

Population attributable risk of factors associated with the repetition of self-harm behaviour in young people presenting to clinical services: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Katrina WITT (D.Phil)^{1 *}; Allison MILNER (PhD)²; Matthew J. SPITTAL (PhD)³; Sarah HETRICK (D.Psych)^{4,5}; Jo ROBINSON (PhD)⁶; Jane PIRKIS (PhD)³; Gregory CARTER (PhD; FRANZCP)⁷

¹ Turning Point, Eastern Health Clinical School, Monash University, Australia.

² Centre for Health Equity, School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Australia.

³ Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, University of Melbourne, Australia.

⁴ Centre for Youth Mental Health, University of Melbourne, Australia.

⁵ Department of Psychological Medicine, University of Auckland, New Zealand.

⁶ Orygen, the National Centre of Excellence in Youth Mental Health and the Centre for Youth Mental Health, University of Melbourne, Australia.

⁷ Centre for Brain and Mental Health Research, Faculty of Health and Medicine University of Newcastle, Australia.

*Address for correspondence:

Dr. Katrina Witt
Turning Point Alcohol and Drugs Research Centre,
Eastern Clinical School, Monash University,
54-62 Gertrude Street,
Fitzroy, 3065, Victoria,
Australia.

P: +61 (03) 8413 8512.

E: katrina.witt@monash.edu

ABSTRACT

The repetition of hospital-treated self-harm by young people is common. However, little work has summarised the modifiable factors associated with this. A thorough understanding of those factors most strongly associated with repetition could guide the development of relevant clinical interventions. We systematically reviewed four databases (EMBASE, Medline, PubMed and PsycINFO) until 15 April 2016 to identify all observational studies of factors for the repetition of self-harm or suicide reattempts (together referred to as 'self-harm behaviour') in young people. We quantified the magnitude of association with odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and calculated the population attributable risk (PAR) and population preventable fraction (PPF) for modifiable factors to provide an indication of the potential impact in reducing subsequent self-harm behaviour in this population. Seventeen studies were included comprising 10,726 participants. Borderline personality disorder (OR 3.47, 95% CI 1.84 to 6.53; PAR 42.4%), any personality disorder (OR 2.54, 95% CI 1.71 to 3.78; PAR 16.3%), and any mood disorder (OR 2.16, 95% CI 1.09 to 4.29; PAR 42.2%) are important modifiable risk factors. Severity of hopelessness (OR 2.95, 95% CI 1.74 to 5.01), suicidal ideation (OR 2.01, 95% CI 1.43 to 2.81), and previous sexual abuse (OR 1.52, 95% CI 1.02 to 2.28; PAR 12.8%) are also associated with repetition of self-harm. We recommend clinical services should focus on identifying key modifiable risk factors at the individual patient level, whilst the reduction of exposure to child and adolescent sexual abuse would also be a useful goal for public health interventions.

Keywords: children; adolescents; young people; self-harm; suicide.

INTRODUCTION

Self-harm refers to intentional self-injury (e.g., self-cutting) or self-poisoning (e.g., consuming substances not intended for human consumption and/or medications in excess of the recommended therapeutic dosage) irrespective of motivation or degree of suicidal intent [1]. Self-harm therefore includes acts intended to result in death (i.e., attempted suicide) as well as those with unclear, or even mixed, motivations (i.e., to relieve stress or to manage negative emotions) [2].

Hospital-treated self-harm in young people is common [3]. In Australia, for example, just over 7,500 young people aged up to 24 years present to hospital following an episode of self-harm each year [4], whilst in England and Wales, around 25,000 young people present to hospital each year following an episode of self-harm [5]. Hospital statistics alone likely underestimate the population burden of self-harm in this age group, however, as only around one in eight young people who report engaging in self-harm ever present to hospital [6-8]. Community-based surveys, for example, find that just over one in 10 young people (11.2%) report having engaged in self-harm in the previous six months [9].

Repetition of hospital-treated self-harm is also common with around 16% of those engaging in self-harm representing to the same hospital within 12 months of the initial self-harm episode [10]. The risk of repetition is particularly high for people in receipt of in- or out-patient psychiatric treatment [11]. Again, community-based studies suggest a higher rate of self-harm repetition (lifetime rates of self-harm repetition: 55.4% for females and 53.2% for males) [12]. Frequent repetition of self-harm is also an important risk factor for suicide death; the leading cause of death among young people globally [13].

Guidelines, such as those by the National Institute of Clinical Excellence [14,15], the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) [16] in the United Kingdom (UK), and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists (RANZCP) [17] recommend a thorough psychosocial needs-based assessment should be undertaken for all young people presenting to clinical services to identify modifiable risk factors that may be associated with the repetition of self-harm. Ensuring a clear understanding of modifiable factors associated with further self-harm behaviour is essential to ensure the effectiveness of such assessments and to inform the development and delivery of appropriate evidence-based treatments for young people aimed at reducing exposure to those modifiable risk factors at the individual (clinical) or community (population) levels [18,19].

Although several reviews have examined risk factors for the repetition of self-harm, little work has been done to summarise the literature with regard to the repetition of self-harm behaviour in young people specifically [20,3]. This is important as certain factors, such as relationship problems [21], experiences of physical and/or sexual abuse [22], and bullying or cyberbullying [23], may have more salience for self-harm in this age group. Additionally, given that around three-quarters of mental health problems have an age of onset of 24 years or younger [24], emergent mental health problems may be particularly associated with repetition of self-harm behaviour in this age group.

Our aim was therefore to undertake a systematic review to identify and quantify the magnitude of the association of risk and/or protective factors for the repetition of self-harm behaviour following an episode of hospital-treated self-harm in young people. We also report population attributable risk fractions (PARs) and population preventable fractions (PPFs), where possible, to estimate the potential impact of these factors on repetition of self-harm behaviour at the

population level. In this way, our review can assist with future efforts to evaluate the potential impact of preventive interventions for this age group.

METHODS

This review conforms to the reporting guidance contained in the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) [25].

Search strategy and selection criteria

We searched four electronic databases (EMBASE, Medline, PubMed and PsycINFO) from their respective start dates until 15 April, 2016. The initial search was undertaken for a larger project and was therefore undertaken for all age groups. Publications specific to risk and/or protective factors for the repetition of self-harm behaviour in young people were secondarily identified using the mean age of the included participants. Keywords were developed by consensus discussions among the author group and were combined using standard Boolean operators (see Supplementary Document SD1). We also used ancestry searching of reference lists of prior reviews to identify further relevant studies inadvertently missed by the initial electronic systematic search [26-36].

All observational studies, including cohort and case-control designed studies, were eligible for inclusion provided: (1) all participants had presented either to the accident and emergency department, general hospital departments, dedicated suicide prevention centres, and/or mental health services (including both in- and out-patient services) following an episode of non-fatal self-harm; (2) the mean age of the participant group at the index presentation was up to 19.9 years; (3) data on at least one self-harm behaviour-relevant outcome, including repetition of

self-harm and/or suicide reattempts were reported; (4) data on risk and/or protective factors present at the index presentation were reported.

Studies were excluded if: (1) participants had not presented to the accident and emergency department, general hospital departments, dedicated suicide prevention centres, and/or mental health services following an episode of non-fatal self-harm; (2) the mean age of the participant group at the index presentation was greater than 20.0 years; (3) data on at least one self-harm behaviour-related outcome were not reported; (4) data for the comparison group (i.e., those without a repeat episode of self-harm behaviour at follow-up) were not reported; (5) data on the predictive validity of risk scale or rule only were reported; (6) data were not amenable to meta-analysis; (7) data for each factor reported were not replicated in at least one further, independent study; (8) a retrospective case/control design was utilized. Overlapping studies not contributing data on at least one unique risk and/or protective factor were also excluded.

Studies were independently screened for inclusion by KW and AM using a two-stage process. First, study titles and abstracts were screened and those with relevant titles and/or abstracts were retained. Second, full texts of these potentially relevant studies were screened for inclusion. Any disagreements during these processes were resolved by consensus among the review group (see Figure 1).

Data extraction

The primary outcome for this review was repetition of self-harm behaviour, including non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts, following discharge from general hospitals, emergency service departments, and/or mental health services. In studies with multiple follow-up points only data for the longest follow-up period were extracted, in line with expert recommendations

[37]. Where multiple studies recruited participants from the same catchment area over the same time frame, data from the study reporting the longest follow-up were extracted. Data from overlapping studies were therefore only included if reporting on a different risk and/or protective factor.

Data extraction was performed independently by two study authors (KW and AM) using a standard *pro forma*. Discrepancies were resolved via consensus discussions between the broader group of authors. Factors were also grouped into domains based on consensus discussions between the review authors, including: demographic, social, historical, clinical and psychiatric, and clinical characteristics of the index episode (see Table 2).

Statistical analysis

Where factors were reported dichotomously we calculated the odds ratio (OR) and the accompanying 95% confidence interval (CI). Where factors were measured on a continuous scale the OR was interpreted slightly differently; here the OR (95% CI) refers to the effect of a one unit increase in scale scores. We used the DerSimonian-Laird random effects model to calculate pooled ORs [38]. Between-study heterogeneity was measured using the I^2 statistic [39].

For risk factors, population attributable risk fractions (PARs) were calculated to indicate the proportion of cases that can be attributed to each risk factor. These were calculated using the pooled OR for each risk factor alongside an estimate of the population prevalence of that factor derived from the control group [40]. For protective factors, we calculated the converse of PARs - population preventable fractions (PPFs) [41]. Given that PARs and PPFs only make conceptual sense for factors amenable to modification, we did not calculate these for static

factors. We were also unable to calculate PARs and PPFs for factors measured on a continuous scale as the proportion exposed at each level of the scale could not be estimated from the data available.

All analyses were undertaken in Comprehensive Meta-Analysis version 3.3.070 [42].

Risk of bias in included studies

Risk of bias in the included studies was assessed using the National Institute of Health (NIH) quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies [43]. The tool includes 14 items related to the adequacy of sample representativeness, measurement of the exposure and outcome variable(s), outcome assessor blinding, and procedures undertaken to account for potential confounding. Each criterion is rated, and reviewers rate the overall study as “good”, “fair”, or “poor” quality based on the rating for each of these criteria.

RESULTS

A total of 13,144 records were identified from the electronic search (see Supplementary Document SD1). After removing duplicates, 12,927 remained for the first stage of screening. Ancestry searching yielded an additional 93 records. Following the removal of non-relevant titles, this figure was reduced to 8,119 records. After screening, 6,462 records were excluded with a further 1,481 were excluded following a review of the full text, leaving a total of 176 records, reporting on data for 126 unique independent studies, eligible for inclusion. Of these, a further 109 were excluded as they did not investigate factors for the repetition of self-harm behaviour in young people specifically. A total of 17 independent studies were therefore included in this review (Figure 1).

----- INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE -----

Study characteristics

Full methodological details for the 17 included studies are provided in Table 1. In brief, the majority were conducted either in the United States of America (USA; four studies; 23.5%) [44-47] or the United Kingdom (UK; 4 studies; 23.5%) [48-51]. Three were conducted in Australia [52-54], and one was conducted in each of Europe [55], France [56], Norway [57], and Switzerland [58]. Two further studies did not report information on where the study had been conducted [59,60].

----- INSERT TABLE 1 HERE -----

These 17 studies comprised a total of 10,726 participants (range: 24 to 6,768 participants). Over half the sample was female in all 17 studies (weighted average over studies: 76.3%, range 53.3% to 94.2%). The weighted mean age of participants at the index episode was 17.3 years (standard deviation [SD] 1.1 years, range 14.5 to 19.0 years). One study included young people (between 10 and 19 years of age) and adults (between 20 and 29 years of age); however, as study authors reported data separately for young people, we were able to include relevant data from this study in the current review [54].

Demographic Factors

None of the demographic factors reported in these 17 studies were associated with an increased risk of repetition of self-harm behavior.

In three studies the primary outcome represented a combined endpoint of non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts in addition to suicide death [52,58,57]. Excluding these studies did not materially affect the results observed (not shown).

Social Factors

None of the social factors reported in these 17 studies were associated with an increased risk of further self-harm behavior, however, only four studies reported data on factors included within this domain (Table 2).

Excluding those studies in which a combined endpoint of non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts in addition to suicide death was utilized strengthened the association for not being raised by both parents (OR 7.56, 95% CI 5.37 to 10.66; 1 study; I^2 = not applicable). For all other factors within this domain, however, the exclusion of these studies did not materially affect these results (not shown).

Historical Factors

A number of studies reported on associations with factors within the historical domain but only two were associated with repetition of self-harm behaviour. A history of sexual abuse was associated with an increased risk of further self-harm behaviour (OR: 1.52, 95% CI 1.02 to 2.28; PAR: 12.8%, 95% CI 0.6% to 26.3%), whilst having no history of self-harm and/or attempted suicide prior to the index hospital presentation was associated with a reduced risk of self-harm repetition (OR: 0.29, 95% CI 0.21 to 0.39; PFF: 32.1%, 95% CI 28.7% to 34.4%) (Table 2).

Excluding those studies in which a combined endpoint of non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts in addition to suicide death was utilized did not materially affect these results (not shown).

Clinical and Psychiatric Factors

Most of the 17 studies included in this review reported on associations with clinical and psychiatric factors (Table 2). Higher hopelessness scores (OR: 2.95, 95% CI 1.74 to 5.01; PAR: not calculable) and suicidal ideation scores (OR: 2.01, 95% CI 1.43 to 2.81, PAR: not calculable) were associated with an increased risk of self-harm repetition. A diagnosis of borderline personality disorder (OR: 3.47, 95% CI 1.84 to 6.53; PAR: 42.4%, 95% CI 20.0% to 62.3%), any personality disorder (OR: 2.54, 95% CI 1.71 to 3.78; PAR: 16.3%, 95% CI 8.2% to 25.9%), and any mood disorder (OR: 2.16, 95% CI 1.09 to 4.29; PAR: 42.2%, 95% CI 5.3% to 67.4%) were also associated with an increased risk of repetition of self-harm behaviour.

Excluding those studies in which a combined endpoint of non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts in addition to suicide death was utilized strengthened the association with depression (OR 1.99, 95% CI 1.14 to 3.48; 4 studies; $I^2 = 46.6\%$). For all other factors within this domain, however, the exclusion of these studies did not materially affect the results (not shown).

Clinical Characteristics of the Index Episode

None of the clinical characteristics of the index episode were associated with repetition of self-harm in this review (Table 2). However, to date only four studies have investigated associations with these factors.

Excluding those studies in which a combined endpoint of non-fatal self-harm and/or suicide reattempts in addition to suicide death was utilized did not materially affect these results (not shown).

DISCUSSION

We conducted a systematic review of the literature to identify modifiable risk and/or protective factors associated with further self-harm behaviour in young people presenting to clinical services following an episode of non-fatal self-harm. Our findings suggest a number of modifiable factors are associated with repetition of self-harm behaviour at the population level, including: sexual abuse, diagnosis of any mood disorder, and features consistent with borderline personality disorder. Greater severity of hopelessness, suicidal ideation, and to a lesser extent, depression were also associated with further self-harm behaviour in this review.

A diagnosis for any mood disorder was associated with one of the largest contributions to self-harm repetition risk at the population level in this review (PAR: 42.2%). In line with previous work, we also found that the severity of symptoms of depression were also associated with repeat self-harm in young people [61], suggesting that the detection and effective treatment of depression should be a cornerstone of suicide prevention initiatives in this age group [61]. International clinical practice guidelines recommend both cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) and interpersonal therapy (IPT) as first-line evidence-based psychological therapies for the treatment of depression in young people [62-65].

Borderline personality disorder has also been found to provide incremental validity, relative to depression, for suicidal ideation, self-harm and, to a lesser extent, suicide attempts in young

people [66]. In this review, we found that a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder was also associated with self-harm repetition at the population level (PAR: 42.4%), suggesting this is also an important treatment target. Given recent encouraging evidence in single trials of dialectical behaviour therapy and mentalization-based therapy for reducing the number of repeat self-harm episodes in young people with a history of repeated self-harm episodes and features consistent with borderline personality disorder [67,68], our results also point to the need to assess for borderline personality disorder symptomatology in all young people presenting to clinical services following an episode of non-fatal self-harm [66].

We also found that a diagnosis of any personality disorder may be a further treatment target (PAR 16.3%). However, it is unclear presently whether this represents the contribution of personality disorders other than borderline personality disorder, or alternatively, the pooled estimate of borderline personality disorder together with other personality disorders. Further work is therefore necessary to determine the unique contribution of personality disorders other than borderline personality disorder to self-harm repetition risk in this age group.

We also found that severity of hopelessness, suicidal ideation, and to a lesser extent, depression were also associated with repetition of self-harm. These findings add weight to those of a recent Cochrane review which found encouraging evidence in single trials of dialectical behaviour therapy and mentalization-based therapy for reducing hopelessness, suicidal ideation and, to a lesser extent, severity of depressive symptoms in young people with recurrent self-harm [67]. Other forms of lower-intensity psychological therapies have also been found to be associated with reductions in depressive symptoms, hopelessness, and suicidal ideation in adults [69], however, the evidence regarding the effectiveness of these therapies on depression, hopelessness, and suicidal ideation in young people specifically is currently lacking [67].

The experience of previous sexual abuse was also strongly associated with self-harm repetition in this review at the population level (PAR: 12.8%). Given that, internationally, between 8-13% of girls and 3-17% of boys are victims of child sexual abuse [70], results of this review would suggest that the development of effective programs for the prevention of exposure to sexual abuse in this age group could lead to significant gains in the reduction of suicidal ideation and behaviour at the community population level. Although several school-based programs have demonstrated effect in improving young people's self-protective knowledge and skills, principally measured via responses to questionnaires or vignettes [71-73], whether this improved knowledge translates to a real reduction in the incidence of sexual abuse at the population level is unknown [74,71]. Additionally, there have been no evaluations of these programs on longer-term mental health and suicidal ideation or behavioural outcomes.

Potential community population intervention targets found to be associated with a reduced risk of further self-harm behaviour in this age-group at the population level include living with family (PFF: 27.2%) and being a full-time student (PFF: 21.5%). Whilst an increasing body of work finds that educational status is associated with self-harm behaviour at both the individual and population levels [40], it is unclear whether educational status is confounded, given that young people who attempt suicide, and particularly those that do so on multiple occasions, are significantly less likely to complete secondary education compared to those without this history [75]. Additionally, given emerging work suggesting an association between greater commitment to school and reduced suicidal ideation [76], it may also be that educational status is confounded with school commitment in this review. Finally, it is also possible that educational status may also be acting as a proxy variable for socio-economic status in this review. Community level interventions to maintain educational involvement are currently

being trialled. Future work will therefore need to demonstrate whether such interventions can be effective in reducing self-harm repetition in this age group.

Strengths and Limitations of the Review

The key strength of our review relates to our use of PARs and PPFs to estimate the potential impact, at the population-level, of interventions to reduce exposure to the key modifiable factors identified in this review. In this way, our review is uniquely placed to provide clinical services, policy makers, and public health practitioners with information to inform the development of appropriate services likely to lead to meaningful reductions in rates of repeated self-harm behaviour in this population.

The primary limitation of this systematic review relates to the small number of studies we were able to include in the review, although, we would argue that this is reflective of the lack of study into repeat self-harm behavior in this population. It is notable, for example, that few studies have investigated associations with social factors commonly implicated with further self-harm behaviour in this age group, including social connectedness, housing problems, relationship problems, and drug and/or alcohol use. Studies in this area also tend to have small sample sizes and are consequently typically under-powered to detect clinically significant associations [77].

We acknowledge that the search is now somewhat dated (15 April, 2016) and that desirably we would have updated it. Resourcing constrains precluded our doing this with the same systematic rigor as we were able to afford the original search. We did, however, perform a more basic search and are confident that few studies of factors associated with self-harm

repetition specific to young people have been published in the intervening period. We therefore believe our conclusions would not change materially with the inclusion of these studies.

The studies included in this review also sourced participants from a variety of different settings, including in- and outpatient mental health services, hospitals, and emergency departments and ascertained the primary outcome measure using a variety of methods. In part, this may be reflected in the high level of heterogeneity observed for a number of factors, including: social welfare involvement with family, history of any chronic physical illness, history of attempted suicide, depression scores, diagnosis of bipolar disorder, and diagnosis of depression.

We defined repeated self-harm behavior as episodes leading to further attendances at accident and emergency department and/or general hospitals and/or medical records. In part, this reflects the fact that studies in this area have tended to recruit highly selected clinical populations [77]. Whilst we acknowledge that there may have been further episodes of self-harm behavior in the community that did not come to the attention of health care services, we chose this definition as it is consistent with the prior literature and has important implications for health service resourcing [78].

Finally, estimates of PARs and PPFs assume a causal relationship such that eliminating exposure to any one factor will leave the association for all other factors unchanged [40]. Whilst ideally we would have reported adjusted ORs and PARs or PPFs to account for possible confounding, this was not possible as only raw data and/or unadjusted effect size estimates could be consistently extracted from the studies included in this review. PARs and PPFs reported in this review are therefore not simply additive as we were unable to estimate independent effects given that there may have been considerable overlap between factors in the

studies included in this review. Self-harm behavior in young people is likely multifactorial, however. Further work on the causal pathway is therefore required before we can confidently conclude that eliminating exposure to any one of the factors identified in this review will lead to clinically significant reductions in subsequent self-harm behavior in this population. Nevertheless, we chose to present PAR and PPF estimates in this review to assist clinicians and policy makers in identifying key priority areas for intervention [40].

Conclusions

Identification of the factors associated with increased risk of repetition of self-harm behaviour at the population-level is critical to inform the development of tailored, youth-friendly interventions. We therefore recommend, on the basis of these findings, that clinical services for self-harm should focus on identifying key modifiable factors, and in particular, mood and personality disorder symptomatology, hopelessness, and suicidal ideation. At the community population (i.e., public health) level, interventions to reduce exposure to sexual abuse, and an increased opportunity for educational exposure are also worth consideration.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the help received by a research assistant, Humaria Maheen, in assisting with ancestry searching.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Ethics Approval Statement

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

Role of the funding source:

This work was supported by the Victorian Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) [Reference Number: C4892]. Individual authors would also like to acknowledge the following sources of funding: KW is funded by an American Foundation for Suicide Prevention Post-Doctoral Fellowship [Reference Number: PDF-0-145-16], SH is funded by an Auckland Medical Research Foundation Douglas Goodfellow Repatriation Fellowship, JR is funded by an NHMRC Early Career Fellowship, and JP is funded by an NHMRC Senior Research Fellowship. Funders had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. Hawton K, Harriss L, Hall S, Simkin S, Bale E, Bond A (2003) Deliberate self-harm in Oxford, 1990-2000: A time of change in patient characteristics. *Psychol Med* 33:987-995
2. Hawton K, Witt K, Taylor Salisbury T, Arensman E, Gunnell D, Hazell P, Townsend E, van Heeringen K (2016) Psychosocial interventions for self-harm in adults *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 5:CD012189
3. Hawton K, Saunders KEA, O'Connor RC (2012) Self-harm and suicide in adolescents. *Lancet* 379:2373-2382
4. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2013) Trends in hospitalised injury, Australia, 1999-00 to 2010-11. *Injury Research and Statistics Series*, number 86. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra, ACT
5. Hawton K, Fagg J, Simkin S, Bale E, Bond A (2000) Deliberate self-harm in adolescents in Oxford, 1985-1995. *J Adolesc* 23:47-55
6. Hawton K, Rodham K, Evans E, Weatherall R (2002) Deliberate self harm in adolescents: self report survey in schools in England. *BMJ* 325:1207-1211
7. McMahon E, Keeley H, Cannon M, Arensman E, Perry I, Clarke M, Chambers D, Corcoran P (2014) The iceberg of suicide and self-harm in Irish adolescents: A population-based study. *Soc Psychiatr Psychiatric Epidemiol* 49:1929-1935
8. Ystgaard M, Arensman E, Hawton K, Madge N, Van Heeringen K, Hewitt A, De Wilde E, De Leo D, Fekete S (2009) Deliberate self-harm in adolescents: Comparison between those who receive help following self-harm and those who do not. *J Adolesc* 32:875-891
9. Evans E, Hawton K, Rodham K, Deeks J (2005) The prevalence of suicidal phenomena in adolescents: A systematic review of population-based studies. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 35:239-250
10. Owens D, Horrocks J, House A (2002) Fatal and non-fatal repetition of self-harm. A systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry* 181:193-199
11. Hawton K, Bergen H, Kapur N, Cooper J, Steeg S, Ness J, Waters K (2012) Repetition of self-harm and suicide following self-harm in children and adolescents: Findings from the Multicentre Study of Self-Harm in England. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 53:1212-1219
12. Madge N, Hewitt A, Hawton K, Wilde EJD, Corcoran P, Fekete S, van Heeringen K, De Leo D, Ystgaard M (2008) Deliberate self-harm within an international community sample of young people: comparative findings from the Child and Adolescent Self-harm in Europe (CASE) Study. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 49 (6):667-677
13. World Health Organisation (2014) Preventing Suicide: A Global Imperative. World Health Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland
14. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2004) Self-Harm: The Short-Term Physical and Psychological Management and Secondary Prevention of Self-Harm in Primary and Secondary Care. National Institute of Clinical Excellence, London, UK
15. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2011) Self-Harm: Longer Term Management. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health and the British Psychological Society, Leicester, UK
16. Royal College of Psychiatrists (2010) Self-harm, Suicide and Risk: Helping People who Self-Harm [College Report: CR158]. Royal College of Psychiatrists, London, UK
17. Carter G, Page A, Large M, Hetrick S, Milner A, Bendit N, Walton C, Draper B, Hazell P, Fortune S, Burns J, Patton G, Lawrence M, Dadd L, Robinson J, Christensen H (2016) Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists clinical practice guideline for the management of deliberate self-harm. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 50:939-1000
18. Carroll R, Metcalfe C, Steeg S, Davies N, Cooper J, Kapur N, Gunnell D (2016) Psychosocial assessment of self-harm patients and risk of repeat presentation: An instrumental variable analysis using time of hospital presentation. *PLoS One* 11:e0149713
19. Bergen H, Hawton K, Waters K, Cooper J, Kapur N (2010) Psychosocial assessment and repetition of self-harm: The significance of single and multiple repeat episode analyses. *J Affect Disord* 127:257-265

20. Robinson J (2016) Repeated self harm in young people: a review. *Australasian Psychiatry* 25:105-107
21. Hawton K, Bergen H, Waters K, Ness J, Cooper J, Steeg S, Kapur N (2012) Epidemiology and nature of self-harm in children and adolescents: Findings from the Multicentre Study of Self-Harm in England. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 21:369-377
22. Madge N, Hawton K, McMahon E, Corcoran P, De Leo D, De Wilde E, Fekete S, Van Heeringen K, Ystgaard M, Arensman E (2011) Psychological characteristics, stressful life events and deliberate self-harm: Findings from the Child and Adolescent Self-Harm in Europe (CASE) study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 20:499-508
23. Hinduja S, Patchin J (2010) Bullying, cyberbullying, and suicide. *Arch Suic Res* 14:206-221
24. Kessler R, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas K, Walters E (2005) Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 62:593-602
25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman D (2009) Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLoS One* 6:e1000097
26. 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
27. Bürk F, Möller H (1985) Prädiktoren für weiteres suizidales Verhalten bei nach einem Suizidversuch hospitalisierten Patienten [Predictors of further suicidal behavior in hospitalized patients following a suicide attempt: Literature review]. *Fortschr Neurol Psychiatr* 53:259-270
28. Beghi M, Rosenbaum J, Cerri C, Cornaggia C (2013) Risk factors for fatal and non-fatal repetition of suicide attempts: A literature review. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat* 9:1725-1736
29. Fliege H, Lee J, Grimm A, Klapp B (2009) Risk factors and correlates of deliberate self-harm behavior: A systematic review. *J Psychosom Res* 66:477-493
30. Fox K, Franklin J, Ribeiro J, Kleiman E, Bentley K, Nock M (2015) Meta-analysis of risk factors for nonsuicidal self-injury. *Clin Psychol Rev* 42:156-167
31. Myers E (1988) Predicting repetition of deliberate self-harm: A review of the literature in the light of a current study. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 77:314-319
32. Bhui K, McKenzie K, Rasul F (2007) Rates, risk factors, and methods of self harm among minority ethnic groups in the UK: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health* 7:336
33. Larkin C, Di Blasi Z, Arensman E (2014) Risk factors for repetition of self-harm: A systematic review of prospective hospital-based studies. *PLoS One* 9 (1):e84282
34. Krawczyk J, Gmitrowicz A (2014) Analysis of the factors protecting against suicide. *Psychiatria i Psychologia Kliniczna* 14 (1):43-49
35. McMillian D, Gilbody S, Beresford E, Neilly L (2007) Can we predict suicide and non-fatal self-harm with the Beck Hopelessness Scale? A meta-analysis. *Psychol Med* 37:769-778
36. Pires M, Silva T, Passos M, Sougey E, Bastos Filho O (2014) Risk factors of suicide attempts by poisoning: Review. *Trends in Psychiatry and Psychotherapy* 36:63-74
37. Deeks J, Higgins J, Altman D (2011) Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins J, Green S (eds) *Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. The Cochrane Collaboration,
38. DerSimonian R, Laird N (1986) Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 7:177-188
39. Higgins J, Thompson S, Deeks J, Altman D (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327:557
40. Li Z, Page A, Martin G, Taylor R (2011) Attributable risk of psychiatric and socio-economic factors for suicide from individual-level, population-based studies: A systematic review. *Soc Sci Med* 72:608-616
41. Shield K, Parkin D, Whiteman D, Rehm J, Viallon V, Micallef C, Vineis P, Rushton L, Bray F, Soerjomataram I (2016) Population attributable and preventable fractions: Cancer risk factor surveillance, and cancer policy projection. *Curr Epidemiol Rep* 3:201-211

42. BioStat (2014) Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (version 3.3.070). Biostat Corporation, Englewood, NJ
43. National Heart Lung and Blood Institute (2014) Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies. Accessed 1 April, 2016 from: <http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-pro/guidelines/in-develop/cardiovascular-risk-reduction/tools/cohort>.
44. Burns C, Cortell R, Wagner B (2008) Treatment compliance in adolescents after attempted suicide: A two-year follow-up study. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 47:948-957
45. Czyz E, Berona J, King C (2015) A prospective examination of the interpersonal-psychological theory of suicidal behavior among psychiatric adolescent inpatients. *Suic Life Threat Behav* 45 (243-59)
46. Barter J, Swaback D, Todd D (1968) Adolescent suicide attempts: A follow-up study of hospitalized patients. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 19:523-527
47. Spirito A, Lewander W, Levy S, Kurkjian J, Fritz G (1994) Emergency department assessment of adolescent suicide attempters: Factors related to short-term follow-up outcome. *Psychiatr Emerg Care* 10:6-12
48. Chitsabesan P, Harrington R, Harrington V, Tomenson B (2003) Predicting repeat self-harm in children: How accurate can we expect to be? *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 12:23-29
49. Glazebrook K, Townsend E, Sayal K (2015) The role of attachment style in predicting repetition of adolescent self-harm: A longitudinal study. *Suic Life Threat Behav* 45:664-678
50. Hawton K, Harriss L (2008) Deliberate self-harm by under-15-year-olds: Characteristics, trends and outcome. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 49:411-418
51. Hawton K, Kingsbury S, Stwinhardt K, James A, Fagg J (1999) Repetition of deliberate self-harm by adolescents: The role of psychological factors. *J Adolesc* 22:369-378
52. Vajda J, Steinbeck K (2000) Factors associated with repeat suicide attempts among adolescents. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 34:437-445
53. Reith D, Whyte I, Carter G (2003) Repetition risk for adolescent self-poisoning: A multiple event survival analysis. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 37:212-218
54. Hu N, Glauert R, Li J, Taylor C (2016) Risk factors for repetition of a deliberate self-harm episode within seven days in adolescents and young adults: A population-level record linkage study in Western Australia. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 50:154-166
55. Hultén A, Jiang G-X, Wasserman D, Hawton K, Hjelmeland H, De Leo D, Ostamo A, Salander Renberg E, Schmidtke A (2001) Repetition of attempted suicide among teenagers in Europe: Frequency, timing and risk factors. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 10:161-169
56. Consoli A, Cohen D, Bodeau N, Guilé J-M, Mirkovic B, Knafo A, Mahé V, Laurent C, Renaud J, Labelle R, Breton J-J, Gérardin P (2015) Risk and protective factors for suicidality at 6-month follow-up in adolescent inpatients who attempted suicide: An exploratory model. *Can J Psychiatry* 60:s27-36
57. Groholt B, Ekeberg Ø, Haldorsen T (2006) Adolescent suicide attempters: What predicts future suicidal acts? *Suic Life Threat Behav* 36:638-650
58. Méan M, Righini N, Narring F, Jeannin A, Michaud P-A (2005) Substance use and suicidal conduct: A study of adolescents hospitalized for suicide attempt and ideation. *Acta Paediatrica* 94:952-959
59. Selby E, Yen S, Spirito A (2013) Time varying prediction of thoughts of death and suicidal ideation in adolescents: Weekly rating over 6-month follow-up. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 42:481-495
60. Yen S, Weinstock L, Andover M, Sheets E, Selby E, Spirito A (2013) Prospective predictors of adolescent suicidality: 6-month post-hospitalization follow-up. *Psychol Med* 43:983-993
61. Moran P, Coffey C, Romaniuk H, Olsson C, Borschmann R, Carlin J, Patton G (2012) The natural history of self-harm from adolescence to young adulthood: A population-based cohort study. *Lancet* 379:236-243
62. McDermott B, Baigent M, Chanen A, Fraser L, Graetz B, Hayman N, Newman L, Parikh N, Peirce B, Proimos J, Smalley T, Spence S (2010) Clinical Practice Guidelines: Depression in Adolescents and Young Adults. *Beyondblue: The National Depression Initiative*, Melbourne, VIC

63. Malhi G, Bassett D, Boyce P, Bryant R, Fitzgerald P, Fritz K, Hopwood M, Lyndon B, Mulder R, Murray G, Porter R, Singh A (2015) Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists clinical practice guidelines for mood disorders. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry* 49:1-185
64. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (2005) Depression in Children and Young People: Identification and Management in Primary, Community and Secondary Care [Clinical Practice Guidelines, No. 28]. British Psychological Society, Leicester, UK
65. Birmaher B, Brent D (2007) Practice Parameter for the Assessment and Treatment of Children and Adolescents with Depressive Disorders. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 46:1503-1526
66. Sharp C, Green K, Yaroslavsky I, Venta A, Zanarini M, Pettit J (2012) The incremental validity of borderline personality disorder relative to major depressive disorder for suicidal ideation and deliberate self-harm in adolescents. *J Pers Disord* 26:927-938
67. Hawton K, Witt K, Taylor Salisbury T, Arensman E, Gunnell D, Townsend E, van Heeringen K, Hazell P (2015) Interventions for self-harm in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 12:CD012013
68. Ougrin D, Tranah T, Stahl D, Moran P, Asarnow J (2015) Therapeutic interventions for suicide attempts and self-harm in adolescents: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 54:97-107
69. 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:e011024
70. Barth J, Bermetz L, Heim E, Trelle S, Tonia T (2013) The current prevalence of child sexual abuse worldwide: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Public Health* 58:469-483
71. Walsh K, Zwi K, Woolfenden S, Shlonsky A (2015) School-based education programmes for the prevention of child sexual abuse. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 4:CD004380
72. Barron I, Miller D, Kelly T (2015) School-based child sexual abuse prevention programs: Moving toward resilience-informed evaluation. *J Child Sexual Abuse* 24:77-96
73. Topping K, Barron I (2009) School-based child sexual abuse prevention programs: A review of effectiveness. *Rev Educat Res* 79:431-463
74. Rudolph J, Zimmer-Gembeck M (2016) Reviewing the focus: A summary and critique of child-focused sexual abuse prevention. *Trauma Violence Abuse*:ePub ahead of Print: DOI: 10.1177/1524838016675478
75. Christiansen E, Agerbo E, Larsen K, Bilenberg N, Stenager E (2015) Youth, suicide attempts and low level of education: A Danish historical register-based cohort study of the outcome of suicide attempt. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 61:802-810
76. Langille D, Asbridge M, Cragg A, Rasic D (2015) Associations of school connectedness with adolescent suicidality: Gender differences and the role of risk of depression. *Can J Psychiatry* 60:258-267
77. Chan J, Draper B, Banerjee S (2007) Deliberate self-harm in older adults: a review of the literature from 1995 to 2004. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry* 22 (8):720-732. doi:10.1002/gps.1739
78. Murphy E, Kapur N, Webb R, Purandare N, Hawton K, Bergen H, Waters K, Cooper J (2012) Risk factors for repetition and suicide following self-harm in older adults: Multicentre cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry* 200:399-404
79. Czyz E, King C (2015) Longitudinal trajectories of suicidal ideation and subsequent suicide attempts among adolescent inpatients. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol* 44:181-193
80. Groholt B, Ekeberg Ø (2009) Prognosis after adolescent suicide attempt: Mental health, psychiatric treatment, and suicide attempts in a nine-year follow-up study. *Suic Life Threat Behav* 39:125-136

Accepted Manuscript

Table 1. Characteristics of studies of factors for repetition of suicidal behavior in young people.

| Study | City and Country | Recruitment Period | N | Mean Age (\pm SD) | Female (%) | Source of Participants | Outcome Ascertainment | Follow-Up Period | Risk of Bias |
|--|---|------------------------|-------|------------------------------|------------|---|---|------------------|--------------|
| Barter, 1968 | Colorado state, United States of America | Jun. 1962 to Jun. 1965 | 45 | Not reported | 71.1 | Admissions to Colorado Psychiatric Hospital following a suicide attempt. | Self-reported readmission to any psychiatric hospital following a suicide attempt. | Up to 3.7 years | Moderate. |
| Burns, 2008 | Mid-Atlantic Region, United States of America (city not reported) | Not reported | 85 | 15.6 \pm 1.3 | 72.9 | Admissions to a private hospital following a suicide attempt. | Self-reported suicide reattempt and/or severe suicidal ideation as assessed using three items from the DISC-1. | 2 years | Low. |
| Chitsabesan, 2003 | Manchester, United Kingdom | Not reported | 149 | 14.5 \pm 1.2 | 89.3 | Referrals to a child and adolescent mental health service following an episode of self-poisoning. | Representations following an episode of self-harm (unclear if this was restricted to self-poisoning). | 6 months | Low. |
| Consoli, 2015 | Rouen, Amiens, Crépy, Creil, and Meaux, France | Jan. 2001 to Dec. 2011 | 107 | 14.9 \pm 1.4 | 84.1 | Admissions to emergency department of any one of five hospitals following a suicide attempt defined according to the Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment) | Readmissions to any one of five hospitals following a suicide attempt and/or an episode of self-harm. | 6 months | Moderate. |
| Czyz, 2015a (Czyz, 2015b) (Ghazuiddin, 2014) (King, 2010) | Ann Arbor, United States of America | Jan. 2002 to Dec. 2005 | 376 | 15.6 \pm 1.3 | 71.9 | Admissions to psychiatric ward at any one of two hospitals due to serious suicidal ideation and/or following a suicide attempt. | Suicide reattempt (unclear how this was ascertained) | Up to 1 year | Low. |
| Glazebrook, 2014 | Nottingham, United Kingdom | Apr. 2010 to Jun. 2011 | 52 | Md. 15.0 (IQR: 15.0-16.0) | 94.2 | Referrals to child and adolescent mental health services following an episode of self-harm. | Self-reported episode of self-harm. | 6 months | Low. |
| Groholt, 2006 (Groholt, 2009) | Oslo, Norway | Jan. 1992 to Dec. 1994 | 92 | 16.9 \pm 1.8 | 90.0 | Admissions to medical ward of any one of six general hospitals following a suicide attempt. | Suicide reattempt according to self-report and/or death by suicide according to either collateral informant report and/or to national mortality statistics. (Data for these two outcomes could not be disaggregated). | 9 years | Low. |
| Hawton, 2008 (Hawton, 2012) | Oxford, United Kingdom | Jan. 1978 to Dec. 2003 | 710 | (Rg.: 8 to 15) | 86.1 | Presentations to emergency department following an episode of self-harm. | Representations to the emergency department following a further episode of self-harm. | 11 years | Moderate. |
| Hawton, 1999 | Oxford, United Kingdom | Not reported | 45 | (Rg.: 13 to 18) | 84.4 | Admissions to a general hospital following an episode of self-poisoning. | Representation to a general hospital following an episode of self-poisoning or self-injury. | 1 year | Low. |
| Hu, 2016† | State of Western Australia, Australia | Jan. 2000 to Dec. 2011 | 6,768 | (Rg.: 10 to 19) | 68.6 | Presentations and/or admissions to any emergency department, general and/or psychiatric hospital in the state following an episode of self-harm. | Representation and/or readmission to any emergency department, general and/or psychiatric hospital following an episode of self-harm according to a statewide hospitalisation register. | 1 week | Moderate. |
| Hultén, 2001 | Various cities across Europe | Jan. 1989 to Dec. 1995 | 1,264 | (Rg.: 15 to 19) | 72.4 | Presentations and/or admissions to emergency department following a suicide attempt. | Representation and/or readmission to any emergency department following a suicide attempt. | 2 years | Low. |
| Méan, 2005 | Lausanne and Geneva, Switzerland | Apr. 2000 to Sep. 2001 | 186 | 18.9 \pm NR | 80.1 | Admissions to one of two general hospitals following a suicide attempt or severe suicidal ideation. | Readmissions to one of two general hospitals following a further suicide attempt and/or death by suicide (unclear how this was ascertained). | 18 months | High. |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------------|-----|------------|------|--|---|-----------|-----------|
| Reith, 2003 | Newcastle and the Hunter Valley, Australia | Jan. 1991 to Dec. 1995 | 450 | 17.0 ± NR | 69.0 | Presentations to a local clinical toxicology unit following an episode of intentional self-poisoning. | Presentations to a local clinical toxicology unit following a further episode of intentional self-poisoning. | 1 year | Low. |
| Selby, 2013 | Not reported | Not reported | 119 | 15.3 ± 1.4 | 68.1 | Admissions to the psychiatric inpatient unit of a general hospital with severe suicidal ideation (i.e., ideation with evidence of suicidal planning) and/or a suicide attempt. | Suicide attempt and/or return of severe suicidal ideation according to self-report. | 6 months | Moderate. |
| Spirito, 1994 | City not reported, United States of America | Not reported | 62 | 15.2 ± 1.4 | 84.5 | Presentations to a regional trauma emergency department centre following a suicide attempt. | Suicide reattempt according to self- and/or collateral informant report. | 3 months | Moderate. |
| Vajda, 2000 | Sydney, Australia | Jan. 1994 to Dec. 1996 | 112 | 17.9 ± 1.9 | 67.9 | Admissions to the emergency department of a teaching hospital following a suicide attempt. | Suicide reattempt resulting in admission to the emergency department of a teaching hospital and/or death by suicide according to Coroner's records. | 12 months | Low. |
| Yen, 2013 | Not reported | Not reported | 104 | 15.3 ± 1.4 | 64.4 | Admissions to the adolescent inpatient psychiatric unit following a suicide attempt, an episode of self-harm, or clinically significant suicidal ideation. | Suicide reattempt or representation to the emergency department to prevent a suicidal behaviour according to self-report. | 6 months | Low. |

Accepted Manuscript

TABLE 2. Factors associated with the repetition of suicidal behavior in studies of young people.

| Risk/Protective Factors (Measured at index presentation) | Pooled OR (95% CI) | Pooled PAR/PFF (95% CI) | k | I ² (%) | References |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Demographic Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Age at index episode (continuous)**</i> | 0.99 (0.66 to 1.48) | | 3 | 5.2 | [49,60,57] |
| <i>Male gender*</i> | 1.05 (0.85 to 1.30) | | 10 | 0.0 | [50,48,79,60,44,57,55,58,53,52] |
| <i>Parents divorced/separated*</i> | 0.91 (0.39 to 2.12) | | 2 | 0.0 | [57,47] |
| <i>Student‡</i> | 0.56 (0.23 to 1.33) | 21.5 (-25.3 to 32.2) | 2 | 34.1 | [52,57] |
| <i>Unemployed</i> | 1.35 (0.52 to 3.47) | 11.2 (-21.1 to 47.4) | 3 | 75.3 | [52,57,53] |
| Social Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Lives with family‡</i> | 0.31 (0.09 to 1.11) | 27.2 (-6.6 to 33.2) | 3 | 67.0 | [52,46,57] |
| <i>Not raised by both parents*</i> | 2.95 (0.53 to 16.33) | | 2 | 74.2 | [46,57] |
| <i>Problems at school</i> | 1.58 (0.65 to 3.85) | 19.4 (-17.2 to 54.3) | 2 | 0.0 | [57,47] |
| <i>Recent (<12 months) antisocial behavior</i> | 1.85 (0.53 to 6.44) | 12.9 (-8.9 to 48.7) | 2 | 0.0 | [58,47] |
| <i>Socially isolated</i> | 6.42 (0.55 to 75.21) | 32.4 (-4.2 to 86.8) | 2 | 54.7 | [46,47] |
| <i>Social welfare involvement with family</i> | 2.81 (0.54 to 14.70) | 38.0 (-18.6 to 82.2) | 2 | 75.2 | [46,57] |
| Historical Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Family history of suicidal behavior</i> | 1.12 (0.53 to 2.36) | 5.0 (-24.7 to 36.7) | 3 | 27.6 | [48,60,47] |
| <i>History of any chronic physical illness</i> | 2.46 (0.27 to 21.99) | 45.2 (-70.0 to 92.2) | 2 | 87.2 | [52,57] |
| <i>History of attempted suicide</i> | 1.74 (0.83 to 3.65) | 18.9 (-5.7 to 45.6) | 7 | 80.5 | [52,48,45,60,57,55,58,47] |
| <i>History of in/out patient psychiatric treatment</i> | 2.28 (0.90 to 5.82) | 14.9 (-1.4 to 39.6) | 3 | 32.8 | [11,48,47] |
| <i>History of multiple episodes of self-harm‡</i> | 2.22 (1.06 to 4.67) | | 2 | 55.9 | [79,58] |
| <i>History of self-harm‡</i> | 1.59 (1.17 to 2.15) | | 3 | 0.0 | [11,60,49] |
| <i>No history of self-harm and/or attempted suicide‡</i> | 0.29 (0.21 to 0.39) | 32.1 (28.7 to 34.4) | 2 | 0.0 | [55,58] |
| <i>Sexually abused</i> | 1.52 (1.02 to 2.28) | 12.8 (0.6 to 26.3) | 5 | 0.0 | [52,48,60,57,58] |
| Clinical and Psychiatric Factors | | | | | |
| <i>Alcohol use/dependence‡</i> | 2.24 (0.98 to 5.13) | | 3 | 0.0 | [53,47,52] |
| <i>Depression scores (continuous)**</i> | 2.25 (0.88 to 5.76) | | 4 | 79.2 | [56,49,57,51] |
| <i>Diagnosed with adjustment disorder‡</i> | 0.72 (0.47 to 1.10) | 7.0 (-2.6 to 12.4) | 3 | 0.0 | [52,57,53] |
| <i>Diagnosed with any anxiety disorder‡</i> | 1.13 (0.75 to 1.69) | | 5 | 0.0 | [60,57,58,54,53] |
| <i>Diagnosed with any eating disorder‡</i> | 0.72 (0.06 to 8.12) | 3.4 (-806.0 to 10.5) | 2 | 74.8 | [60,57] |
| <i>Diagnosed with any mood disorder</i> | 2.16 (1.09 to 4.29) | 42.2 (5.3 to 67.4) | 2 | 0.0 | [57,58] |
| <i>Diagnosed with any personality disorder</i> | 2.54 (1.71 to 3.78) | 16.3 (8.2 to 25.9) | 3 | 0.0 | [52,57,53] |
| <i>Diagnosed with any psychosis</i> | 1.71 (0.99 to 2.92) | 8.7 (-0.1 to 20.7) | 5 | 28.7 | [52,57,58,54,53] |
| <i>Diagnosed with bipolar disorder‡</i> | 1.64 (0.20 to 13.54) | | 2 | 82.3 | [60,54] |
| <i>Diagnosed with borderline personality disorder</i> | 3.47 (1.84 to 6.53) | 42.4 (20.0 to 62.3) | 3 | 52.6 | [54,60] |
| <i>Diagnosed with depression</i> | 1.46 (0.70 to 3.05) | 23.1 (-24.8 to 57.3) | 5 | 76.1 | [56,52,48,60,54] |
| <i>Diagnosed with substance use disorder</i> | 1.22 (0.93 to 1.59) | 7.1 (-2.5 to 17.2) | 6 | 0.0 | [60,57,58,54,48,53] |
| <i>Drug use/dependence</i> | 1.52 (0.67 to 3.43) | 12.2 (-9.5 to 39.3) | 3 | 0.0 | [47,52,57] |
| <i>Current in/out patient psychiatric treatment</i> | 2.05 (0.45 to 9.20) | 44.4 (-71.0 to 86.2) | 2 | 72.2 | [80,55] |
| <i>Hopelessness scores (continuous)**</i> | 2.95 (1.74 to 5.01) | | 4 | 0.0 | [56,48,57,51] |
| <i>Impulsivity scores (continuous)**</i> | 1.19 (0.32 to 4.49) | | 2 | 0.0 | [57,51] |
| <i>Suicidal ideation scores (continuous)**</i> | 2.01 (1.43 to 2.81) | | 2 | 0.0 | [79,60] |
| <i>Suicide intent scores (continuous)**</i> | 1.31 (0.47 to 3.63) | | 2 | 45.1 | [57,51] |
| Clinical Characteristics of the Index Episode | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---|------|------------|
| <i>Index episode: premeditated (vs. impulsive)</i> | 1.18 (0.29 to 4.82) | 6.9 (-40.8 to 60.9) | 2 | 44.5 | [47,57] |
| <i>Left suicide note‡</i> | 0.76 (0.31 to 1.87) | 6.0 (-30.2 to 15.5) | 2 | 0.0 | [47,57] |
| <i>Referred for in/out patient psychiatric treatment‡</i> | 0.84 (0.48 to 1.46) | 7.1 (-29.1 to 20.0) | 2 | 38.4 | [80,55] |
| <i>Suicide intent evident at index episode</i> | 1.01 (0.44 to 2.35) | 0.7 (-39.1 to 40.3) | 2 | 0.0 | [47,57] |
| <i>Use of violent methods at index episode (vs. non-violent methods)</i> | 1.27 (0.71 to 2.27) | 5.2 (-6.3 to 20.5) | 3 | 33.0 | [55,57,47] |

Table Notes: **CI:** confidence interval; **I²:** I-squared percentage; **k:** number of studies; **NA:** not applicable; **NC:** not calculated; **OR:** odds ratio; **PAR:** population attributable risk; **PPF:** Population Preventable Fraction. ; . Risk and/or protective factors in bold font are significant at the 0.05 level.

* The PAR/PPF was not calculated as this risk and/or protective factor is not amenable to intervention.

** The PAR/PPF was not calculated at this risk and/or protective factor was measured on a continuous scale.

† The PAR/PPF could not be calculated for this risk factor as one or more of the studies did not originally present data in 2x2 contingency tables precluding calculation of the prevalence of this risk factor within the control or no-repetition group.

‡ PFF.

Accepted Manuscript

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram.

Accepted Manuscript