, Boegels, Donaldson, Bishop, and Lewander (2002)	USA	36	40	94.1	Patients presenting to hospital following a suicide attempt.	• Aged less than 12 or older than 18; and • Residing outside catchment area and/or homeless.	Compliance enhancement: Self-report. One-hour session reviewing expectations for Anger: STAXI. outpatient treatment, addressing the factors likely to impede attendance, and addressing treatment misconceptions. Verbal contract between adolescent, parents, and staff to attend all treatment sessions. Participants also contacted by telephone at 1, 2, 4, and 8 weeks post-discharge to review compliance with treatment.	Repetition of SH: Self-report. Depression: CES-D. Hoplessness: Hoplessness Scale for Children. Family Functioning: McMaster Family Assessment Device. Treatment barriers: Barriers to Service Questionnaire, Family Barriers according to an idiosyncratic scale, and Service Barriers according to an idiosyncratic scale. Treatment use: Self-report supplemented by collateral informant report.	No information on allocation concealment provided. Nature of the study suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to treatment allocation. No information on outcome assessor blinding.

Wood, Trainor, Rothwell, Moore, and Harrington (2001)	32	31	77.8	Patients referred to child and adolescent mental health services following an episode of self-harm. • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Residing in prison and/or custodial environment; and • Suicide risk.	Aged less than 12 or older than 16; • Diagnosed with an intellectual disability and/ or organic disorder; • Diagnosed with psychosis and/or experiences psychotic symptoms; • Residing in prison and/or custodial environment; and • Suicide risk.	Manualized developmental psychotherapy program delivered in a group format. Sessions involve elements of CBT, DBT, group psychotherapy. Suicide: Unclear how this outcome was ascertained. Treatment comprises a one-off initial assessment, followed by 6 acute group-therapy sessions, and weekly therapy sessions continuing until the young person feels ready to leave the intervention.	Group-based psychotherapy: Repetition of SH; Self-report Nature of trial suggests participants and clinical personnel not blind to allocation. Data on suicides had to be requested from study authors, suggesting possible selective reporting bias.	Depression: SMFQ and K-SADS.	Functioning: HoNOSCA.	Suicidal ideation: SIQ.
--	----	----	------	--	---	--	--	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------

AOD: alcohol and other drug; CBT: cognitive behavioral therapy; DBT: dialectical behavior therapy; DBT-A: dialectical behavior therapy for adolescents; EU: enhanced usual care; SH: self-harm; TAU: Treatment as usual; UK: United Kingdom; USA: United States of America.

included (Table 1). Moreover, in the remaining 52 trials where information was provided on gender, in all but one over one-half of participants were female (range 48.5% to 94.1%; Table 1). We found no evidence of a significant increase in the proportion of male participants included in these trials by year of publication ($\beta = -0.34$, $se = 0.21$, $p = 0.12$; Supplementary Appendix 2).

Types of Intervention Conditions

The trials included in this review were characterized by a diversity of interventions (Table 1). For adults, the most frequently evaluated intervention (18 trials; 32.7%) was cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT). There were five trials of dialectical behavior therapy (DBT), four trials of case management, four trials of postcards, three trials of telephone contact, two each of green(emergency) cards, emotion-regulation skills training, intensive outpatient follow-up, mixed multimodal interventions, and treatment adherence enhancement approaches. There was one trial each of a brief alcohol-related intervention, behavior therapy, brief information and support, general hospital admission, general practitioner letters, home-based problem-solving therapy, mentalization, mobile telephone-based psychotherapy, interpersonal problem-solving skills training, intensive inpatient treatment and aftercare, and prolonged, long-term aftercare.

For children and adolescents, there were three trials evaluating the effectiveness of group-based psychotherapy, two trials of DBT adapted for adolescents (DBT-A), and one trial each of a CBT-based approach, green (emergency) cards, home-based family therapy, mentalization, therapeutic assessment, and treatment adherence enhancement approaches (Table 1).

Types of Control Conditions

The experimental interventions were compared against a diversity of control conditions (Table 1). Most trials (52 trials; 78.9%) compared the intervention to treatment as usual (TAU). The remaining 14 trials compared the intervention to either a different form of active psychotherapy (10 trials; 15.1%), enhanced usual care (two trials; 3.0%), waitlist (one trial; 1.5%), or no treatment (one trial; 1.5%).

However, although in most trials (53 trials; 80.3%) some information was provided on the treatment(s) that were available to control participants, information was provided on the therapies actually received by these participants in only six trials (9.1%). Elsewhere we have shown previously that effects in favor of CBT-based psychotherapy vary by quality of TAU and TAU content (Witt et al., 2018). For this reason, data on TAU content and amount received should wherever possible be included in future trials in this area.

Outcomes Related to Suicidal Thoughts and Behavior

Data on the primary outcome measure, repetition of self-harm, were reported for all but one of the included trials (65 trials; 98.5%; Table 1). Most commonly, information about repetition of self-harm was obtained through self-report only (with or without the use of a standardized interview schedule) (27 trials; 41.5%), followed by hospital and/or medical records (18 trials; 27.7%). This information was less commonly obtained from collateral informant and/or hospital and/or medical records supplemented by self-reported information (13 trials; 20.0%) and, in single trials, through collateral informant

report only or using mixed methods; namely, self-reported information at the post-intervention assessment and hospital records at follow-up. No information was provided on how the primary outcome measure was ascertained in four (6.1%) trials.

Information on suicide deaths was recorded for the majority of trials (53 trials; 78.8%; *Table 1*); although we as reviewers often had to request these data from the study authors. In a few studies suicides were ascertained from official sources, including mortality data or Coroner's records (14 trials; 26.4%), collateral informant report only (five trials; 9.4%), or collateral informant report supplemented by data from official sources (four trials; 7.5%). In general, however, no information was provided on how suicides were ascertained (30 trials; 56.7%).

Data on suicidal ideation were reported in 27 trials (40.9%; *Table 1*). Most commonly, this was assessed using the self-report Beck Scale for Suicidal Ideation [BSSI; (Beck, Kovacs, & Weissman, 1979); 15 trials; 55.6%], followed by the Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire [SIQ; (Reynolds, 1988); six trials; 22.2%], the Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire [SBQ; (Linehan, 1981); two trials; 7.4%], the Suicidal Cognition Scale [SCS; (Rudd, Joiner, & Rajab, 2001); one trial; 3.7%], the Schotte Scale for Suicidal Ideators [SSI; (Schotte & Clum, 1982); one trial; 3.7%], from an idiosyncratic scale (one trial; 3.7%), and from self-report (one trial; 3.7%).

Outcomes Related to Other Measures

Data on other non-suicidal secondary outcomes were also reported in a number of trials (*Table 1*). In line with the NICE guidelines on the short-term assessment of

self-harm (National Institute for Clinical Excellence 2004), many trials reported data on depression (37 trials; 56.1%), hopelessness (19 trials; 28.8%) and, to a lesser extent, problem-solving ability (16 trials; 24.2%). Mostly, this was using self-reported scales such as the Beck Depression Inventory [BDI; (Beck, Ward, Mendelsohn, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961)], the Beck Hopelessness Scale [BHS; (Beck & Steer, 1988)], and various self-report scales for problem solving.

Given the role of anxiety in the etiology of self-harm (Hawton, Saunders, Topiwala, & Haw, 2013) data on anxiety were also reported in 17 trials (25.7%). However, despite recent work implicating alcohol as an important proximal risk factor for suicidal behavior (Borges et al., 2017), only six trials (9.1%) evaluated the effect of treatment for self-harm on alcohol and/or drug use.

Mechanisms of Change

Few trials (3 trials; 4.5%) explicitly included data on hypothesized mechanisms of change. In two trials of emotion-focused regulation training, for example, the authors hypothesized that the intervention would improve emotion regulation and experiential avoidance which, in turn, would lead to a reduction in repetitive self-harming behavior (Gratz, Tull, & Levy, 2014; Gratz & Gunderson, 2006). In a separate report, the authors found that reductions in emotion regulation indirectly led to reductions in self-harm through their effect on borderline personality disorder-related cognition and affective functioning, suggesting that the ability to regulate emotion is an important treatment target for women with borderline personality disorder who engage in

frequent, repeated self-harm (Gratz, Bardeen, Levy, Dixon-Gordon, & Tull, 2015).

In a study of mentalization-based therapy for adolescents (MBT-A), the authors not only included measures of mentalization ability and avoidance, which they hypothesized would be related to mechanisms of change (Rossouw & Fonagy, 2012), but also used mediation analyses to determine whether changes in these outcomes were related to reductions in self-harming behavior. These authors found that once improvements in these measures were statistically controlled, the effect of MBT-A on repetition of self-harm at the post-intervention assessment was no longer significant, suggesting that the ability to mentalize is an appropriate treatment target for the prevention of self-harming behavior in this age group.

In some other trials, variables which could be related to such mechanisms were assessed but without explicit mention that they were hypothesized to be mechanisms of change. For example, in a number of trials of CBT-based psychotherapy, effects of the intervention on problem-solving ability were also assessed. In two other trials of problem-solving based approaches, the authors also reported information on whether the intervention actually produced changes in ability to solve interpersonal or other problems. A number of trials of DBT also included information on whether the intervention led to an improved ability to tolerate emotional arousal.

Selective Outcome Reporting

Selective outcome reporting occurs when outcomes within an RCT are selectively reported on the basis of their significance (Dwan, Gamble, Williamson, & Kirkham, 2013). To investigate this, we

searched international trial registries to obtain the study protocols for all trials published subsequent to the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors' (ICMJE) mandatory trial registration guidelines in 2005 (De Angelis et al., 2004). Of the 34 trials published after 2005, just under one-half (15 trials; 44.1%) had been registered with an international trial registry. Just over half of the registered trials had been prospectively registered. However, for six (40%) they had been registered retrospectively after the trial had been completed. The clinical trial registry record was no longer available for one trial (Ougrin et al., 2011). For one further trial, additional information on the intervention was available online; however, details on participant inclusion and exclusion criteria and details on the primary and secondary outcomes to be assessed were not available (Fleischmann et al., 2008).

Sample Size and Power Analysis

Although the sample size for included trials has increased over time ($\beta = 23.6$, $se = 11.9$, $p = 0.05$; Figure 2), most trials are still underpowered to detect significant effects for self-harm repetition and suicide. Using rates of self-harm and suicide for cognitive behavioral-based therapy in adults, the approach we found to be associated with the greatest reduction in self-harm repetition and suicide in our recent Cochrane review (Hawton et al., 2016b), we estimate that a minimum of 1,862 participants would be needed in each trial arm to detect a significant effect for repetition of self-harm with 80% power at the conventional $p = 0.05$ level (Table 2). For suicide, moreover, a minimum of 8,757 participants would be required in each trial arm to detect a significant treatment effect (Table 2).




FIGURE 2. Bubble plot of sample sizes in 66 trials of psychosocial therapies for self-harm in adults and children and adolescents by year of publication.

TABLE 2. Power calculations for trials to assess impact of cognitive behavioral-based psychotherapy in adults on repetition of self-harm and suicide over a 12-month follow-up period.

Outcome	Event rate (%)		Sample size (per arm)
	Usual Care Group	Intervention Group	
Repetition of self-harm	16.3	3.3	1,862
Suicide	1.6	0.05	8,757

Based on actual rates of repetition of self-harm and suicide over a 12-month follow-up period for cognitive behavioral-based psychotherapy in the recent Cochrane review of psychological interventions for adults (Hawton et al., 2016b), with alpha set at 5% and power at 80%.

Adequacy of Random Sequence Generation

We found that for most trials (49 trials; 74.2%), the random sequence generation was adequate. We did not find that outcome estimates were exaggerated in trials with inadequate or unclear random sequence generation as compared to those

with adequate sequence generation. For CBT-based interventions in adults, for example, adequacy of the random sequence generation made no material difference to overall findings regarding the intervention for self-harm repetition at the final follow-up assessment, although only two such trials were rated as having inadequate/unclear random sequence generation (Inadequate/




FIGURE 3. Effect of cognitive behavioral-based psychotherapy versus treatment as usual for repetition of self-harm at the final follow-up assessment subgrouped according to adequacy of the allocation concealment procedure.

unclear random sequence generation: OR 0.63, 95% CI 0.27 to 1.49, 2 trials, $p=0.29$, $I^2=0.0\%$; Adequate random sequence generation: OR 0.68, 95% CI 0.52 to 0.89, 15 trials, $p=0.005$, $I^2=23.0\%$; Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2=0.03$, $df=1$, $p=0.87$). For all other categories of intervention there were too few included studies to meaningfully undertake such analyses.

Adequacy of Allocation Concealment

For the majority of trials (38 trials; 57.6%), allocation concealment was adequate, having been conducted using opaque, sealed envelopes (16 trials), by an offsite researcher (10 trials), or a third-party researcher working independently of the research team (10 trials). In the two

remaining trials, correspondence with study authors indicated that allocation had been adequately concealed.

We did not find that intervention estimates were exaggerated in trials with inadequate or unclear allocation concealment. For CBT-based interventions in adults, for example, adequacy of the allocation concealment procedure made no material difference to overall findings regarding the intervention for self-harm repetition (Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2=2.35$, $df=1$, $p=0.12$; Figure 3). Similarly, for suicide, there was no evidence to suggest that trials with inadequate or unclear allocation concealment were associated with exaggerated treatment effects, although there were only seven trials in which the sequence generation procedure was either inadequate or unclear (Inadequate/unclear allocation concealment: OR 0.81, 95% CI 0.23 to

2.88, 7 trials, $p = 0.75$, $I^2 = 0.0\%$; Adequate allocation concealment: OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.19 to 1.69, 8 trials, $p = 0.31$, $I^2 = 0.0\%$; Test for subgroup differences: $\chi^2 = 0.17$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.68$). For all other categories of intervention, there were too few included studies to meaningfully undertake these analyses.

Blinding

Adequately blinding participants, clinical personnel, and outcome assessors to treatment allocation minimizes the role of performance and detection bias as neither party is then likely to provide biased assessments as to the effectiveness of the intervention. Psychosocial treatment trials present unique challenges to blinding, however, as it is generally not possible to

blind participants to the treatment they are actively receiving, or clinical personnel to the treatment they are delivering (Shean, 2014). As a consequence, participant and clinical personnel blinding could not convincingly be achieved in any of the included trials.

Perhaps most surprisingly, in well under one-half of all the trials (28 trials; 42.4%), outcome assessors were either not blind to treatment allocation or there was insufficient information to confirm whether outcome assessors were blind. While there was some suggestion that outcome estimates for repetition of self-harm may have been greater in trials with inadequate or unclear outcome assessor blinding, this was not significant for CBT-based trials for either repetition of self-harm at the final follow-up assessment ($\chi^2 = 3.61$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.06$; Figure 4) or for suicide




FIGURE 4. Effect of cognitive behavioral-based psychotherapy versus treatment as usual for repetition of self-harm at the final follow-up assessment subgrouped according to adequacy of the procedure used to blind outcome assessors.




FIGURE 5. Effect of cognitive behavioral-based psychotherapy versus treatment as usual for suicides at the final follow-up assessment subgrouped according to adequacy of the procedure used to blind outcome assessors.

($\chi^2=2.17$, $df=1$, $p=0.14$; Figure 5). For all other categories of intervention, there were too few included studies to meaningfully undertake these analyses.

Zelen's Post-Consent Design

Four trials (6.1%) included in this review used Zelen's post-consent randomization design (Carter, Clover, Whyte, Dawson, & D'este, 2005; Hatcher, Coupe, Wikirwhi, Durie, & Pillai, 2016; Hatcher, Sharon, Parag, & Collins, 2011; Hatcher et al., 2015), in which eligible participants are both identified and randomly allocated to the intervention or control group prior to seeking their consent to take part in the trial. Allocation status is then revealed to participants, who can then either consent to participate, decline, or consent to participate only if they can

change groups (Adamson, Cockayne, Puffer, & Torgerson, 2006). In three of these trials, participants who refused to provide consent following treatment allocation were excluded from further analysis for all non-suicidal secondary outcome measures (Hatcher et al., 2011; 2015, 2016).

DISCUSSION

Recent years have seen a substantial increase in the number of RCTs of psychosocial treatments for adults who self-harm. Thus, the number of trials has nearly trebled as of 29 April, 2015 since we previously reviewed trial methodology (Arensman et al., 2001). In children and adolescents, however, the number of trials remains relatively small, especially given the extent of self-harm in this population

(Hawton, Saunders, & O'Connor, 2012), with one trial in our earlier review and just 11 in the current review.

There has been a notable increase in trials from low-to-middle income countries. However, guidance on treatments for self-harm is still dominated by research from high income countries, particularly the USA and UK. Although relatively few studies have investigated characteristics of persons who engage in self-harm in non-Western settings (Spears, Montgomery, Gunnell, & Araya, 2014), there would appear to be important differences both in the methods of self-harm used as well as the characteristics of those who engage in self-harm between lower-to-middle income countries as compared to higher-income countries (Gholamrezaei et al., 2017). Opportunities for intervention are also more limited in lower-to-middle income countries. Possible reasons include the fact that fewer persons in low-to-middle income countries have a history of repeated, non-fatal episodes of self-harm, perhaps as a consequence of ready availability of highly lethal means (Mohamed et al., 2011), and that resource limitations mean that availability of mental health professionals trained to deliver complex multi-component and prolonged psychosocial interventions is very limited (Benson & Shakya, 2008).

The majority of participants in these trials have been female, reflecting the general characteristics of self-harm patients attending hospital-based services (Arensman, Griffin, & Corcoran, 2016; Geulayov et al., 2016). However, there appears to have been little effort to develop and evaluate interventions specifically focused on males. This is surprising, especially given the greater risk of suicide following self-harm in males than females (Carroll et al., 2014; Hawton, Bergen,

et al., 2015). Clinically important subgroups of self-harm patients were also excluded from a number of these trials, including those with a diagnosis of a major mental illness (especially psychosis) and those with alcohol and/or other drug dependence. There were also no identified trials of participants older than 65 years at randomization, despite increasing risks of suicide in older age groups, particularly in males.

We found that in trials where an intervention was compared with TAU, while the potential range of interventions available in the TAU condition was often indicated, there was rarely any record of the treatments actually received and by how many patients. In future trials where TAU is used as a control treatment condition, we suggest that not only should the potential types of interventions in this condition be pre-specified, but the actual treatments received by patients should, if possible, be recorded. We acknowledge that specific information on the treatment received by participants randomized to the TAU arm may have to be excluded from publications owing to space limitations. For this reason, we would recommend RCTs of psychosocial interventions for self-harm should consider submitting this information as supplementary documents, as was recently done in a trial of DBT (Priebe et al., 2012).

The main outcome measures in the trials in our reviews were related to repetition of self-harm. These were assessed in a variety of ways, with some studies relying on self-report, which may have led to the identification of more episodes, especially those not resulting in presentation to clinical facilities (Guthrie et al., 2001). Other trials relied on hospital and/or medical records, which will largely identify hospital-presenting episodes only. We would

therefore suggest that a combination of both is ideal. We would also suggest future trials in this area report data on frequency of repetition of self-harm.

Given the strong association between self-harm and future suicide (Carroll et al., 2014; Hawton, Bergen, et al., 2015), it was surprising how infrequently deaths by suicide (including where there were no deaths), were reported, especially when requests to authors revealed that this information was available. However, while the majority of coronial investigations are closed within a year and a half from the date of death, we would acknowledge that at least a third of suicide cases remain open two years later, and a few of these remain open four years later based on Australian data (Studdert, Walker, Kemp, & Sutherland, 2016). We would therefore strongly recommend that deaths from any cause should be reported in addition to those attributable to suicide specifically, given the well-recognized misclassification of deaths likely to have been due to suicide (Gunnell et al., 2013), particularly suicides involving self-poisoning (Bohnert et al., 2013). To date, however, only three trials included such information (Fleischmann et al., 2008; Kawanishi et al., 2014; Morthorst, Krogh, Erlangsen, Alberdi, & Nordentoft, 2012).

There is also the question of what outcomes should be assessed in trials of therapies for self-harm patients and at what time points. Clearly this will depend partly on the characteristics of the patient population. Also, consideration must be paid to restricting the number of patient-rated outcomes to a level that will not discourage their participation. However, where possible, we suggest that the following factors should be considered for inclusion in trials in this field. Depression is one, given the strong links with suicidal behavior.

However, with increasing recognition of the contributory role of anxiety in the etiology of self-harm (Hawton et al., 2013), we suggest that this is another important factor that should be considered for inclusion. Finally, because of the key mediating roles of hopelessness, suicidal ideation, and problem-solving (Thompson, Mazza, Herting, Randell, & Eggert, 2005), consideration should also be given to inclusion of measures of these outcomes.

There may also be other outcomes which participants would view as being particularly important; investigating what these outcomes might be, and ensuring they are assessed in future trials in this area, is essential to ensure treatments are pertinent to this patient group (Owens, 2010). Qualitative evaluations of future interventions will also help to generate insight into how the intervention process is perceived by participants themselves; and may also help to improve participation and adherence rates (Whitehead, Crowe, Bugge, & Coppel, 2016).

One potential component of trials that is often neglected is assessment of likely mediators of treatment effect. However, it can reasonably be argued that the key initial aim in conducting trials should be to assess whether a treatment is effective, and then if it is, to investigate mediating factors, including through treatment dismantling procedures.

In our previous paper on methodological issues in trials of interventions for self-harm patients, we highlighted the fact that all trials were too small to allow detection of differences between treatment conditions in terms of repetition of self-harm (Arensman et al., 2001). While we have shown that the size of trial has increased somewhat in recent years, most trials are still underpowered. This is likely to represent a waste of resources since the results

will not usually generate information that can inform clinical services as to the best options for treatment. Larger trials are therefore required to demonstrate whether interventions are effective (Ioannidis, 2005). To achieve the size of trials necessary to generate reliable evidence multicenter studies will usually be required to allow access to sufficiently large populations of patients. Multicenter trials, such as the World Health Organization's SUPREMISS trial (Fleischmann et al., 2008) and the Saving and Empowering Lives in Europe (SEYLE) Project (Wasserman et al., 2010). These types of trial can also provide access to diverse populations thereby improving the representativeness of trial participants and hence the generalizability of the results. However, it is recognized that trials of sufficient size to detect robust effects on suicide are probably not feasible.

Zelen's post-consent design was used in some recent trials, but, unlike in Zelen's original concept, data on participants who subsequently refused consent to participate were excluded from secondary analyses. This particularly affected non-suicidal outcome measures which mainly relied on self-reported information. Zelen originally envisaged keeping participants' data in the group to which they were randomized (Richter & Dewey, 2014). However, without participant consent, this does not seem feasible. The use of this trial design therefore presents some problems for the interpretation of results from trials.

In none of the trials we reviewed were participants blind to the treatment condition to which they had been allocated, but in reality this is virtually impossible in trials of psychosocial interventions. This limitation similarly applied to the clinicians delivering treatment. As a result, the quality of psychosocial trials for self-harm

are typically downgraded, relative to pharmacological trials, when entered into reviews and meta-analyses, such as those conducted for the Cochrane Collaboration (Higgins & Altman, 2008). This downgrading, in turn, implies that these trials indicate poorer quality evidence. We suggest that in future separate rating measures related to blinding they should be developed and applied to trials of psychosocial interventions to avoid giving the impression that the quality of evidence for psychosocial interventions is of a poorer methodological quality relative to trials for pharmacological interventions.

In most trials that we have reviewed, assessments have been conducted at certain time points (e.g., end of therapy and at follow up). With the advent of successful electronic methods of assessing changes in mood and other psychological parameters these might be incorporated in future trials (Miklowitz et al., 2012). These technologies have the advantage that they can be used to assess progress at relatively short time-intervals (e.g., weekly), thereby providing an analog for real-time assessments through, for example, the use of ecological momentary assessment.

Finally, the end date of the systematic search which informed this article is April 29, 2015. While several important trials in the field have been published in the interim, [e.g., (Asarnow, Hughes, Babeva, & Sugar, 2017; Cottrell et al., 2018; Furuno et al., 2018; McMain, Guimond, Barnhart, Habinski, & Streiner, 2017)], we would note that these newer trials are characterized by the same limitations in sample representativeness, outcome measurement, particularly in relation to the inclusion of data on hypothesized mechanisms of action, and a lack of participant involvement in the design and evaluation of the intervention.

CONCLUSIONS

Since we published our previous review of methodology of trials of therapeutic interventions for self-harm patients, the number of trials in the field has grown substantially, and there has been some increase in their geographical spread worldwide. The size of trials has also increased somewhat. However, most trials are subject to considerable and often crucial methodological limitations. We hope that this report will assist those who are planning future trials in this field so that the results of investigations can provide greater guidance for clinicians and others responsible for planning clinical services, together with service users, about what treatments are likely to be most effective.

AUTHOR NOTE

Katrina Witt Centre for Suicide Research, Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Ellen Townsend Self-Harm Research Group, School of Psychology, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

Ella Arensman National Suicide Research Foundation and Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College Cork, Cork, Republic of Ireland.

David Gunnell School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

Philip Hazell Discipline of Psychiatry, Sydney Medical School, Sydney, Australia.

Tatiana Taylor Sainsbury Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London, London, UK.

Tatiana Taylor Sainsbury Centre for Global Mental Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

Kees Van Heeringen Unit for Suicide Research, Department of Psychiatry and Medical Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium.

Keith Hawton Centre for Suicide Research, Department of Psychiatry, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Keith Hawton, Centre for Suicide Research, Department of Psychiatry, Warneford Hospital, Oxford, OX3 7JX, UK. Email: keith.hawton@psych.ox.ac.uk

ETHICAL APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

Ethical approval and participant consent were not required for this review, since the study involved review and analysis of previously published data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the help of all authors who provided additional clarification and/or extra data for their trials.

CONSENT TO PUBLISH

All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript for publication.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

This review involves analysis of previously published data available in the studies included in this review. The final dataset is available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

K.H. authored two of the trials included in this article, and E.A., D.G., P.H., and K.V.H. authored one trial each. We declare no other competing interests.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

K.H. had the idea for this article. All authors extracted data and assessed risk of bias for included trials. K.W. and T.T.S. conducted the statistical analyses. K.W. and K.H. wrote the initial version of the article. All authors contributed to the interpretation of results and revisions of the article and approved the final version.

FUNDING

This review received no specific source of external funding. K.H. used personal funding received from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) to support the project. The NIHR had no role in the research or the decision to publish. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NIHR.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed at [publisher's weblink](#).

REFERENCES

- Adamson, J., Cockayne, S., Puffer, S., & Torgerson, D. (2006). Review of randomised trials using the post-randomised consent (Zelen's) design. *Contemporary Clinical Trials*, 27(4), 305–319. doi:[10.1016/j.cct.2005.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cct.2005.11.003)
- Allard, R., Marshall, M., & Plante, M. C. (1992). Intensive follow-up does not decrease the risk of repeat suicide attempts. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 22(3), 303–314. doi:[10.1111/j.1943-278X.1992.tb00735.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.1992.tb00735.x)
- Arensman, E., Griffin, E., & Corcoran, P. (2016). Self-Harm: Extent of the problem and prediction of repetition. In R. O'Connor & J. Parkes (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Suicide Prevention* (pp. 61–73). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Arensman, E., Townsend, E., Hawton, K., Bremner, S., Feldman, E., Goldney, R., ... Träskman-Bendz, L. (2001). Psychosocial and pharmacological treatment of patients following deliberate self-harm: The methodological issues involved in evaluating effectiveness. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 31(2), 169–180. doi:[10.1521/suli.31.2.169.21516](https://doi.org/10.1521/suli.31.2.169.21516)
- Asarnow, J., Hughes, J., Babeva, K., & Sugar, C. (2017). Cognitive-behavioral family treatment for suicide attempt prevention: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 56(6), 506–514. doi:[10.1016/j.jaac.2017.03.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2017.03.015)
- Bateman, A., & Fonagy, P. (2009). Randomized controlled trial of outpatient mentalization-based treatment versus structured clinical management for borderline personality disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 166(12), 1355–1364. doi:[10.1186/s12888-016-1000-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-016-1000-9)
- Beautrais, A. L., Gibb, S. J., Faulkner, A., Ferguson, D. M., & Mulder, R. T. (2010). Postcard intervention for repeat self-harm: randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 197(1), 55–60. doi:[10.1192/bjp.bp.109.075754](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.109.075754)
- Beck, A., Kovacs, M., & Weissman, A. (1979). The assessment of suicidal intention: The Scale for Suicidal Ideation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 47(2), 343–352. doi:[10.1037//0022-006X.47.2.343](https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-006X.47.2.343)
- Beckman, K., Mittendorfer-Rutz, E., Lichtenstein, P., Larsson, H., Almqvist, C., Runeson, B., & Dahlin, M. (2016). Mental illness and suicide after self-harm among young adults: Long-term follow-up of self-harm patients, admitted to hospital care, in a national cohort. *Psychological Medicine*, 46(16), 3397–3405. doi:[10.1017/S0033291716002282](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291716002282)

- Beck, A., & Steer, R. (1988). *Manual for the Beck Hopelessness Scale*. New York, NY: Psychological Corporation.
- Beck, A., Ward, C., Mendelsohn, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 4(6), 561–571. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1961.01710120031004
- Bennewith, O., Stocks, N., Gunnell, D., Peters, T.J., Evans, M.O., & Sharp, D.J. (2002). General practice based intervention to prevent repeat episodes of deliberate self-harm: cluster randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*, 324(7348), 1254–1257. doi:10.1136/bmj.324.7348.1254
- Benson, J., & Shakya, R. (2008). Suicide prevention in Nepal: A comparison to Australia - a personal view. *Mental Health in Family Medicine*, 5(3), 177–182.
- Bohnert, A., McCarthy, J., Ignacio, R., Ilgen, M., Eisenberg, A., & Blow, F. (2013). Misclassification of suicide deaths: Examining the psychiatric history of overdose decedents. *Injury Prevention*, 19(5), 326–330. doi:10.1136/injuryprev-2012-040631
- Borges, G., Bagge, C. L., Cherpitel, C. J., Conner, K. R., Orozco, R., & Rossow, I. (2017). A meta-analysis of acute use of alcohol and the risk of suicide attempt. *Psychological Medicine*, 47(5), 949–957. doi:10.1017/S0033291716002841
- Brown, G. K., Ten Have, T., Henriques, G. R., Xie, S. X., Hollander, J. E., & Beck, A. T. (2005). Cognitive therapy for the prevention of suicide attempts. *JAMA*, 294(5), 563–570. doi:10.1001/jama.294.5.563
- Carroll, R., Metcalfe, C., & Gunnell, D. (2014). Hospital presenting self-harm and risk of fatal and non-fatal repetition: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One*, 9(2), e89944. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0089944
- Carter, G. L., Clover, K., Whyte, I. M., Dawson, A. H., & Este, C. D. (2005). Postcards from the EDge project: randomised controlled trial of an intervention using postcards to reduce repetition of hospital treated deliberate self-poisoning. *BMJ*, 331(7520), 805–809. doi:10.1136/bmj.38579.455266.E0
- Cedereke, M., Monti, K., & Ojehagen, A. (2002). Telephone contact with patients in the year after a suicide attempt: Does it affect treatment attendance and outcome? A randomised controlled study. *Eur Psychiatry*, 17(2), 82–91. doi:10.1016/S0924-9338(02)00632-6
- Clarke, T., Baker, P., Watts, C.J., Williams, K., Feldman, R.A., & Sherr, L. (2002). Self-harm in adults: A randomised controlled trial of nurse-led case management versus routine care only. *Journal of Mental Health*, 11(2), 167–176. doi:10.1080/09638230020023561-1
- Cooney, E., Davis, K., Thompson, P., Wharewera-Mika, J., & Stewart, J. (2010). *Feasibility of evaluating DBT for self-harming adolescents: A small randomised controlled trial*. Auckland, New Zealand: Te Pou o Te Whakaaro Nui and The National Centre of Mental Health Research, Information and Workforce Development.
- Cotgrove, A., Zirinsky, L., Black, D., & Weston, D. (1995). Secondary prevention of attempted suicide in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 18, 569–577. doi:10.1006/jado.1995.1039
- Cottrell, D. J., Wright-Hughes, A., Collinson, M., Boston, P., Eisler, I., Fortune, S., ... Farrin, A. J. (2018). Effectiveness of systemic family therapy versus treatment as usual for young people after self-harm: A pragmatic, phase 3, multi-centre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 5(3), 203–216. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(18)30058-0
- Crawford, M. J., Csipke, E., Brown, A., Reid, S., Nilsen, K., Redhead, J., & Touquet, R. (2010). The effect of referral for brief intervention for alcohol misuse on repetition of deliberate self-harm: an exploratory randomized controlled trial. *Psychological Medicine*, 40(11), 1821–1828. doi:10.1017/S0033291709991899
- Davidson, K.M., Brown, T.M., James, V., Kirk, J., & Richardson, J. (2014). Manual-assisted cognitive therapy for self-harm in personality disorder and substance misuse: a feasibility trial. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 38(3), 108–111. doi:10.1192/pb.bp.113.043109
- De Angelis, C., Drazen, J. M., Frizelle, F. A., Haug, C., Hoey, J., Horton, R., ... Weyden, M. B. V. D. (2004). Clinical trial registration: A statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 351(12), 1250–1251. doi:10.1056/NEJMMe048225
- Donaldson, D., Spirito, A., & Esposito-Smythers, C. (2005). Treatment for adolescents following a suicide attempt: Results of a pilot trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent*

- Psychiatry*, 44(2), 113–120. doi:10.1097/00004583-200502000-00003
- Dubois, L., Walter, M., Bleton, L., Genest, P., Lemonnier, E., & Lachevre, G. (1999). Evaluation comparative et prospective d'un protocole de prise en charge spécifique de jeunes suicidants: Analyse du diagnostic psychiatrique initial, de l'observance thérapeutique et du taux de récidive à un an (résultats préliminaires). *Annales Médico-Psychologiques*, 157(8), 557–561.
- Dwan, K., Gamble, C., Williamson, P., & Kirkham, J. (2013). Systematic review of the empirical evidence of study publication bias and outcome reporting bias - an updated review. *PLoS One*, 8(7), e66844. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066844
- Evans, M.O., Morgan, H.G., Hayward, A., & Gunnell, D.J. (1999a). Crisis telephone consultation for deliberate self-harm patients: effects on repetition. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 175, 23–27. doi:10.1192/bj.p.175.1.23
- Evans, K., Tyrer, P., Catalan, J., Schmidt, U., Davidson, K., Dent, J., ... Thompson, S. (1999b). Manual-assisted cognitive-behaviour therapy (MACT): A randomized controlled trial of a brief intervention with bibliotherapy in the treatment of recurrent deliberate self-harm. *Psychological Medicine*, 29(1), 19–25. doi:10.1017/S003329179800765X
- Fleischmann, A., Bertolote, J., Wasserman, D., De Leo, D., Bolhari, J., Botega, N., ... Thanh, H. (2008). Effectiveness of brief intervention and contact for suicide attempts: A randomized controlled trial in five countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, 86(9), 703–709. doi:10.2471/BLT.07.046995
- Furuno, T., Nakagawa, M., Hino, K., Yamada, T., Kawashima, Y., Matsuka, Y., ... Hirayasu, Y. (2018). Effectiveness of assertive case management on repeat self-harm in patients admitted for suicide attempt: Findings from ACTION-J. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 225, 460–465. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2017.08.071
- Geulayov, G., Kapur, N., Turnbull, P., Clements, C., Waters, K., Ness, J., ... Hawton, K. (2016). Epidemiology and trends in non-fatal self-harm in three centres in England, 2000–2012: Findings from the Multicentre Study of Self-Harm in England. *BMJ Open*, 6(4), e010538. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010538
- Gholamrezaei, M., De Stefano, J., & Heath, N. (2017). Nonsuicidal self-injury across cultures and ethnic and racial minorities: A review. *International Journal of Psychology*, 52(4), 316–326. doi:10.1002/ijop.12230
- Gibbons, J.S., Butler, J., Urwin, P., & Gibbons, J.L. (1978). Evaluation of a social work service for self-poisoning patients. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 133, 111–118. doi:10.1192/bj.p.133.2.111
- Gratz, K., Bardeen, J., Levy, R., Dixon-Gordon, K., & Tull, M. (2015). Mechanisms of change in an emotion regulation group therapy for deliberate self-harm among women with borderline personality disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 65, 29–35. doi:10.1016/j.brat.2014.12.005
- Gratz, K., & Gunderson, J. (2006). Preliminary data on an acceptance-based emotion regulation group intervention for deliberate self-harm among women with borderline personality disorder. *Behavior Therapy*, 37(1), 25–35. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2005.03.002
- Gratz, K., Tull, M., & Levy, R. (2014). Randomized controlled trial and uncontrolled 9-month follow-up of an adjunctive emotion regulation group therapy for deliberate self-harm among women with borderline personality disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, 44(10), 2099–2122. doi:10.1017/S0033291713002134
- Green, J.M., Wood, A.J., Kerfoot, M.J., Trainor, G., Roberts, C., Rothwell, J., ... Harrington, R. (2011). Group therapy for adolescents with repeated self harm: randomised controlled trial with economic evaluation. *BMJ*, 342, d682. doi:10.1136/bmj.d682
- Gunnell, D., Bennewith, O., Simkin, S., Cooper, J., Klineberg, E., Rodway, C., ... Kapur, N. (2013). Time trends in coroners' use of different verdicts for possible suicides and their impact on officially reported incidence for suicide in England: 1990–2005. *Psychological Medicine*, 43(7), 1415–1422. doi:10.1017/S0033291711002401
- Guthrie, E., Kapur, N., Kway-Jones, K., Chew-Graham, C., Moorey, J., Mendel, E., ... Tomenson, B. (2001). Randomised controlled trial of brief psychological intervention after deliberate self poisoning. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 323, 135–138. doi:10.1136/bmj.323.7305.135

- Haagsma, J. A., Graetz, N., Bolliger, I., Naghavi, M., Higashi, H., Mullany, E. C., ... Phillips, M. R. (2016). The global burden of injury: incidence, mortality, disability-adjusted life years and time trends from the Global Burden of Disease study 2013. *Injury Prevention*, 22(1), 3–18. doi:[10.1136/injuryprev-2015-041616](https://doi.org/10.1136/injuryprev-2015-041616)
- Harned, M.S., Korslund, K.E., & Linehan, M.M. (2014). A pilot randomized controlled trial of dialectical behavior therapy with and without the dialectical behavior therapy prolonged exposure protocol for suicidal and self-injuring women with borderline personality disorder and PTSD. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 55, 7–17. doi:[10.1016/j.brat.2014.01.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2014.01.008)
- Harrington, R., Kerfoot, M., Dyer, E., McNiven, F., Gill, J., Harrington, V., ... Byford, S. (1998). Randomized trial of a home-based family intervention for children who have deliberately poisoned themselves. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37, 512–518. doi:[10.1016/S0890-8567\(14\)60001-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0890-8567(14)60001-0)
- Hassanian-Moghaddam, H., Sarjami, S., Kolahi, A.-A., & Carter, G.L. (2011). Postcards in Persia: Randomised controlled trial to reduce suicidal behaviours 12 months after hospital-treated self-poisoning. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 198(4), 309–316. doi:[10.1192/bjp.bp.109.067199](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.109.067199)
- Hatcher, S., Coupe, N., Wikiriwhi, K., Durie, S. M., & Pillai, A. (2016). Te Ira Tangaga: A Zelen randomised controlled trial of a culturally informed treatment compared to treatment as usual in Maori who present to hospital after self-harm. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 51(6), 885–894. doi:[10.1007/s00127-016-1194-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-016-1194-7)
- Hatcher, S., Sharon, C., House, A., Collins, N., Collings, S., & Pillai, A. (2015). The ACCESS study: Zelen randomised controlled trial of a package of care for people presenting to hospital after self-harm. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 206(3), 229–236. doi:[10.1192/bjp.bp.113.135780](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.113.135780)
- Hatcher, S., Sharon, C., Parag, V., & Collins, N. (2011). Problem-solving therapy for people who present to hospital with self-harm: Zelen randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 199(4), 310–316. doi:[10.1192/bjp.bp.110.090126](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.110.090126)
- Hawton, K., Bancroft, J., Catalan, J., Kingston, B., & Stedeford, A. (1981). Domiciliary and outpatient treatment of self-poisoning patients by medical and non-medical staff. *Psychological Medicine*, 11(1), 169–177. doi:[10.1017/S003329170053381](https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329170053381)
- Hawton, K., McKeown, S., Day, A., Martin, P., O'Connor, M., & Yule, J. (1987). Evaluation of out-patient counselling compared with general practitioner care following overdoses. *Psychol Med*, 17(3), 751–761. doi:[10.1017/S003329170025988](https://doi.org/10.1017/S003329170025988)
- Hawton, K., Arensman, E., Townsend, E., Bremner, S., Feldman, E., Goldney, R., ... Traskman-Bendz, L. (1998). Deliberate self-harm: Systematic review of efficacy of psychosocial and pharmacological treatments in preventing repetition. *BMJ*, 317(7156), 441. doi:[10.1136/bmj.317.7156.441](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.317.7156.441)
- Hawton, K., Bergen, H., Casey, D., Simkin, S., Palmer, B., Cooper, J., ... Owens, D. (2007). Self-harm in England: A tale of three cities. Multicentre Study of Self-Harm. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 42(7), 513–521. doi:[10.1007/s00127-007-0199-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-007-0199-7)
- Hawton, K., Bergen, H., Cooper, J., Turnbull, P., Waters, K., Ness, J., & Kapur, N. (2015). Suicide following self-harm: Findings from the Multicentre Study of Self-Harm in England, 2000–2012. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 175, 147–151. doi:[10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.062](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2014.12.062)
- Hawton, K., Saunders, K., & O'Connor, R. (2012). Self-harm and suicide in adolescents. *Lancet*, 379(9834), 2373–2382. doi:[10.1016/S0140-6736\(12\)60322-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60322-5)
- Hawton, K., Saunders, K., Topiwala, A., & Haw, C. (2013). Psychiatric disorders in patients presenting to hospital following self-harm: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 151(3), 821–830. doi:[10.1016/j.jad.2013.08.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2013.08.020)
- Hawton, K., Witt, K. G., Salisbury, T. L. T., Arensman, E., Gunnell, D., Hazell, P., ... van Heeringen, K. (2016a). Psychosocial interventions following self-harm in adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(8), 740–750. doi:[10.1016/S2215-0366\(16\)30070-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30070-0)
- Hawton, K., Witt, K., Taylor Salisbury, T., Arensman, E., Gunnell, D., Hazell, P., ... van Heeringen, K. (2016b). Psychosocial interventions for self-harm in adults. *Cochrane Database*

- Syst Rev*, 5, CD012189. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012189
- Hawton, K., Witt, K., Taylor Salisbury, T., Arensman, E., Gunnell, D., Hazell, P., & van Heeringen, K. (2015a). Pharmacological interventions for self-harm in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 7, CD011777. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011777
- Hawton, K., Witt, K., Taylor Salisbury, T., Arensman, E., Gunnell, D., Townsend, E.,, Hazell, P. (2015b). Interventions for self-harm in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, 12, CD012013. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012013
- Hawton, K., Zahl, D., & Weatherall, R. (2003). Suicide following deliberate self-harm: Long-term follow-up of patients who presented to a general hospital. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 182, 537–542. doi:10.1192/bjp.182.6.537
- Hazell, P.L., Martin, G., McGill, K., Kay, T., Wood, A., Trainor, G., ... Harrington, R. (2009). Group therapy for repeated deliberate self-harming adolescents: Failure of replication of a randomized trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48(6), 662–670. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181aOacec
- Hetrick, S., Robinson, J., Spittal, M., & Carter, G. (2016). Effective psychological and psychosocial approaches to reduce repetition of self-harm: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and meta-regression. *BMJ Open*, 6(9), e011024. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2016-011024
- Higgins, J., & Altman, D. (2008). Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In J. Higgins & S. Green (Eds.), *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (pp. 188–235). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Higgins, J., Deeks, J., & Altman, D. (2008). Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In J. Higgins & S. Green (Eds.), *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Husain, N., Afsar, S., Ara, J., Fayyaz, H., Ur Rahman, R., Tomenson, B., ... Chaudhry, I.B. (2014). Brief psychological intervention after self-harm: randomised controlled trial from Pakistan. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 204(6), 462–470. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.138370
- Hvid, M., Vangborg, K., Sørensen, H.J., Nielsen, I.K., Stenborg, J.M., & Wang, A.G. (2011). Preventing repetition of attempted suicide - II: The Amager Project, a randomized controlled trial. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 65(5), 292–298. doi:10.3109/08039488.2010.544404
- Ioannidis, J. (2005). Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Medicine*, 2(8), e124. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124
- Kapur, N., Gunnell, D., Hawton, K., Nadeem, S., Khalil, S., Longson, D., ... Cooper, J. (2013). Messages from Manchester: Pilot randomised controlled trial following self-harm. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 203(1), 73–74. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.126425
- Kawanishi, C., Aruga, T., Ishizuka, N., Yonemoto, N., Otsuka, K., Kamijo, Y., ... Hirayasu, Y. (2014). Assertive case management versus enhanced usual care for people with mental health problems who had attempted suicide and were admitted to hospital emergency departments in Japan (ACTION-J): A multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 1(3), 193–201. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(14)70259-7
- Liberman, R.P., & Eckman, T. (1981). Behavior therapy vs insight-oriented therapy for repeated suicide attempts. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 38(10), 1126–1130. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1981.01780350060007
- Linehan, M. (1981). *The Suicidal Behaviors Questionnaire*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Seattle.
- Linehan, M.M., Armstrong, H.E., Suarez, A., Allmon, D., & Heard, H.L. (1991). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of chronically parasuicidal borderline patients. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 48(12), 1060–1064. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.1991.01810360024003
- Linehan, M.M., Comtois, K.A., Murray, A.M., Brown, M.Z., Gallop, R.J., Heard, H.L., ... Lindenboim, N. (2006). Two-year randomized controlled trial and follow-up of dialectical behavior therapy vs therapy by experts for suicidal behaviors and borderline personality disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63(7), 757–766. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.63.7.757
- Marasinghe, R.B., Edirippulige, S., Kavanagh, D., Smith, A., & Jiffry, M.T.M. (2012). Effect of mobile phone-based psychotherapy in suicide prevention: A randomized controlled trial in Sri Lanka. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, 18(3), 151–155. doi:10.1258/jtt.2012.SFT107

- McLeavey, B., Daly, R., Ludgate, J., & Murray, C.M. (1994). Interpersonal problem-solving skills training in the treatment of self-poisoning patients. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 24(4), 382–394. doi:[10.1111/j.1943-278X.1994.tb00817.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1943-278X.1994.tb00817.x)
- McMain, S., Guimond, T., Barnhart, R., Habinski, L., & Streiner, D. (2017). A randomized trial of brief dialectical behaviour therapy skills training in suicidal patients suffering from borderline disorder. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 135(2), 138–148. doi:[10.1111/acps.12664](https://doi.org/10.1111/acps.12664)
- McMain, S.F., Links, P.S., Gnam, W.H., Guimond, T., Cardish, R.J., Korman, L., & Streiner, D.L. (2009). A randomized trial of dialectical behavior therapy versus general psychiatric management for borderline personality disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 166(12), 1365–1374. doi:[10.1176/appi.ajp.2009.09010039](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2009.09010039)
- Mehlum, L., Tømoen, A.J., Ramberg, M., Haga, E., Diep, L.M., Laberg, S., ... Grøholt, B. (2014). Dialectical behavior therapy for adolescents with repeated suicidal and self-harming behavior - a randomized trial. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*, 53(10), 1082–1091. doi:[10.1016/j.jaac.2014.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2014.07.003)
- Miklowitz, D. J., Price, J., Holmes, E. A., Rendell, J., Bell, S., Budge, K., ... Geddes, J. R. (2012). Facilitated integrated mood management for adults with bipolar disorder. *Bipolar Disorders*, 14(2), 185–197. doi:[10.1111/j.1399-5618.2012.00998.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1399-5618.2012.00998.x)
- Mohamed, F., Perera, A., Wijayaweera, K., Kularatne, K., Jayamanne, S., Eddleston, M., ... Gunnell, D. (2011). The prevalence of previous self-harm among self-poisoning patients in Sri Lanka. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 46(6), 517–520. doi:[10.1007/s00127-010-0217-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00127-010-0217-z)
- Morgan, H.G., Jones, E.M., & Owen, J.H. (1993). Secondary prevention of non-fatal deliberate self-harm. *The green card study. British Journal of Psychiatry*, 163(1), 111–112. doi:[10.1192/bj.163.1.111](https://doi.org/10.1192/bj.163.1.111)
- Morthorst, B., Krogh, J., Erlangsen, A., Alberdi, F., & Nordentoft, M. (2012). Effect of assertive outreach after suicide attempt in the AID (Assertive Intervention for Deliberate self-harm) trial: Randomised controlled trial. *BMJ*, 345(Aug 22 1), e4972. doi:[10.1136/bmj.e4972](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e4972)
- National Institute for Clinical Excellence. (2004). *Self-Harm: The Short-Term physical and psychological management and secondary prevention of Self-Harm in primary and secondary care*. Leicester, UK: British Psychological Society.
- Ougrin, D., Zundel, T., Ng, A., Banarsee, R., Bottle, A., & Taylor, E. (2011). Trial of therapeutic assessment in London: Randomised controlled trial of therapeutic assessment versus standard psychosocial assessment in adolescents presenting with self-harm. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 96(2), 148–153. doi:[10.1136/adc.2010.188755](https://doi.org/10.1136/adc.2010.188755)
- Owens, C. (2010). Interventions for self-harm: Are we measuring outcomes in the most appropriate way? *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 197(6), 502–503. doi:[10.1192/bj.197.6.502a](https://doi.org/10.1192/bj.197.6.502a)
- Patsiokas, A.T., & Clum, G.A. (1985). Effects of psychotherapeutic strategies in the treatment of suicide attempters. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 22(2), 281–290. doi:[10.1037/h0085507](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0085507)
- Perry, I., Corcoran, P., Fitzgerald, A., Keeley, H., Reulbach, U., & Arenzman, E. (2012). The incidence and repetition of hospital-treated deliberate self-harm: Findings from the world's first national registry. *PLoS One*, 7(2), e31663. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0031663](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0031663)
- Priebe, S., Bhatti, N., Barnicot, K., Bremner, S., Gaglia, A., Katsakou, C., ... Zinkler, M. (2012). Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of dialectical behaviour therapy for self-harming patients with personality disorder: A pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 81(6), 356–365. doi:[10.1159/000338897](https://doi.org/10.1159/000338897)
- Reynolds, W. (1988). *Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire: professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Richter, F., & Dewey, M. (2014). Zelen design in randomized controlled clinical trials. *Radiology*, 272(3), 919. doi:[10.1148/radiol.14140834](https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.14140834)
- Rossouw, T., & Fonagy, P. (2012). Mentalization-based treatment for self-harm in adolescents: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 51(12), 1304–1313. doi:[10.1016/j.jaac.2012.09.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2012.09.018)
- Rudd, M., Joiner, T., & Rajab, M. (2001). *Treating Suicidal Behaviour: An Effective Time-Limited Approach*. London, UK: The Guilford Press.

- Salkovskis, P.M., Atha, C., & Storer, D. (1990). Cognitive-behavioural problem solving in the treatment of patients who repeatedly attempt suicide. A controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 157, 871–876. doi:10.1192/bjp.157.6.871
- Schotte, D., & Clum, G. (1982). Suicide ideation in a college population. *J Consult Clin Psychol*, 50(5), 690–696.
- Shean, G. (2014). Limitations of randomized control designs in psychotherapy research. *Advances in Psychiatry*, 2014, 561452. doi:10.1155/2014/561452
- Slee, N., Garnefski, N., Van der Leeden, R., Arensman, E., & Spinhoven, P. (2008). Cognitive-behavioural intervention for self-harm: randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 192(3), 202–211. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.107.037564
- Spears, M., Montgomery, A., Gunnell, D., & Araya, R. (2014). Factors associated with the development of self-harm amongst a socio-economically deprived cohort of adolescents in Santiago, Chile. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 49(4), 629–637. doi:10.1007/s00127-013-0767-y
- Spirito, A., Boergers, J., Donaldson, D., Bishop, D., & Lewander, W. (2002). An intervention trial to improve adherence to community treatment by adolescents after a suicide attempt. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 41, 435–442. doi:10.1097/00004583-200204000-00016
- Stewart, C.D., Quinn, A., Plever, S., & Emmerson, B. (2009). Comparing cognitive behavior therapy, problem solving therapy, and treatment as usual in a high risk population. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 39(5), 538–547. doi:10.1521/suli.2009.39.5.538
- Studdert, D. M., Walter, S. J., Kemp, C., & Sutherland, G. (2016). Duration of death investigations that proceed to inquest in Australia. *Injury Prevention*, 22(5), 314–320. doi:10.1136/injuryprev-2015-041933
- Tapolaa, V., Lappalainen, R., & Wahlström, J. (2010). Brief intervention for deliberate self-harm: An exploratory study. *Suicidology Online*, 1, 95–108.
- Thompson, E., Mazza, J., Herting, J., Randell, B., & Eggert, L. (2005). The mediating roles of anxiety, depression, and hopelessness on adolescent suicidal behaviors. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 35(1), 14–34. doi:10.1521/suli.35.1.14.59266
- Torhorst, A., Möller, H.J., Bürk, F., Kurz, A., Wächtler, C., & Lauter, H. (1987). The psychiatric management of parasuicide patients: A controlled clinical study comparing different strategies of outpatient treatment. *Crisis*, 8(1), 53–61.
- Torhorst, A., Möller, H.J., Kurz, A., Schmid-Bode, W., & Lauter, H. (1988). Comparing a 3-month and a 12-month-outpatient aftercare program for parasuicide repeaters. In H.J. Möller, A. Schmidtke, & R. Welz (Eds.), *Current Issues of Suicidology* (pp. 419–424). Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag.
- Turner, R.M. (2000). Naturalistic evaluation of dialectical behaviour therapy-oriented treatment for borderline personality disorder. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 7(4), 413–419. doi:10.1016/S1077-7229(00)80052-8
- Tyrer, P., Thompson, S., Schmidt, U., Jones, V., Knapp, M., Davidson, K., ... Wessely, S. (2003). Randomized controlled trial of brief cognitive behaviour therapy versus treatment as usual in recurrent deliberate self-harm: The POPMACT study. *Psychological Medicine*, 33(6), 969–976. doi:10.1017/S0033291703008171
- Vaiva, G., Ducrocq, F., Meyer, P., Mathieu, D., Philippe, A., Libersa, C., & Goudemand, M. (2006). Effect of telephone contact on further suicide attempts in patients discharged from an emergency department: Randomised controlled study. *BMJ*, 332(7552), 1241–1245. doi:10.1136/bmj.332.7552.1241
- Van der Sande, R., Van Rooijen, L., Buskens, E., Allart, E., Hawton, K., Van der Graaf, Y., & Van Engeland, H. (1997). Intensive in-patient and community intervention versus routine care after attempted suicide. A randomised controlled intervention study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 171, 35–41. doi:10.1192/bjp.171.1.35
- Wasserman, D., Carli, V., Wasserman, C., Aptek, A., Balazs, J., Bobes, J., ..., Hoven, C. (2010). Saving and Empowering Young Lives in Europe (SEYLE): A randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*, 10, 192. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-10-192
- Waterhouse, J., & Platt, S. (1990). General hospital admission in the management of parasuicide. A randomised controlled trial. *British*

- Journal of Psychiatry*, 156, 236–242. doi:10.1192/bj.p.156.2.236
- Wei, S., Liu, L., Bi, B., Li, H., Hou, J., Tan, S., ... Liu, Y. (2013). An intervention and follow-up study following a suicide attempt in the emergency departments of four general hospitals in Shenyang, China. *Crisis*, 34(2), 107–115. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000181
- Weinberg, I., Gunderson, J.G., Hennen, J., & Cutter, C.J. (2006). Manual assisted cognitive treatment for deliberate self-harm in borderline personality disorder patients. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 20(5), 482–492. doi:10.1521/pedi.2006.20.5.482
- Welu, T.C. (1977). A follow-up program for suicide attempters: Evaluation of effectiveness. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 7(1), 17–30. doi:10.1111/j.1943-278X.1977.tb00886.x
- Whitehead, L., Crowe, M., Bugge, C., & Coppell, K. (2016). Developing and evaluating complex interventions: Enhancing the role of qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 15, 37. doi:10.1177/1609406916672113
- Witt, K., Pache de Moraes, D., Salisbury Taylor, T., Arensman, E., Gunnell, D., Hazell, P., ... Hawton, K. (2018). Treatment as usual (TAU) as a control condition in trials of cognitive behavioural-based psychotherapy for self-harm: Impact of content and quality on outcomes in a systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 235, 343–347. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2018.04.025
- Wood, A., Trainor, G., Rothwell, J., Moore, A., & Harrington, R. (2001). Randomized trial of group therapy for repeated deliberate self-harm in adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(11), 1246–1253. doi:10.1097/00004583-200111000-00003