NIHR | National Institute for Health and Care Research

HSDR Evidence Synthesis Centre Topic Report

How do risk assessments for self harm and suicide in crisis or emergency settings change the clinical encounter and outcomes for children and adolescents?: realist synthesis and mapping review

Anna Cantrell[1], Katie Sworn[1], Duncan Chambers[1], Andrew Booth[1]*, Elizabeth Taylor Buck[1], Scott Weich[1]

[1] School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

*Corresponding author: A.Booth@sheffield.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Andrew Booth is a member of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Services and Delivery Research (HSDR) Funding Board (2019-2022) and the NIHR Evidence Synthesis Advisory Group (2019-2022).

Published October 2022
DOI: https://doi.org/10.3310/hsdr-tr-135079

This report should be Referenced as follows:

Cantrell A, Sworn K, Chambers D, Booth A, Taylor Buck E, Weich S et al. *How do risk assessments for self harm and suicide in crisis or emergency settings change the clinical encounter and outcomes for children and adolescents?: realist synthesis and mapping review.* Southampton NIHR Health and Social Care Delivery Research Topic Report; 2022. DOI : https://doi.org/10.3310/hsdr-tr-135079

HSDR Evidence Synthesis Centre Topic Report

This report

The research reported in this topic report was commissioned and funded by the Health and Social Care Delivery Research (HSDR) programme as part of a series of evidence syntheses under project number NIHR130588 For more information visit https://www.fundingawards.nihr.ac.uk/award/NIHR130588

This topic report has been peer-reviewed and reviewed by the NIHR Journals Library Editors. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HSDR Editors have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' work and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments however; they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this topic report.

This topic report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HSDR programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

HSDR programme

The HSDR programme funds research to produce evidence to impact on the quality, accessibility and organisation of health and social care services. This includes evaluations of how the NHS and social care might improve delivery of services.

For more information about the HSDR programme please visit the website at https://www.nihr.ac.uk/explore-nihr/funding-programmes/health-and-social-care-delivery-research.htm

The editorial review process was managed by the NIHR Journals Library Editorial Office. Any queries about this topic report should be addressed to journals.library@nihr.ac.uk.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Abstract

Background

Risk assessment is a key process when a child or adolescent presents at risk for self harm or suicide in a mental health crisis or emergency. Risk assessment by a healthcare professional should be included within a biopsychosocial assessment. However, the predictive value of risk screening tools for self harm and suicide in children and adolescents is consistently challenged. A review is needed to explore how best to undertake risk assessment and the appropriate role for tools/checklists within the assessment pathway.

Aims

To map research relating to risk assessment for child and adolescent mental health and to identify features that relate to a successful risk assessment.

Objectives

To review factors within the clinical encounter that impact upon risk assessments for self-harm and suicide in children and adolescents;

(i) To conduct a realist synthesis to understand mechanisms for risk assessment, why they occur and how they vary by context;
(ii) To conduct a mapping review of primary studies/reviews to describe available tools of applicability to the UK.

Data sources

Databases, including MEDLINE, PsycInfo, Embase, CINAHL, HMIC, Science and Social Sciences Citation Index and the Cochrane Library were searched (September 2021). Searches were also conducted for reports from websites

Review methods

A resource-constrained realist synthesis was conducted exploring factors that impact upon risk assessments for self harm and suicide. This was accompanied by a mapping review of primary studies/reviews describing risk assessment tools and

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

approaches used in UK child and adolescent mental health. Following piloting, four reviewers screened retrieved records. Items were coded for the mapping and/or for inclusion in the realist synthesis. The review team examined the validity and limitations of risk screening tools. In addition, the team identified structured approaches to risk assessment. Reporting of the realist synthesis followed *RAMESES* guidelines.

Results

From 4084 unique citations, 249 papers were reviewed and 41 studies (49 tools) were included in the mapping review. Eight reviews were identified following full-text screening. Fifty-seven papers were identified for the realist review. Findings highlight fourteen explanations (programme theories) for a successful risk assessment for self-harm and suicide.

Forty-nine individual assessment tools/approaches were identified. Few tools were developed in the UK, specifically for children and adolescents. These lacked formal independent evaluation. No risk screening tool is suitable for risk prediction; optimal approaches incorporate a relationship of trust, involvement of the family, where appropriate, and a patient-centred holistic approach. The objective of risk assessment should be elicitation of information to direct a risk formulation and care plan.

Limitations

Many identified tools are well-established but lack scientific validity, particularly predictive validity, or clinical utility. Programme theories were generated rapidly from a survey of risk assessment.

Conclusions

No single checklist/approach meets the needs of risk assessment for self-harm and suicide. A whole-system approach is required, informed by structured clinical judgement. Useful components include a holistic assessment within a climate of trust, facilitated by family involvement.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Study registration

This study is registered as PROSPERO CRD42021276671.

Funding

The National Institute for Health Research Health and Social Care Delivery Research programme. [500 words]

Table of Contents

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

List of tables and figures

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Glossary

Deliberate self-harm – term no longer favoured by the Royal College of Psychiatrists, prefer **self-harm.**

Risk assessment - a detailed clinical assessment to include evaluation of biological, social and psychological factors that are relevant to the child/adolescent and, in the judgement of the healthcare professional conducting the assessment, relevant to future risks, including suicide and self-harm.

Risk formulation - The process of summarising the assessment, identifying the risks and triggers, and how these interact together. Risk formulation (i) identifies 'why' someone engages in problematic behaviour not just 'if' they will engage in it, and (ii) encourages a shift away from simply identifying risk factors to thinking about how key variables interact and connect in the expression of risk.

Risk management plan – a clearly identifiable part of the care plan that should address the long-term and more immediate risks identified in the risk assessment as well as addressing specific psychological, pharmacological, social and relational

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

factors associated with increased risk, with the agreed aim of reducing risk of repetition of self-harm and/or the risk of suicide. It should include a crisis plan outlining self-management strategies and how to access services during a crisis and ensure consistency with the long-term treatment strategy.

Risk screening – the specific use of tools within the risk assessment process to try to predict the likelihood of risk of self-harm and/or suicide.

Self-harm - any act of self-poisoning or self-injury carried out by an individual irrespective of motivation. This commonly involves self-poisoning with medication or self-injury by cutting. Important exclusions include harm to the self arising from excessive consumption of alcohol or recreational drugs, or from starvation arising from anorexia nervosa, or accidental harm to oneself.

Suicidal ideation (SI) - often called suicidal thoughts or ideas, a broad term used to describe a range of contemplations, wishes, and preoccupations with death and suicide.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Abbreviations

Acronym	Definition
ACB	Assessment of Concerning Behavior
ADHD	Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder
ALSPAC	Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children
APT	Association of Psychological Therapies
ARMS	At Risk Mental State
ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorder
ASQ	Ask Suicide Screening Questions
BHS	Beck Hopelessness Scale
BYI	Beck Youth Inventory
CAARMS	Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States
CAMHS	child and adolescent mental health services
CAMS	Collaborative Assessment and Management of Suicidality
C-CASA	Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment
CASH	Child and Adolescent Self-Harm Schedule
CASPI	Child–Adolescent Suicidal Potential Index
CAT	computerised adaptive testing
CBQ	Challenging Behaviour Questionnaire
CGAS	Children's Global Assessment Scale
CMIS	Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule
CMOC	Context – Mechanism - Outcome - Configuration
CORC	Child Outcomes Research Consortium
CRAY	Checklist for Risk Aggression in Youth
CRIES - 8	Children's Revised Impact of Event Scale
C-SSRS	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale
CYP	Children and Young Persons
CYP-MH SAT	Children and Young People - Mental Health Safety Assessment Tool
DASS	Depression Anxiety Stress Scale
DAWBA	Development and Well-Being Assessment

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Acronym	Definition
DBC	Developmental Behaviour Checklist
DICES	Describe the risk; Identify the options; Choose your preferred option(s); Explain your choice; Share your thinking
DSRS	Depression Self-Rating Scale
EIP	early intervention in psychosis
FACE - CARAS	Functional Analysis of Care Environments - Child and Adolescent Risk-Assessment Suite
FEDS	Functional Analysis of Care Environments (FACE) Eating Disorder Schedule
FPS	Family Perceptions Scale
GHQ - 12	General Health Questionnaire - 12
GMSR	Gender Minority Stress and Resilience
HADS	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale
HAM-D	Hamilton rating scale for Depression
HCR - 20	Historical, Clinical, Risk Management–20
HEEADSSS	Home, Education/Employment, Eating, Activities, Drugs, Sexuality, Suicidal ideation and Safety
ICHOM	International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement
JVQ	Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire
KIDSCREEN - 10	KIDSCREEN-10 Index
MFQ	Moods and Feelings Questionnaire
MSSI	Modified Scale for Suicide Ideation
NCISH	National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health
PCLSV	Psychopathy Checklist–Screening Version
PHQ - 9	Patient Health Questionnaire-9
PMDD	Persistent Major Depressive Disorder
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis
PSCY	Paediatric Symptom Checklist for Youths
PSI	Parenting Stress Index
RBQ	Repetitive Behaviour Questionnaire
RCADS	Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale (RCADS)

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Acronym	Definition
RFLA	Reasons for Living Inventory for Adolescents
RSQ	Risk of Suicide Questionnaire
RTSHIA	Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents
SAD - PERSONS	SAD PERSONS Scale
SAPROF	Structured Assessment of Protective Factors for violence risk
SAVRY	Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth
SBI	Suicide Behaviour Interview
SBQC	Suicidal Behaviours Questionnaire for Children
SCARED	Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders
SCQ	Social Communication Questionnaire
SCRAP	Schedule for Risk of Aggression in Psychosis
SDQ - AVS	Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire Added Value Scores
SHARP	Sexual Harm Adolescent Risk Protocol
SHQ	Self-Harm Questionnaire
SHRAC	Self-Harm Risk Assessment for Children
SI-IAT	Self-Injury Implicit Association Test
SIQ	Suicide Ideation Questionnaire
SIS	Suicide Intent Scale
SITBI	Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviours Interview (SITBI)
SPS	SAD PERSONS Scale
SRS	Suicide Risk Scale
SSFII	Suicide Status Form-II (SSFII)
SSI	Scale for Suicide Ideation
STAR V2	Standard Tool for the Assessment of Risk; Version 2
START-AV	Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability: Adolescent Version
STOP-SAS	Suicidality Treatment Occurring Paediatrics - Suicidality Assessment Scale
STORM	Skills-based Training On Risk Management
TAQ	The Activity Questionnaire
TAQAT	Therapeutic Assessment Quality Assurance Tool

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Acronym	Definition
TSCYC	Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children
UEQ	Unusual experiences questionnaire
VABS	Vineland Adaptive Behaviour Scale
VAS	Vulnerability Assessment Schedule
WARRN	Wales Applied Risk Research Network

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Plain Language summary

When young people up to 18 years of age present to health services, having tried to poison themselves, take an overdose or injure themselves, a health professional needs to work out whether this is likely to happen again (risk assessment). Lists of questions or things to look for (risk screening) have proved unreliable. Thorough discussion with the child or teenager may be helpful but takes much time. How can a health professional best use time spent with a young person to prevent further harm and make sure that they get the treatment that they need?

This review focuses on young persons who use health services in the United Kingdom. Included studies report how health professionals work out whether young people are likely to harm themselves; either how to handle the overall discussion or to use memory aids or checklists (known as tools) to help the discussion.

Tools developed in the USA many years ago have not been tested well enough with UK populations. Recent approaches within the UK are used inconsistently. Young persons do not like how they are assessed. Health professionals may use methods that have not been shown to work or use tools differently from how they were designed.

This review identified fourteen ways to help a young person have valued discussions with a health professional. Health professionals should not simply “tick boxes”; tools should help them gain a full picture, including input from other family members. Health professionals should create a trusted relationship where the young person feels respected and heard. Tools should not label someone “at risk” but should support care that reduces the risk of further harm. Health professionals should gather good-quality information that includes asking about thoughts of suicide. Staff

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

should be supported by training, guidance and feedback from experienced colleagues.

.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Scientific Summary

Background

Risk assessment occupies a central place in the management of children and adolescents who present to acute paediatric care settings at risk for self-harm and suicide. A risk assessment should be included within a detailed clinical assessment that includes evaluation of biological, social and psychological factors that are relevant to the child/adolescent. However, current NICE guidance cautions against using tools or checklists to predict the risk of suicide (risk screening) and against using risk screening tools to determine subsequent clinical management. Current guidelines for self-harm in over 8's (NICE, 2011) frame risk assessment as one of two components of a comprehensive psychosocial assessment, the other being a needs assessment. By gaining an accurate picture of the circumstances of a child or adolescent a health professional can target a future pathway to appropriate intervention and treatment. However, evidence from surveys suggests that risk assessment continues to serve its historic functions of protecting the community and avoiding claims of negligence rather than being grounded in the welfare of the child/adolescent. As a consequence risk assessment is not currently harnessing its full potential as an intervention to prevent self-harm and suicide. Numerous risk assessment tools, including some risk screening tools, are used across different services and information is neither gathered consistently nor completely. In some cases risk screening tools are viewed as a tick box exercise or even used for purposes for which the available tools or checklists are not designed. The focus of this review is on the well-being of the children or adolescents themselves and not on the actuarial function of managing risk of harm to others.

Despite extensive numbers of tools and approaches, the relationship between risk assessment for self-harm and suicide and treatment intervention and outcome remains unclear. Uncertainties remain, especially around 'what works, for whom, and why?'

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Aims

To map the research literature relating to risk assessment for child and adolescent mental health and then to explore published and 'grey' literature through a resource-constrained realist-informed review,

Objectives

To understand the underlying mechanisms for risk assessment for self-harm and suicide, why they occur and how they vary by context and then to review risk screening tools currently in use in the UK and similar contexts and to explore how different approaches to using these tools impact upon risk assessment for self-harm and suicide within child and adolescent mental health services.

Methods

Two complementary reviews were conducted: (1) a realist synthesis; and (2) a mapping review of risk screening tools and risk assessment approaches (PROSPERO database registration number: CRD42021276671)

Realist synthesis

Data sources

MEDLINE (including Epub Ahead of Print & In-Process), PsycInfo, Embase, CINAHL, HMIC, Science and Social Sciences Citation Index and the Cochrane Library. Importantly, the electronic search was complemented by innovative use of the scite tool as well as forward citation searching via Google Scholar and checking for additional relevant articles from reference lists.

Screening criteria and study selection

Studies that describe the procedures, format and clinical, patient and family perspectives of the risk assessment process for self-harm and suicide within a UK setting were identified by the review team and prioritised for analysis. Following

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

piloting of eligibility criteria within the team, titles/abstracts were initially screened by one of the review team. Articles identified as potentially relevant were obtained in full text. Attempts were made to identify unpublished literature, for example guidelines and public reports. The full-text literature was screened independently by a single reviewer. Screening was initially inclusive; to minimise threats posed by use of a single reviewer.

Assessment of Rigour, Relevance and Richness

In line with realist methodology no formal attempt was made to assess the individual study quality of papers included in the synthesis. No papers were excluded on the basis of study quality. Assessment of rigour was determined by study design with weight being placed upon systematic reviews and good quality comparative research designs. Additional quality markers comprised relevance; privileging studies conducted within child and adolescent mental health, and richness; according detail provided about the risk assessment process. Included papers are detailed in Appendix 3.

Study characteristics

The electronic search strategy identified 4084 unique references. Screening based on titles/abstracts identified 149 articles for full-text screening. Screening of full-text articles identified 29 papers to be included in the review. An additional 28 papers were identified through backwards and forwards citation searching, with 57 papers included in the final realist synthesis.

Data extraction

Study details (including aim, methodology, findings and implications were extracted by a single reviewer. Details were then mapped against the 14 programme theories.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Data synthesis

Data were synthesised using a realist synthesis approach. One member of the review team independently generated programme theories from a survey of clinical risk assessment across the UK. Candidate programme theories were considered by the full review team before being completed and finalised. The lead reviewer then used references identified by the team, supplemented by purposive searching and follow-up of references to locate evidence to support, counter or extend the initial interpretations. The fourteen programme theories were confirmed as valid propositions and combined within an overarching programme theory.

Mapping review

Screening criteria

The mapping review used the following inclusion criteria:

- *Population and setting*: children or adolescents of 18 years of age or younger considered at risk for self-harm or suicide in the United Kingdom. Inclusion was unrestricted by setting.
- *Index (or focal) approach or tool*: either an overall approach or specific tool used to undertake a detailed clinical assessment; to include evaluation of biological, social and psychological factors relevant to the child/adolescent and relevant to future risks, limited to suicide and self-harm (risk assessment).
- *Comparator approach or tool*: any other approach or tool.
- *Outcomes*: test performance (sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, reliability, validity), utility and acceptability.
- *Study design*: Any empirical design. Reviews, systematic or quasi-systematic.

Data sources

A comprehensive search of MEDLINE, PsycInfo, Embase, CINAHL, HMIC, Science and Social Sciences Citation Index and the Cochrane Library was conducted in

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

September 2021. Targeted ‘grey’ literature searches to identify reports/case studies in websites.

Study selection

Relevant empirical studies and systematic reviews were identified and screened by single review from one of the team to identify reports of approaches and tests used in a UK context for risk assessment for self-harm and suicide.

Study characteristics

From 4,996 citations limited to the UK, 912 duplicates were removed leaving 4084 unique citations. 249 papers were reviewed at full-text and 41 studies were included in the mapping review. For the mapping of reviews 1,743 citations were identified; 499 duplicates were removed leaving 1,244 unique review citations. Following full-text screening 8 reviews remained.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Secondary data were extracted on study and population characteristics, tool details and methods of evaluation. No data were available on the resource implications of use of tools or approaches. However, mention was made of the prohibitive time required to conduct a thorough biopsychosocial assessment within the context of an emergency or crisis.

Quality appraisal was conducted independently using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) tool, and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Data synthesis

Findings from the mapping review of tools and approaches were presented using narrative synthesis, using textual and tabular presentation. Studies were not sufficiently homogeneous to permit meta-analysis.

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Public and patient involvement

The research team worked with the standing public and patient advisory group for the Sheffield Evidence Synthesis Centre. The group regularly feeds into the conduct and dissemination of evidence syntheses commissioned by the National Institute for Health Research, providing perspectives on contextual factors and key messages to ensure benefit and relevance for service users.

Results

Results from the realist synthesis

Fourteen programme theories were identified and tested. These included eleven propositions relating to the conduct of risk assessment for self-harm and suicide and a further three propositions relating to what is considered unhelpful.

Candidate Programme Theory Components identified from the Literature

Through this preliminary review, successful interventions are considered to require the following:

1. IF risk assessment approaches are simple, accessible, and part of a wider assessment process THEN staff are able to generate standardised, informative and clinically useful assessments LEADING TO appropriate use of support and services.
2. IF clinical staff focus clinical risk assessment processes on building relationships THEN clinicians and adolescents trust each other LEADING TO frank and open communication within the clinical encounter.
3. IF the emphasis of clinical risk assessment processes is on gathering good quality information on (i) the current situation, (ii) past history, and (iii) social factors THEN staff use information to inform a collaborative approach to management LEADING TO co-ordinated and integrated care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

4. IF staff are comfortable asking young patients about suicidal thoughts THEN young service users share relevant information concerning their circumstances LEADING TO an appropriate service response.
5. IF risk assessment processes are conducted consistently across mental health services THEN the quality of response to young service users does not depend upon does not depend upon each individual contact LEADING TO the availability of consistent information across services.
6. IF staff are trained in how to assess, formulate, and manage risk, including appropriate referral THEN staff feel equipped to manage the risks for children and adolescents who present to health services LEADING TO an emphasis on positive risk taking.
7. IF staff are supported by on-going supervision THEN staff feel able to deliver a consistent approach to risk assessment LEADING TO a reduction in adverse events
8. IF Families and carers are involved in the assessment process THEN families and carers are given an opportunity to express their views on potential risk LEADING TO a collaboratively developed risk management plan
9. IF mental health staff communicate risk assessments with primary care THEN young people are directed to appropriate care LEADING TO successful health outcomes.
10. IF the management of risk is personal and individualised THEN young people don't see their care as 'protocol driven' and won't feel alienated LEADING TO their engagement with care.
11. IF organisations involved in risk assessment utilise a whole system approach THEN this strengthens the standards of care for everyone, LEADING TO the safe management of supervision, delegation and onward referral.

Three "counter programme theories" relate to how risk assessment might result in unintended consequences:

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

12. IF staff view risk assessment tools as a way of predicting future suicidal behaviour THEN staff incorrectly interpret individual levels of need for care LEADING TO inappropriate use of restrictive practices such as involuntary hospitalisation, restraint, sedation and seclusion (for the service user)

13. IF clinicians use risk screening tools and scales in isolation within the risk assessment process THEN treatment decisions are determined by a score LEADING TO incorrect interpretation of individual need for care and inappropriate utilisation of child and adolescent mental health services (for the service).

14. IF staff develop tools for risk assessment locally THEN checklists and scales lack formal psychometric evaluation LEADING TO limited clinical utility of tools for risk assessment and unnecessarily restrictive treatment options

Exploring the eleven positive propositions helped in the identification of five particularly useful features include: (1) incorporation of tools within wider standardised and consistent assessment processes; (2) trusted relationships that encourage clear and open communication, including family involvement; (3) good quality information within a personalised and individualised approach; and (4) appropriate training and supervision; and, (5) appropriate inter-agency communication and referral networks, within a whole system approach. Similarly exploration of the three negative propositions helped in the identification of three negative features;(1) misuse of risk assessment tools for prediction; (2) use of tools in isolation, typically within a “scoring” approach; and (3) development of local tools with little formal validation.

Results from the mapping review

A total of 49 reports of tools or approaches to assessing the risk of self-harm and suicidality amongst children or adolescents were identified from the reviews (n = 8) or original studies (n = 41). Our analysis extended the 29 assessment tools included

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

in a previous scoping review;[1] adding two recent tools[2, 3] and expanding beyond formal tools to include overall approaches. We included tools previously included in the scoping review[1] where used in a UK context and with a primary focus on suicide. Tools varied in length, response and scoring format, age ranges and degree of psychometric testing.[1] In particular, tools lacked predictive validity. Most assessments were tested across broad age ranges, and so lack sensitivity to the age groups of particular interest to this review. The relative lack of tools for children, as opposed to adolescents, is noticeable. Tools were subject to limited psychometric testing, and no single tool was valid or reliable for use with children presenting in mental health crisis to non-mental health settings.[1]

Implications for health-care practice and service delivery

- A thorough biopsychosocial assessment offers a holistic approach to assessment across many factors including, but not focused upon, risk of self-harm and suicide. Such an assessment requires that service managers identify time for this interaction, particularly for front-line staff.
- Checklists may help in demonstrating compliance with national standards and protocols but, ultimately, may threaten the relationship between health professional and young person or obscure a full understanding of patient risk.
- Findings from these reviews confirm recommendations made by NICE guidance with regard to the misuse of risk assessment tools for prediction of suicide risk and for determining clinical management.
- Variability in suicidality, even over short periods of time, make suicide risk prediction particularly problematic. Checklist approaches are static, not dynamic, and therefore unlikely to meet the needs for ongoing risk assessment. Attention should focus on improving the quality of the risk assessment process, perhaps learning from successful training, supervision and quality improvement initiatives.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Recommendations for research

- Further studies evaluating the utility of specific risk screening tools and instruments are not warranted, although additional evaluations of risk assessment processes would benefit from further qualitative insights. Such evaluations could provide an accurate picture of what assessment processes are being used and the clinical value ascribed to each component according to the principles of psychosocial assessment.
- Further research is required to evaluate the value to young person, health professional and health service of a complete and holistic assessment not simply provision of an alternative tool. An evaluated approach to overall assessment could then be used to support safety management decisions across acute paediatric care settings.
- In particular, health systems and organisational leadership initiatives could benefit from further close examination of how theoretical tensions between risk minimisation and patient centred care are enacted at a practical and operational level.

Trial registration

This study is registered as PROSPERO CRD42021276671.

Funding

This project was funded by the Health Services and Delivery Research programme of the National Institute for Health Research.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Chapter 1 Background and introduction

Rationale

Suicide prevention is a key priority of the NHS Long Term Plan (NHS, 2019). In the most recently available figures (from 2020) a total of 5,224 deaths by suicide were registered in England and Wales (ONS, 2020). The National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health (NCISH) annual report indicates that over a quarter of people who die by suicide have been in contact with mental health services within the last year (NCISH, 2021). Suicide and self-harm represent the most acute forms of crises for children and young people.

Predicting and managing risk is an important element of mental health care planning in the UK. In mental health, risk is constructed as a potential negative outcome or behaviour arising from the unwanted actions of people using services.[4] This results in two main concerns: the risk the person presents to themselves in the form of suicide or vulnerability and the risk the person presents to others[4]. As mentioned above, the first of these risks is common. The risk of harm to others is rarer but adds substantial concerns for health staff and for the mental health system.

Throughout this report a distinction is made between the risk assessment process and the tools that are used within the process. The risk assessment process is used in response to many drivers and to meet many demands; these vary from offering a person-centred care approach through to seeking to predict the risk of future harm to self or others through risk screening. Some of these responses are considered to be appropriate and others are not. As a consequence, two broad types of tool can be identified; those that are designed with the intent of predicting risk i.e. risk screening, specifically self-harm and suicide, and those that are intended for broader use in facilitating the risk assessment process. Both of these approaches are explored in this report.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Approaches to Risk Assessment

Within the wider context of risk assessment three main approaches have been identified - unstructured clinical judgement (based on professional gut feeling), actuarial (using validated tools to measure risk) and structured clinical judgement (a combination of the former two)[5]. The current risk averse climate, common to many areas of protection and safeguarding, has seen increased use of actuarial approaches to risk management.[6] A**ctuarial approaches** utilise statistical techniques to generate risk predictors along with **checklist approaches.** Actuarial approaches seek to make it easier to demonstrate adherence with procedures and may simplify completion making the process little more than a tick box exercise. Organisationally, checklists and scales facilitate standardisation of procedures and of documentation, particularly when included within integrated electronic records.

"…Those advocating for their use suggest that they enrich assessment by providing 'an anchor against the force of bias',[7] greater inter-rater reliability and scientific validity, greater transparency around decisions taken as well as providing documentation for review, audit and analysis should a negative event occur".[5, 8]

Conversely, **clinical** approaches involve an assessment derived in part from the medical and mental health disciplines. Clinical approaches include the **structured clinical** approach which uses prompts or checklists to guide and subsequently interpret the risk assessment.[9] Outside of a clinical context, this expertise-based approach may alternatively be labelled **structured professional judgement**.[10] Aside from these three reference points, additional terms are used to describe certain features or characteristics of approaches, either individually or collectively. Assessments that employ **a theory-informed** approach assume that, because the subsequent assessment is based on theory, it can prove superior to approaches that are simply determined by institutional requirements and the procedural structure of assessment guidelines.[11] Practitioners refer to a **formulation process**;[12] in such circumstances they employ a systematic approach that identifies all factors critical to

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

a specific risk assessment and considers the purpose of the assessment, scope and depth of the necessary analysis, analytical approach, available resources and outcomes, and overall risk management goal. Others contrast a **problem-orientated** approach with a **medical model** approach.[13] Other descriptions may focus more on the intended aim of the assessment, as, for example, with the **collaborative approach** or **therapeutic approaches**. Approaches may reference the content, as in **multi-faceted approach** or the overarching philosophy of care as in the **interpersonal approach**. Finally, increasing attention is being directed at a **whole system approach**, recognising the complexity of the included interventions and of the context in which they are delivered. These diverse approaches can similarly be observed within the specific context of risk assessment for self harm and suicide.

Although risk assessment remains contested within mental health care, efforts continue to focus on developing actuarial mechanisms for identifying and predicting future risk behaviours. The predictive accuracy of risk screening in mental health care falls short of the performance of commonly accepted tools from other branches of healthcare.[4] In the light of reviews that repeatedly document significant limitations of such scales, with consistent recommendations that scales are not used for routine clinical practice, there is a need to consider whether such scales truly meet the best interests of the individual child or adolescent mental health patient.[4]

NICE Guidance

The 2011 *NICE guidance on managing self-harm in over 8s* describes risk assessment as “a detailed clinical assessment that includes the evaluation of a wide range of biological, social and psychological factors that are relevant to the individual and, in the judgement of the healthcare professional conducting the assessment, relevant to future risks, including suicide and self-harm”.[14] Risk assessments may be used as part of a broader assessment to inform treatment planning but have been frequently misused to guide clinician predictions of future behaviour.[15, 16]

© Queen’s Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

At the time of this review an update to the 2011 NICE guidance entitled *Self harm: assessment, management and preventing recurrence* [GID-NG10148] was under development. Its expected publication date was the 6th July 2022. This guidance is intended to fully update both: *Self-harm in over 8s: short-term management and prevention of recurrence (CG16)* and *Self-harm in over 8s: long-term management (CG133)* which are both heavily referenced within this report.

Risk assessment tools and scales can form part of the risk assessment process and are generally checklists to be completed by patient or health professional to give a quick and rough estimate of patient risk for example high or low risk of suicide. However, concerns have been expressed about how risk assessments are undertaken across the UK. NICE guidance on long-term management of self-harm in over 8s recommend the following "Do not use risk assessment tools and scales to predict future suicide or repetition of self-harm" and "Do not use risk assessment tools and scales to determine who should and should not be offered treatment or who should be discharged".[14] Risk screening may have unintended consequences in drawing the clinical encounter towards a focus on self-harm which may itself have harmful effects. However, contrary to staff fears, there is little evidence to suggest that simply discussing the possibility of self harm or suicide increases the chance that children or young people will contemplate such actions.

Suicides in children are very rare, and predicting them is difficult. The NICE Quality Standard on depression in children and young people (NICE, 2019; NG 134) states that children and young people with suspected severe depression should be are seen by a child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) professional within 2 weeks of referral, or within a maximum of 24 hours if at a high risk of suicide. Prompt access to services is essential if children and young people are to receive the right treatment at the right time.[17] Arrangements should be in place so that children and young people referred to CAMHS with suspected severe depression and a high risk of suicide are kept in a safe place and seen as an emergency, within a maximum of

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

24 hours, to help prevent injury or worsening of symptoms. However, CAMHS service are currently experiencing extreme pressure.

A mental health professional called to assess a child or adolescent during a crisis situation, either in Accident and Emergency, in a CAMHS outpatient service or at young person's home, needs to assess her/his suicide risk quickly. Assessment is typically conducted via an interview. Checklists and assessment instruments have been developed to facilitate the clinical encounter. They also offer a structure within which to obtain the necessary information on which to base a comprehensive assessment. NICE (2011) guidance recommends that risk assessment is used as part of a broader assessment to inform treatment planning.[18] However they have been frequently misused to guide clinicians' predictions of future behaviour.

Concern has been expressed that risk assessments frequently fail to capitalise on their clinical value, being translated into a perfunctory exercise that occurs in isolation from an overall assessment of a young person's biopsychosocial need. This is particularly the case given that a primary motivation for completion of risk assessment processes is likely to be seeking to avert recriminations relating to likely risk to others. A relatively rare, and yet high profile, risk (harm to others) has therefore come to dominate risk management considerations ahead of the more frequent occurrences of child or adolescent self-harm or suicide. A UK Royal College of Psychiatrists report titled *"Rethinking risk to others"*[19] raised concerns about a culture of blame and the proliferation of invalidated tick box assessment forms that are produced as a means of 'back covering' and that represent 'a lazy and authoritarian approach to delivering health care'…."[20]

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2022. This work was produced by Cantrell *et al*. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This document may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Aims and objectives

Our initial research question is:

> "Which risk assessment tools for self harm and suicide are currently in use in CAMHS services in the UK and other English-speaking high-income countries?

The review then addresses the main research question:

> "For whom and in what circumstances do risk assessments for self harm and suicide change the clinical encounter for children and adolescents and what effect does this have on their mental health outcomes?",

Our aim is to address the initial research question by mapping the literature and then to explore the main research questions by a resource-constrained realist-informed review of published and 'grey' literature.

The review objectives were:

> To review the factors within the clinical encounter that impact upon risk assessments for self-harm and suicide within child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS), specifically;
>
> (i) To conduct a realist synthesis to understand underlying mechanisms for risk assessment, why they occur and how they vary by context;.
>
> (ii) To conduct a mapping review of primary studies and reviews to identify and describe the available tools of potential applicability to the UK for undertaking risk assessments for self-harm and suicide within CAMHS.

The timescale for this review was three months; its purpose is to provide an overview, description and summary of the available evidence, particularly in terms of identifying when particular approaches to conducting a clinical encounter for risk assessment for self harm and suicide are most or least suitable.

Our approach involved:

- Conducting systematic searches across the major medical, psychology and health related bibliographic databases and additional ‘grey’ literature searches.
- Descriptively mapping retrieved items meeting broad inclusion criteria plus any additional included items identified from the reference lists of review articles.
- Coding the items according to the following elements: risk assessment tools used (their features, validity), training, the clinical setting where the risk assessment tools for self harm and suicide are used, characteristics of the health professional and young people use of the tools within the clinical encounter, the short-medium term impact of the risk assessment, long term impacts.
- Coding the data for explanations of how the risk assessment process is perceived to work (context mechanism outcome configurations or CMOCs) to inform the realist analysis
- Summarising the findings in a final literature review report.

Chapter 2 Methods

The review comprised two stages. The first involved an analytic realist logic within a realist review. A realist review is specifically designed to answers questions such as ‘how?’, ‘why?’, ‘for whom?’, ‘in what circumstances?’ and ‘to what extent?’ complex interventions, such as risk assessment for self harm and suicide within a clinical encounter, actually ‘work’. Through a review of the literature, the review team develops an overarching programme theory which they gradually refine using data from documents identified as the review progresses. Within this programme theory, the team uses a realist logic of analysis to explore outcome patterns. In brief, mechanisms cause outcomes to occur, but the relevant mechanisms are only activated within conducive contexts. The second review involved a mapping review to identify the quantity and quality of the literature on risk assessment in child and adolescent mental health services.

Rationale for a resource-constrained realist review

Conventional systematic reviews assume that outcomes result from a linear progress of cause leading to effect [21]. However, clinical encounters do not take place within a controlled experimental setting but occur within a complex, continually-shifting context [22]. In seeking to explain the processes that are taking place it becomes necessary to use a theory driven approach; focusing on explanations of how interventions “work” (programme theories) [23]. Realist synthesis represents a tried and tested methodology, frequently used within the NIHR Health Services & Delivery Research Programme to generate, explore and test such explanations by synthesizing complex evidence from diverse sources and thus offer an understanding of why and how complex interventions work [24].

A realist review is designed to answers questions such as ‘how?’, ‘why?’, ‘for whom?’, ‘in what circumstances?’ and ‘to what extent?’ complex interventions, such as risk assessment for self harm and suicide within a clinical encounter, actually ‘work’[25]. Through a review of the literature, the review team develops an overarching programme theory which they gradually refine using data from documents identified

as the review progresses[26, 27]. Within this programme theory, the team uses a realist logic of analysis to explore outcome patterns [28].

In brief, mechanisms cause outcomes to occur, but the relevant mechanisms are only activated within conducive contexts [29]. By examining the “mechanisms”, exploring the “contexts” where the intervention occurred, and then linking these contexts and mechanisms to the “outcome” of the intervention a review team is able to examine the relationships between these three components [30]. Each combination of context (C), mechanism (M), and outcome (O) is labelled a “C-M-O configuration” [31]. Where patterns of C-M-O configurations recur they offer semi-predictable patterns/paths of how a program functions - broad “rules” for how and when certain outcomes most typically occur[32].

A realist review typically requires as much as twelve months of research endeavour; time spent in exploring the literature and in generating subsequent analysis. In recognition that policy windows may not always accommodate extensive analysis some have coined the term “rapid realist review” for circumstances intended to support an accelerated transition from research to policy/practice[33]. The review team resists this terminology, not least because, in contrast to other rapid forms of synthesis, rapid realist synthesis variants offer no concessions to an abbreviated methodology. Instead, the report privileges “resource-constrained realist review”, recognising that constraints do not impact upon the methodology, as such, but may restrict the number of programme theories to be explored or, in the case of this review, constrain the quantities of evidence assembled to sustain or negate each theory. By exploring all the candidate theories the review team hopes to facilitate overall conclusions while acknowledging the potential for further nuance and explanation of the hypothesis underpinning each programme theory.

Prior to this resource-constrained realist review, a pre-specified protocol was produced which is available via the website of the funder, the National Institute for Health Research Health Service & Delivery Research Programme. This protocol incorporates both realist review and mapping review elements and includes the research question, search strategy, synthesis methodology, inclusion criteria for relevance screening, data extraction form, quality assessment tool, and plans for dissemination. This overview of methods offered a framework within which the

specific realist review methods could be reviewed, revised and enhanced as relevant evidence became apparent. This section of the report follows the RAMESES (Realist and Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses: Evolving Standards) guidelines [34] for reporting, modified to accommodate a resource-constrained realist review.

In addition, to the data extraction to facilitate the review of tools, data were coded to inform the subsequent realist analysis. The codes were piloted with codes being refined based on emerging concepts throughout the analysis period. Coded text was selected according to its facility to address the following questions:

1. Does this section of text referring to context, mechanism or outcome?
2. How might this specific CMOC be described (whether partial or complete)?
3. (a) How does this (full or partial) CMOC relate to the clinical encounter? (b) Are there data which support how the CMOC relates to the clinical encounter? (c) In light of this CMOC and any supporting data, does the clinical encounter need to be changed?
4. (a) Is the evidence sufficiently trustworthy and rigorous to change the CMOC? (b) Is the evidence sufficiently trustworthy and rigorous to justify changing the clinical encounter?

Eligibility criteria

To be included in the mapping review a publication was required to meet the criteria provided in **Table 1** and to not be excluded by the criteria given in **Table 2**:

Table 1 - Inclusion criteria

	Primary list	
Date	Evidence published between 1st January 2011 (year of NICE guideline) and 31st December 2021	
Setting	Any setting in which structured formal child and adolescent mental health risk assessment for self harm and suicide is conducted which meets the above criteria (e.g. health or social care settings and child's own home).	
Population	Child and adolescent mental health population (8 years and older to correspond with NICE guideline) and their family members and clinicians	
Study type	Systematic reviews OR Primary studies not restricted by study design (to include relevant audits or service evaluations in addition to formal research studies) but these must include quantitative or qualitative research or evaluation data.	
Model of care	Child and adolescent mental health and crisis care contexts	
Outcomes	Include any reported outcomes. Primary outcomes to include: Health Outcomes (Suicide and self-harm, Depression symptoms etc.), Health Service Outcomes (Admission, Resource utilisation etc.), and Individual Outcomes (Mood, Anxiety etc.)	
Other	Individual studies from UK (for realist synthesis and review of tools)	Systematic reviews that include studies from Australia, New

	Discursive accounts, guidance and qualitative studies (realist synthesis)	Zealand, Canada, USA, UK and Ireland) (Review of tools)

Table 2 - Exclusion criteria

Date	Evidence published before January 1st 2011
Setting	Interventions / services that do not typically include structured formal risk assessment. Needs assessment as a form of psychological assessment. Studies only about self-harm were excluded as a single approach to self harm/suicide is required,
Population	Adults (18 years or older) and child under 8 years
Study type	Papers that describe interventions / services without providing any quantitative or qualitative data. Conceptual papers and projections of possible future developments.
Model of care	Other first contact that does not involve risk assessment. Unstructured or informal approaches to risk assessment
Outcome	Studies that include no process (e.g. qualitative) or outcome (e.g. quantitative) data.
Other	Studies conducted in low or middle income countries. Studies from non-Anglophone high income countries. Papers not published in English.

Information sources

A broad search to identify published and peer reviewed literature focused on how child and adolescent mental health risk assessment is delivered in the United Kingdom was conducted, including a search for relevant grey literature. The team sought to identify examples of current practice, pilots and other child and adolescent mental health initiatives carried out in the UK and review their robustness, applicability and scalability.

The search strategy combined thesaurus and free-text terms and relevant synonyms for the population (child and adolescent mental health population) and intervention (risk assessment (broad terms to retrieve research on use of risk assessment, and risk screening scales/tools; including terms for psychosocial assessment as the broad term for assessments including risk assessment components)), using proximity operators where appropriate. Search terms were then combined using Boolean operators appropriately. Outcome terms were not included in the search as outcomes information is not always included in title or abstracts meaning that their use could impact negatively on the identification and retrieval of relevant studies. Similarly, the search strategy was not limited to self harm and suicide with these inclusion criteria being assessed at the subsequent study selection stage.

Once agreed with NIHR HSDR and DHSC, the search strategy on MEDLINE was translated for other major medical and health-related bibliographic databases. The search was limited to research published in English from 2011-Current to reflect developments since the NICE guidance (2011). Methodological search filters were not utilised to keep searching broad and ensure all relevant study types were retrieved. Geographical (i.e. UK) [35] and review filters were used; first to restrict to the United Kingdom and subsequently, to retrieve systematic reviews.

MEDLINE (including Epub Ahead of Print & In-Process), PsycInfo, Embase, CINAHL, HMIC, Science and Social Sciences Citation Index and the Cochrane Library were all searched in September 2021. Targeted ‘grey’ literature searches were carried in October 2021 out to identify reports/case studies in websites including: Mental Health Foundation www.mentalhealth.org.uk, MindEd for Families

mindedforfamilies.org.uk/young-people, Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health www.rcpch.ac.uk/, Royal College of Psychiatrists www.rcpsych.ac.uk and Young Minds www.youngminds.org.uk. Additional evidence was identified from the reference lists and/or citation searching of included studies.

We also utilised expertise of colleagues working in mental health including Scott Weich and Elizabeth Taylor Buck and input from Dr Bernadka Dubicka, consultant and research lead in Pennine Care Foundation Trust, Greater Manchester and Chair of the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) Child and Adolescent Faculty to identify additional documents and initiatives being carried out within a UK context to ensure that the review is as inclusive as possible.

Data management / data selection

Search results were downloaded to Endnote bibliographic management software.

Selection process

A pilot study selection exercise involved members of the review team independently coding a small sample of records (200 each). Verdicts were compared and inter-rater reliability was rated as acceptable. The remaining records were distributed between the review team (AC, KS, ABo and DC) and then subject to independent single review. A sample of excluded records was reviewed to minimise the likelihood of exclusion in error. Where a verdict of unsure was recorded by one reviewer these records were passed to a second reviewer for agreement to be resolved by consensus. In the event of continued disagreement a third reviewer (ABo) arbitrated on eventual inclusion.

Data collection process

Following piloting of a data extraction form, a user-friendly Google forms interface was used to input data into a Google Sheets / Excel spreadsheet. Summary tables were inserted within the final report and summarised data were produced for the summary report. In accordance with most rapid reviews, duplicate data extraction was not considered possible. However, data were iteratively checked and re-checked during writing of the final report.

Data items

Data to be extracted included:

- Year and place of study
- The tool and risk assessment method
- The population included (age group, clinical characteristics and setting)
- Study design and outcomes measured (any outcomes measured by studies relevant to patient mental health (e.g. status of condition, risks and care planning as a result of the risk assessment) were included.
- Main findings
- Key messages including limitations.

Quality Assessment

In line with realist-informed approaches, that privilege richness of data and relevance over rigour, preliminary quality assessment of each study focuses on generic limitations of study design, although specific design limitations were documented where identified. Given the diverse evidence to be included, the review team made the decision to only apply quality assessment to studies evaluating an actual tool. This allowed for the use of insights from qualitative data and process evaluations as well as implementation studies.

For the mapping review the team compiled published assessments relating to the different aspects of validity for the individual tools and documented these according to systematic methods (**Table 9**). Quality appraisal was then conducted independently using the appropriate sections (quantitative or qualitative or both) of the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) tool, and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Data synthesis

Synthesis takes the form of descriptive, narrative approaches – such as textual, tabular and graphical presentation. However, following a mapping process, the team utilised a realist based approach. A realist review seeks to explore the underlying causes for

observed outcomes and when these might occur by reviewing published and grey literature.

Using the analytic building blocks known as context–mechanism–outcome configurations (CMOCs) (i.e. propositions which describe what works (or happens), for whom and in what contexts and why) the team explored these contexts [36]. Contexts are conditions that activate or modify the behaviour of mechanisms [26]. This realist review seeks to identify and understand the contexts that impact on factors that determine the outcome of the risk assessment process, whether that clinical encounter is successful or suboptimal. Realist methods offer an optimal vehicle for exploring the complex and dynamic nature of the clinical encounter.

The resource-constrained realist review sought to explore the contexts that influence risk assessment for mental health for children and adolescents by seeking to answer the following questions:

- Which factors within the clinical encounter impact positively or negatively on risk assessment for self harm and suicide in children and adolescents within child and adolescent mental health services?
- What are the underlying mechanisms, why do they occur and how do they vary in different contexts?

This resource-constrained realist review supports exploration of risk screening tools and risk assessment processes in child and adolescent mental health including a descriptive analysis of tools most commonly used within the United Kingdom. As a result, this review focuses on the processes of risk assessment while acknowledging known limitations to the design and utilisation of specific risk screening tools. The question on underlying mechanisms involved exploring key components and processes within risk assessment for self harm and suicide and constructing programme theory statements for each stage or component – for assessment against the identified evidence. Individual team members extracted data from each allocated study and coded the context, mechanisms, and outcomes within the studies.

Synthesis followed a pathway approach, as used in previous realist-based reviews for primary care and social care. [26],[37] Resultant CMOCs were discussed within the research team. Comments from patient representatives and clinical experts were fed into the iterative, cyclical process of searching, data extraction, analysis and programme theory development.

The scope of the resource-constrained realist review was clarified through regular team meetings to discuss the protocol, review process and synthesis outputs. The agreed review question was: “For whom and in what circumstances do risk assessments for self harm and suicide change the clinical encounter for children and adolescents and what effect does this have on their mental health outcomes?”.

Although findings for child and adolescent mental health services in general are privileged, the review team sought to identify specific age differences between children and adolescents where these may exert an influence on the conduct or outcome of the clinical encounter. Where contextual differences relate to the setting of the risk assessment these were also highlighted in the review findings.

Searching for relevant evidence: search strategy and eligibility criteria

To test the programme theory, a qualified information professional developed and implemented a search strategy to retrieve relevant primary studies and discursive contributions from both academic and grey literature. This complemented the overall search strategy as implemented for the mapping review and executed across multiple bibliographic databases (See previous section). Items informing the programme theories were identified from the full bibliographic searches. Supplementary subject searches and forward citation were then executed on Google Scholar using the Publish or Perish desktop search engine. These electronic searches were complemented by innovative use of the scite tool to view “within publication citations” in context and to establish whether the citation provides supporting or contrasting evidence for cited claims.

Relevance confirmation, data extraction, and quality assessment

A single reviewer assessed each study to determine its relevance to the review question and to extract pertinent detail. Given the nature of the question and the available evidence (non-research designs) no attempt was made to appraise the quality of included studies. Assessment of relevance involved studies being assigned one of three categories based on conceptual relevance:

*** - **Directly relevant** – evidence derived from a child and adolescent risk management context

** - **Partially relevant** – evidence derived from a wider mental health risk management context which may or may not include child and adolescent populations.

* - **Indirectly relevant** - evidence on risk assessment more generally (e.g. risk assessment for violence)

Patient and public involvement (PPI)

Patients and members of the public have been involved in this review through the Sheffield Evidence Synthesis Centre PPI group. This PPI group advises on the plain language summary and other relevant outputs and provides perspectives on relevant contextual factors and key messages for NHS staff.

Chapter 3 Results

This section begins by characterising the main approaches that feature in risk assessment. Both generically and specifically. Thereafter, the Results section falls into two subsections. First, programme theory components are examined and explored within a resource-constrained realist review. Second, the report presents a review of approaches to assessment and tools used specifically in the UK context

The Pathway to Intervention

The risk assessment process is clearly defined in NICE documentation and other guidance (Table 3; Box 1). Within this overarching structure latitude exists with regard to the purpose of risk assessment, how exactly it is performed, what scales or tools are used, if any, and how the outputs and outcomes from risk assessment are used.

Table 3 - Stages of the risk assessment pathway

Stage	Detail
1. Child presents to service	Presentations to accident and emergency departments, primary care, acute paediatric care etc.
2. Initial triage and care	Initial assessment for risk (e.g. by paediatrician or registered children's nurse) and assignment of immediate (e.g. physical) care
3. Risk formulation	Brings together an understanding of personality, history, mental state, environment, potential causes and protective factors, or changes in any of these to provide a narrative of individual risk.

4. Development of care plan and risk management plan	A risk management plan should be included in the overall care plan
5. Regular review of care plan	Plans should be updated, to include monitoring changes in risk and specific associated factors for the service user, and evaluation of impact of treatment strategies over time.

Appendix Two expands upon the stages of the risk assessment pathway offering further detail on each of these processes,

Box 1- Areas to be included in a structured risk assessment (NICE guideline CG 133)

- methods and frequency of current and past self-harm
- current and past suicidal intent
- depressive symptoms and their relationship to self-harm
- any psychiatric illness and its relationship to self-harm
- the personal and social context and any other specific factors preceding self-harm, such as specific unpleasant affective states or emotions and changes in relationships
- specific risk factors and protective factors (social, psychological, pharmacological and motivational) that may increase or decrease the risks associated with self-harm
- coping strategies that the person has used to either successfully limit or avert self-harm or to contain the impact of personal, social or other factors preceding episodes of self-harm
- significant relationships that may either be supportive or represent a threat (such as abuse or neglect) and may lead to changes in the level of risk
- immediate and longer-term risks.

Results 1: Programme Theories for Risk Assessment

This section reports a resource-limited realist review of risk assessment tools and processes in child and adolescent mental health. 57 papers were identified for inclusion in the realist review. These comprised 7 systematic reviews, 1 RCT, 6 quantitative studies, 18 qualitative studies and 9 surveys with 7 discussion papers, 3 conventional literature reviews, and one opinion piece. There were two case studies and a further two case studies that combined case studies with qualitative research. Finally, there was a single case note review. The flow of information through the resource constrained realist review process is shown in **Figure 1 – PRISMA diagram**.



Figure 1 – PRISMA Flowchart for the realist review

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

Initial theory

Initial theory for how, when, and why risk assessment is intended to work within the clinical encounter in child and adolescent mental health was identified by undertaking a detailed examination of *The assessment of clinical risk in mental health services. National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health (NCISH)* [38]*.* This report asked 85 mental health trusts and health boards in the UK for details of the main risk assessment tools and approaches that they currently used. Information on the nominated tools was documented, including structure, content, and symptom profile. The Inquiry contacted clinicians, patients and carers asking them to share their experiences of tools via an online survey targeted across mental health services in general [38]. Importantly, it sought to represent clinician, patient and carer viewpoints as required when exploring a complex adaptive system. While this confidential inquiry was not specific to a child and adolescent population the team considered it a suitable starting point because:

(i) the focus of the review question is not on the population but on the context of assessment within a mental health service (in its broadest sense) and

(ii) evidence would be privileged according to its relevance to the review question, meaning that the team would particularly seek and highlight nuances from a specific child and adolescent mental health context.

However, critical differences combine to make the application of an assessment of child or adolescent suicide and self-harm unique.[1] Power differentials, which will exist for both populations, are particularly amplified for younger children. Furthermore, a child at risk exists in a complex care system that includes both protective and risk factors. Assessment of young people in many contexts is conducted by non-mental health experts who lack specialist knowledge and experience to inform clinical decisions.[39] Further differences may relate to the focus of assessments, for example in acute paediatric care assessment typically takes place within an immediate (i.e. hours or days) window for potential self-harm or suicide.[1] In such contexts, assessments are performed in time-limited circumstances with children and adolescents with potentially dynamic and fluctuating mental health. In the United Kingdom, NICE (2004) guidelines advocate that children and adolescents who self-harm should be assessed for risk.[40] This assessment is

intended to identify psychiatric illness and its relationship to self-harm, assess personal and social context together with any specific factors predicting self-harm. It is further required to recognize any significant relationships, either supportive or representing a threat. Such an assessment needs to consider the relatively immediate risk of self-harm or suicide in order to make time-critical risk management decisions.

We formulated fourteen programme theory components derived from the clinical implications of the *National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health (NCISH)* report. In each case the intention was to represent Context (signified by IF), mechanisms (represented by THEN) and outcomes (designated by LEADING TO). When programme theory components were either underspecified or incomplete other sources of evidence are used to complete the context-mechanism-outcomes configurations (CMOCs). A single reviewer extracted the following information from the source documents:

- The activities associated with the risk assessment process.
- The setting in which the risk assessment process took place, including physical environment, social setting, and wider social and economic climate (if specified).
- The outcomes of each intervention, including both clinical outcomes and responses by adolescent or carer.

Box 2 - Candidate Programme Theory Components identified from the Literature

Through this preliminary review, successful interventions are considered to require the following:

1. IF risk assessment approaches are simple, accessible, and part of a wider assessment process THEN staff are able to generate standardised, informative and clinically useful assessments LEADING TO appropriate use of support and services.
2. IF clinical staff focus clinical risk assessment processes on building relationships THEN clinicians and adolescents trust each other LEADING TO frank and open communication within the clinical encounter.

3. IF the emphasis of clinical risk assessment processes is on gathering good quality information on (i) the current situation, (ii) past history, and (iii) social factors THEN staff use information to inform a collaborative approach to management LEADING TO co-ordinated and integrated care.
4. IF staff are comfortable asking young patients about suicidal thoughts THEN young service users share relevant information concerning their circumstances LEADING TO an appropriate service response.
5. IF risk assessment processes are conducted consistently across mental health services THEN the quality of response to young service users does not depend upon does not depend upon each individual contact LEADING TO the availability of consistent information across services.
6. IF staff are trained in how to assess, formulate, and manage risk, including appropriate referral THEN staff feel equipped to manage the risks for children and adolescents who present to health services LEADING TO an emphasis on positive risk taking.
7. IF staff are supported by on-going supervision THEN staff feel able to deliver a consistent approach to risk assessment LEADING TO a reduction in adverse events
8. IF Families and carers are involved in the assessment process THEN families and carers are given an opportunity to express their views on potential risk LEADING TO a collaboratively developed risk management plan
9. IF mental health staff communicate risk assessments with primary care THEN young people are directed to appropriate care LEADING TO successful health outcomes.
10. IF the management of risk is personal and individualised THEN young people don't see their care as 'protocol driven' and won't feel alienated LEADING TO their engagement with care.
11. IF organisations involved in risk assessment utilise a whole system approach THEN this strengthens the standards of care for everyone, LEADING TO the safe management of supervision, delegation and onward referral.

As a complementary activity, the review team identified three “counter programme theories” which relate to how the risk assessment process might result in unintended consequences:

12. IF staff view risk assessment tools as a way of predicting future suicidal behaviour THEN they incorrectly interpret individual levels of need for care LEADING TO inappropriate use of restrictive practices such as involuntary hospitalisation, restraint, sedation and seclusion (for the service user).

13. IF clinicians use risk screening tools and scales in isolation within the risk assessment process THEN treatment decisions are determined by a score LEADING TO incorrect interpretation of individual need for care and inappropriate utilisation of child and adolescent mental health services (for the service).

14. IF staff develop tools for risk assessment locally THEN checklists and scales lack formal psychometric evaluation LEADING TO limited clinical utility of tools for risk assessment and unnecessarily restrictive treatment options

Following identification of programme theory components the team decided to construct an overall logic model as a “conceptual map” within which to locate the diverse programme theories. An initial version was identified from a Screening and Referral Logic Model derived from a relevant publication from the RAND Corporation (Figure 2).[41] The team then overlaid the 14 programme theories on the initial logic model to create a logic model for the realist review (Figure 3).

Figure 2 - Simplified Screening and Referral Logic Model adapted from RAND Corporation [41]

STRUCTURE	**PROCESS**	**OUTCOME**
Screening protocols and procedures Staff training Staff supervision Structures and support	Service reaching need (e.g. geographic, language and culture groups) Support to access services	Short term outcomes Increase in skills and knowledge (self-efficacy) of service providers Proportion of users accessing (or being brought

Referral protocols and procedures Linkages with community services and treatment	Referral to appropriate services	to) and/or engaged in appropriate services Proportion of patients experiencing reduced symptoms
		Long term outcomes Changes in mental health service utilization Reduction in numbers of patients reaching crisis point Reduction in suicide rates

Figure 3 - Logic Model developed for the realist review

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Context</td><td>Structure</td><td>Process</td><td colspan="2">Outcomes</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Short Term Outcomes</td><td>Long Term Outcomes</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Positive Programme Actions</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>PT1 Wider assessment process
PT2 Emphasis on building relationships
PT3 Emphasis on gathering good quality information
PT5 Consistent risk assessment processes</td><td>Reduction in referrals to CAMHS services

PT4(i) Staff comfortable in asking about suicidal thoughts</td><td>Changes in use of CAMHS services</td></tr>
</table>

PT11 Whole system approach to risk assessment	PT1 Simple, accessible tools PT7 On-going supervision ▶	PT6 Staff trained to assess, formulate and manage risk PT8 Family and carer involvement in assessment PT9 Staff communicate assessments to primary care PT10 Personal and Individualised risk management ▶	Increase in provider knowledge, skills and self-efficacy PT4(ii) Staff comfortable in asking about suicidal thoughts Reduction in symptoms precipitating suicidal ideation	Reduction in rates of self-harm Reduction in rates of suicides
	Negative Programme Actions			
	PT14 Locally developed tools ▶	PT13 Use of tools/scales in isolation PT12 Staff use tools to "predict" suicidal behaviour ▶	Inappropriate utilisation of CAMH Services	

Results

1. Usability

1. IF risk assessment approaches are simple, accessible, and part of a wider assessment process THEN staff are able to generate standardised, informative and clinically useful assessments LEADING TO appropriate use of support and services.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the *NCISH* report which promotes an assessment process that goes beyond strict actuarial approaches [38].

Evidence base: Three systematic reviews, one NICE guidance document, one feasibility study, one qualitative study, one narrative review, one survey, five commentaries and one textbook.

Risk assessment scales are commonly used in clinical practice to quantify the risk of suicide, with 85% of NHS mental health trusts using checklist-style approaches [38]. Currently, no standardized risk screening tool is available for use within clinical practice in the United Kingdom.[1] Furthermore, risk screening tools that exist possess questionable validity, reliability and acceptability (**See Validity and Table 9**).

In contrast, NICE guidance (CG133) recommends that risk assessment should take place within a comprehensive assessment of the patient's needs.[14] A recent systematic review[43] concludes that current evidence is not yet sufficient to recommend that structured diagnostic assessments should be universally adopted as an adjunct to clinical practice. However, the reviewers suggest that structured diagnostic assessments could be applied cautiously and mindfully pending further evaluation. A minority of users of the Davies' structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis expressed concern that 'having a form to fill in' hampers the development of rapport and a relationship between the young person and the professional.

Critics of actuarial approaches comment on the paucity of empirical evidence to support the ability of tools to predict accurately.[16, 44-46] **See Programme Theory #12**. Many argue that tools are based on information about groups, which is of limited value in predicting the behaviours of an individual.[5, 44, 47] Within adult mental health

care the literature consistently affirms that the focus of mental health organizations is now on risk management[48, 49], quality assurance, and patient safety.[49] Recent studies suggest that this may also be true for CAMHS.[50, 51] Risk assessment in isolation from the development and implementation of clinical judgment frameworks becomes potentially ineffectual. Clinicians should not shelter behind the "fallacy" of risk assessment, instead of acknowledging that assessment tools are likely to serve the organization more than the patient.[52]

A possible corollary to programme theory component 1 is that development of simple assessment tools within a complete assessment process could result in higher rates of referral for risk of self harm and suicide, thereby increasing utilisation of CAMHS services.

2. Trust

2. IF clinical staff focus clinical risk assessment processes on building relationships THEN clinicians and adolescents trust each other LEADING TO frank and open communication within the clinical encounter.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component on building relationships is based on the NCISH report which found that clinicians believed that an important focus of risk assessment involved building a rapport such that the assessment flowed smoothly [38].

Evidence base: One NICE guidance document, five qualitative studies, two surveys, one case study, and one commentary.

NICE guidance 133 states that "health and social care professionals working with people who self-harm should: aim to develop a trusting, supportive and engaging relationship with them". Such a recommendation is further informed by qualitative research using interviews with nurses on wards of four psychiatric hospitals.[53] Professionals are concerned about how risk assessment may influence their relationship with service users. Often mental health nurses tend to emphasize risk avoidance to maintain safety.[5, 54, 55] Literature describing nurses' perceptions of safety in acute mental health reports that nurses perceive their role as mainly risk management.[5] Most packages focus on assessment skills, risk screens, and risk factor tools but do not address tensions between divergent views of people in

distress and professionals involved and how to build empathic partnerships[5] in time- and resource-poor environments.

A further tension relates to working environments that privilege “task-based nursing over therapeutic care” and those that create “conditions for open and genuine communication”. Task-based working environments, exemplified by a pre-occupation with tick-box risk assessment, often prove detrimental to person-centred care. Furthermore, within a mental health service context, a focus on risk management “inherently erodes the formation of a therapeutic relationship, as patients who are viewed as risky are not trusted”.[56]

In contrast, where “conditions for open and genuine communication” exist staff members seek to focus on “developing an accurate and meaningful picture of patients”.[53] As a consequence staff members can enhance their capacity for compassionate and considerate contact and communication with patients experiencing suicidal ideation.

Compassionate care is particularly important - unlike their feelings for the self-harm population in general, staff typically hold positive attitudes towards self-harm specifically in adolescents and young children.[39, 57] If done well in an unhurried, empathetic, and non-judgmental manner, the interview can be therapeutic and encourage the patient to seek future help. By contrast, negative attitudes and a focus on the patient’s physical needs might result in the patient avoiding emergency services in the future. A healthcare professional should not give false reassurance, because patients may doubt that they are taking their situation seriously [58]. If possible, they should seek to obtain a corroborative history of the event from a third party [58].

Assessing young people requires engagement, empathy and a genuine curiosity about what has happened to bring the young person to a point of acute risk. Such an approach seeks to increase the chances of openness and honesty and a collaborative risk assessment. Otherwise, young people will keep risky thoughts and plans hidden, particularly if they think they will be judged or punished.

When presenting to their GP, young people feel that it is important that their GPs initiate the conversation about mental health, suicide and self-harm.[59] If a GP asks

directly about such topics this may overcome some of the barriers to disclosure of suicidal thoughts, depressive symptoms or mental health problems more generally.

In the context of risk assessments for suicidal behaviour and/or self-harm, young people dislike labels such as ‘risk’ and ‘risk assessment’.[59] They perceive such labels to be potentially stigmatising and problematic. Young people may be especially vulnerable to labels that could increase stigma; language and terms related to suicidality or self-harm may be perceived as “pathologising”. Awareness of these attitudes may help in a shift away from professional-focused terms such as ‘at-risk’ and ‘risk assessment’, to patient-focused language such as ‘coping assessment’[60]. However participants in one qualitative study disliked the term ‘assessment’, suggesting the inclusion of language relating to ‘well-being’.[59]

Young people endorse the need for “comprehensive psychosocial-based assessments that prioritise collaboration and the therapeutic alliance, are holistic, acknowledge that risk is dynamic over time, and are needs-driven”.[59] Individualised, needs-based approaches to assessment are key for young people.[59]

A collaborative dialogue facilitates empowerment and creates opportunities for young people to be involved in decision making and to meet their growing needs for autonomy, agency and control [59]. Such a dialogue is concordant with principles of patient-centred care, shared decision making and patient engagement. Furthermore, patient-centred care is fundamental to a biopsychosocial approach and recognises the pivotal role of the family. Young people may be particularly sensitive to power disparities and condescension. A friendly, non-judgemental attitude is critical; poor attitudes and body language and impersonal, over-medicalised approaches impede the therapeutic alliance and the disclosure of suicidal behaviour/self-harm.[59]

Young people’s views of self-harm services have not been extensively studied.[61] A recent study has explored the views of young people in relation to the role of GPs.[59] GPs have been found, in one study, to be the most frequent health care practitioner source for urgent referrals of children and young people for self-harm, suicidal thoughts or following overdose. Families may prefer to access their GPs when worried about these issues. GPs can feel dependent on specialist support and feel the need for increased training in supporting children and young people with mental

health issues.[62] Young people expect GPs to be skilled and knowledgeable in providing practical resources and support for presentations of suicidal behaviour and self-harm, including crisis support.[59] Assistance from the GP with accessing crisis resources or using a safety plan is viewed as highly beneficial.[59] GPs taking the time to demonstrate resources to the young person was another expression of care and connection to assist a positive relationship.[59] Young people may have little previous experience of how the healthcare system is structured, and therefore might require more 'scaffolding' than adults.[63]

Young people are typically ambivalent when seeking help. They may isolate themselves, feeling that it is not safe, or that they are not ready to disclose their suicidal thoughts and feelings (e.g. as a consequence of feeling shame). In response nurses describe how they try to enable patients to communicate in an open and genuine way.[53] By presenting themselves as accessible and approachable, reaching out to patients, and encouraging patients to approach them and talk to them nurses are able to work on creating an open and communicative environment.[53] Nurses highlight the need to develop a trusting relationship, respect the emotions of patients, and reassure patients that they can disclose suicidal ideation.[53]

All the above suggests that "…policy makers and hospital leaders should aim to create environments where [staff] can be involved in multifaceted and interpersonal approaches to suicide risk assessment".[64] In such environments organisations could create relationships between children and young people and professionals that release preventive and therapeutic potential, rather than encouraging impersonal observations and ineffective checklist approaches. **See Programme Theory #1**.

3. Credible information

3. IF the emphasis of clinical risk assessment processes is on gathering good quality information on (i) the current situation, (ii) past history, and (iii) social factors THEN staff use information to inform a collaborative approach to management LEADING TO co-ordinated and integrated care.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report[38] which found that clinicians believed that an important element of risk assessment is the quality of the

information gathered. The clinicians interviewed noted the importance of gathering a thorough history of previous incidents, and having an awareness of triggers for distress, e.g. significant anniversaries. They reported that a good risk history should include details of the incident and its consequences as well as the likelihood of the incident being repeated. However, some highlighted the difficulty of predicting suicide [38].

Evidence base: Two quantitative studies, one multi-centre study, three qualitative studies, three surveys, and three commentaries.

Critics argue that tools tend to focus on historical (static) risk factors thus ignoring the dynamic or situational variables, which impact on the person.[5, 8] The FACE-CARAS suite of tools promotes use of schedules that enquire about both historical (static) and current (dynamic) risk factors.[65]

Key to risk assessment is a collaborative dialogue, which encompasses the provision of adequate, detailed information across all aspects of a young person's care, including treatment options and confidentiality.[59] Assessment tends to focus on risks people with mental health diagnoses pose which marginalises consideration of other risks like living in inadequate accommodation.[66] It constructs individuals as risks who need interventions rather than identifying *issues within particular communities, such as those with higher levels of poverty, substance abuse and unemployment*.[48] It may also obscure risks that come from accessing mental health services which potentially include loss of liberty, forced treatment, or negative experiences.…".[67 68]

Young people value the protection of their privacy, particularly for sensitive issues.[59] However, this should not be interpreted as a reason not to ask them about their thoughts of self-harm or suicide. Health professionals should also be aware that different types of self-harm may be viewed differently by children and young persons. For example, stigma associated with cutting may make a child or young person more secretive whereas attempted suicide frequently signals that the young person has reached a point where they are no longer able to cope at all.[61] Young people also express concerns regarding the privacy and confidentiality of their medical information relating to mental health and suicidal behaviour/self-harm.[59]

Challenges exist in relation to incompleteness of information. A survey of outpatient and inpatient adolescents in the UK showed that 20% reported at least one episode of self-harm on the questionnaire that was not recorded in the clinical record.[69] The authors concluded that “using a combination of clinical interviews (with multiple informants), paper-and-pencil tools and comprehensive clinical records' keeping afford the best chance of identifying adolescents who self harm”.[69] A Multicentre Study of Self-harm in England[70] reported that psychosocial assessment occurred in only 57 % of presentations in the study, even though the three centres (six hospitals) involved had well-established specialised self- harm services. The authors concluded that this “low rate of completion demonstrates the extent to which hospitals fall short of implementing the national guideline recommendation that all self-harm patients should receive a specialist assessment”.[70] They suggest that this low completion requires further investigation, particularly as “non-assessment may have several causes (e.g., self-discharge, patient refusal, unavailability of staff, emergency department policy)”.[70] They argue that this is particularly critical given what they claim as “accumulating evidence that psychosocial assessment is associated with reduction in risk of repetition of self-harm” and the fact that “provision of appropriate psychiatric and social care is unlikely in the absence of an assessment”.[70]

The FACE-CARAS tools are predicated on a stepped approach to completion – such that subsequent tools are only completed when indicated by the overall risk profile – but even within the context of research and evaluation completion of subscales was found to be unacceptably incomplete.[65]

While advances in computerisation and clinical records have shifted the exact nature of this challenge the need for multiple and complementary approaches remains as pressing as ever. Specific challenges relate to conducting suicide risk assessment. Self-report measures of suicidality are limited by reporting biases (e.g., young people may conceal suicidality to avoid anticipated negative consequences) and high temporal variability (i.e. self-reported suicidal ideation may fluctuate from moment to moment).[71]

When patients feel able to communicate in an open and genuine way, nurses are able to get to know patients, can assess suicidal ideation and also identify risk and

protective factors. Strategies used to characterise the presence and severity of suicidal ideation, include listening to and observing patients, asking patients about the presence of suicidal thoughts and plans, and checking with colleagues.[53] Nurses must be alert to expressions that might be indicative of suicidal ideation (e.g., self-harm and social isolation). Nurses describe how they depend upon their intuitive senses, and that their own emotional responses, including "feeling anxious about the potential of a suicidal attempt", provide cues to emerging suicidal ideation. Conversely, such emotional responses may also make nurses more likely to assess suicide risk as higher than it actually is.[53]

4. Communicative Environment

4. IF staff are comfortable asking young patients about suicidal thoughts THEN young service users share relevant information concerning their circumstances LEADING TO an appropriate service response.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] in which patients recommended that risk assessment tools should incorporate a focus on suicidal thoughts, i.e. "to encourage staff to confidently tackle difficult questions".

Evidence base: One meta-analysis, one quantitative study, one service improvement project, five qualitative studies, five surveys, and one editorial comment.

Mental health nurses who are confident can make responsible decisions related to risk management.[5] Some nurses seem to have the interpersonal qualities and skills to move beyond checking and controlling suicide risk and instead make efforts to acknowledge and connect (with) the patient as a person, even during standardized assessments and observations.[53] These nurses adopt a focus that transcends a reductionist focus on static risk and protective factors and seems to open doors to a holistic picture of patients by being attentive to their needs and hopes and trying to understand the nature of their suicidal expressions.[20, 72]

One possible source of discomfort for staff members, particularly those who do not specialise in mental health, is the fear that asking patients about suicide might induce suicidal ideation. In general, nurses favour 'daring to discuss' suicidal ideation

to support the patient's communication. However, they also felt that they must not 'force the conversation'.[53] Thirteen studies (2001 – 2013) have examined whether asking about suicide induces suicidal ideation.[73] With samples including both adolescents and adults and both general and at-risk populations, none of the identified studies found a statistically significant increase in suicidal ideation in participants as a result of being asked about their suicidal thoughts. Findings suggest that acknowledging and talking about suicide with adolescent populations may in fact reduce, rather than increase suicidal ideation, with a suggestion that repeat questioning may benefit long-term mental health.[73] Studies in treatment-seeking populations suggest that asking people who are or have been suicidal about suicidality can lead to improvements in mental health.[73] Review findings suggest that recurring ethical concerns about enquiring about suicidality could be relaxed.

The fear that asking about suicide itself precipitates action (so-called iatrogenic risk) persists, especially among clinicians with a non-psychiatric background. A meta-analysis quantitatively synthesized thirteen studies that explicitly evaluated the iatrogenic effects of assessing suicidality via prospective research designs. When pooled the overall effect of assessing suicidality did not demonstrate significant iatrogenic effects in terms of negative outcomes. A key strength of this study is that the review authors stratified studies according to the timing of their follow-up assessments, concluding that assessing suicidality did not result in any significant negative effects on immediate, short-term, or long-term follow-up assessments The authors conclude that their findings support the appropriateness of universal screening for suicidality, and state that this should allay the fears of clinicians that assessing suicidality is harmful.[74]

Clinicians' anxieties may increase the reliance on undertaking an assessment based upon a checklist of phenomenological or epidemiologically valid items that provide few opportunities to account for individual differences that may provide a more accurate and richer suicide risk assessment. [75] Use of risk assessment tools may provide false reassurance, assuaging the clinician burden and sense of dyscontrol, whilst giving the impression of effective working and so mediating corporate risk.

Losing a patient by suicide can impact on professional practices, including issues around objective clinical decision-making. It may lead to behaviours likened to

learned helplessness such as increased vigilance when dealing with future suicidal patients and avoidance of treating suicidal patients.[76, 77] These in turn may lead to an ongoing reliance on the same systems for assessment and treatment.[75]

One feature that might influence staff's comfort and willingness to ask young people about suicidal ideation relates to whether young people themselves feel comfortable with such questioning. Increasing numbers of qualitative studies have found that, contrary to the beliefs of many, young people do not mind being asked about the presence or absence of suicidal thoughts.[78-81] Several tools utilise self-report approaches. For example, the developers of the RTSHIA point out how the quality of data produced by self-report measures is comparable to that obtained through clinical interviews.[3] They state that people may feel more comfortable admitting to sensitive thoughts and acts when they are asked to circle a response or write a brief explanation instead of providing a verbal report, which may be influenced by interpersonal reactions to interviewers. Reassurance of the confidentiality and anonymity of self-reports is also important for young people. Pragmatically, few alternatives to self-report data exist when requesting personal and sensitive information from young people.

5. Consistency of Approach

5. IF risk assessment processes are conducted consistently across mental health services THEN the quality of response to young service users does not depend upon each individual contact LEADING TO the availability of consistent information across services.

Supporting evidence

Programme theory component #5 is based on the NCISH report[38] which found "little consistency in the length, content or use of risk tools, although there was greater consistency in some places than others". Risk assessment also needs to be consistent across mental health services.[38]

Evidence base: One systematic review, one mixed-methods study, one interrupted time series, one case series, one service improvement project and two surveys.

As articulated the programme theory relates to inconsistencies in the role and personal characteristics of the staff member making the contact and to inconsistencies resulting from contact with multiple, uncoordinated individuals. Patients who were critical of the assessment process felt that there was inconsistency between teams.[38] It is noteworthy that one of the strengths of the Wales Applied Risk Research Network (WARRN) initiative, as identified by clinicians, is the development of a consistent approach, within and between organisations.[82] Clinicians acknowledged that different agencies had created a common language and understanding that improved communication both across and between agencies.[82] These benefits have been similarly realised by a consistent two step risk assessment and management process (Comp RA) within Northern Ireland.[38] Benefits can also extend to the development of standardised training and supervision procedures and processes, seen in the WARRN and ACT training programmes.

Programme theory #5 is further supported by a mixed methods study[83] which examined which risk assessment tools were currently in use in the UK, and collected views from clinicians, service-users and carers on the use of these tools. Findings showed little consistency in use of these instruments [83]. Clinicians, patients and carers expressed both positive and negative views of the featured instruments. Findings attest to the need for assessment processes to be consistent across mental health services. Many professionals using the Davies' structured assessment for adolescents in a crisis thought that it was good for a professional to have some structure and framework within which to operate so that "nothing would be missed". Significantly, this view was not shared universally. On-going supervision is another provision to support consistency of approach. Care for self-harm within emergency departments appears to be particularly variable, with research showing it be ineffective and delayed.[84]

Areas where compliance needs to be improved, include appropriate completion of the risk assessment.[85] A recent study extracted anonymised data from child and adolescent mental health services at two time points. Data were compared with prevalence and population data and then a subsample was evaluated against National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) Guidelines. Between time points

there was a significant decrease in the number of cases that had a risk assessment completed appropriately and the number that had a full risk screen completed.[85] It is unlikely that this result was due to either a genuine reduction in the level of risk seen in CAMHS[86] or that it represents a change in reporting practices. Even where a risk screen is completed somewhere in their notes, consistency needs to be improved to standardise risk monitoring and communication between services. For example, if a young person transitions to adult services having readily accessible information on risk is crucial.

Further variation relates to the experience of the clinician; experienced clinicians tend to use a positive risk-taking approach, whereas recently-qualified clinicians do not feel as confident with suicidality cases unless they are routinely confronted with such cases (such as those working in a crisis team).[75]

6. Self Efficacy

6. IF staff are trained in how to assess, formulate, and manage risk, including appropriate referral THEN staff feel equipped to manage the risks for children and adolescent who present to health services LEADING TO an emphasis on positive risk taking.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which found that healthcare professionals do not feel confident in being able to implement care plans, within which immediate risks can be mitigated, if they lack appropriate support and guidance to inform their assessment.[1]

Evidence base: One systematic review, one randomized controlled trial, three quantitative studies, one mixed-methods study, one qualitative study, one pre-post study, one service improvement project, three surveys and one commentary.

Nurses with good confidence can make responsible decisions related to risk management.[5] Continuing education about the use of risk assessment tools is needed to demonstrate that their use is compatible with therapy.[5] Staff need training if they are to use risk assessments in such a way that ensures their reliability.[87] A mixed-methods study in the UK reported little consistency in the use of instruments

and highlighted a need for adequate training.[83] Nearly a third of clinicians surveyed in UK mental health services reported poor levels of training, highlighting practical issues in the use of tools and the poor quality of documented information.[83] Noticeably, training is a substantive component of both the Davies' structured assessment for adolescents in a crisis and for the WARRN formulation-based approach[82] – both indicating that familiarity with a structured process and how it integrates within clinical judgement should be considered more important than technical mastery of a tool or checklist. Over two days, the WARRN training modules cover basic clinical skills such as how to conduct a clinical interview and what should be covered, techniques for asking difficult questions, how to formulate, and how to produce risk management plans. The essential need for documentation and communication of presenting risks and the reasons underpinning these risks are highlighted. The value of co-production with the service-user and family/carer is also covered. Standardized paperwork and forms to record the WARRN assessment and formulation are provided for use by clinicians following training.[82]

Typically, healthcare professionals within emergency departments environments have limited mental health training, and as such, feel ill equipped to assess and manage the associated risks apparent for children or adolescents presenting following an episode of self-harm or attempted suicide.[88] The limitations of these prediction methodologies likely impact on clinicians' confidence when assessing suicide risk. Dealing with patients who self-harm and/or are suicidal is perhaps one of the most difficult challenges faced by clinicians [75]. One study estimated that 88% of mental health professionals have at least some level of fear relating to a patient dying by suicide, as well as discomfort around working with suicidal patients.[89] More than two thirds of doctors practising emergency medicine believe that they are insufficiently trained at assessing those attempting self-harm. The limited training that health professionals receive relating to the assessment and management of suicidality may contribute to the burden felt by clinicians working in healthcare settings. Learned helplessness may result as suicide rates remain unaffected and predictive data have little impact on reversing this rate. The checklist-style structure of risk assessment within many NHS mental health services forms an "aide memoire" of items characteristic of many suicide risk prediction tools.

Evidence highlights that training focusing specifically on the management of the suicidal drivers, or factors mediating the cognitions, emotions and behaviours augmenting suicidal risk, resulting in suicidal behaviours, can have a positive effect on clinicians' confidence, clinical skills and implementation of evidence-based practices.[90, 91.] Greater awareness and accurate knowledge can de-stigmatize self-harm behaviour by staff enabling them to develop a greater understanding of contextual issues.[92] Additionally, education and attitude awareness may equip professionals with alternative explanations for self-harm behaviour that can help them to become more empathic and, subsequently, to alter their behaviours. [88, 93]

Training was a major component of a service improvement initiative aimed at improving suicide prevention in North East Lincolnshire.[75] Three phases of training were delivered across the organisation: "suicide risk triage" training, CAMS training, and CAMS concordance. All qualified staff were required to attend a mandatory 1-day training course entitled 'risk triage training' in groups of approximately twelve staff. Besides providing an overview of how the "suicide risk triage" model was to be implemented within services, training collected data on factors that clinicians felt impacted on their confidence during the suicide risk assessment. The mandatory training also ensured all clinicians met a baseline level of ability and knowledge and was delivered to all new and newly qualified clinicians. Anecdotal feedback from the training highlighted the positive impact of a clear, structured approach to clinical risk decision-making to help clarify the most appropriate pathways to care for suicide risk presentations and the benefit of having support available for decision-making around challenging risk cases. The authors highlight evidence that CAMS training can significantly decrease clinician's anxiety about working with suicidal risk and increase confidence, with results sustained at 3-month follow-up.[94] However, they acknowledge that the CAMS approach has yet to be evaluated in the UK.

Evidence from another study suggests that while training may help in ensuring staff can engage with the theoretical aspects of the situation they need additional provision for practical implementation.[95] Reflective peer review is suggested as one mechanism by which to help staff to reflect on their risk assessments, consider the knowledge and information that has informed their risk management plans and

discuss this with their peers in a supportive environment.[95] The authors claim that such a programme improved staff skills, confidence and documentation.[95]

Similar findings are reported from a joint Australia-Switzerland initiative to investigate whether a training intervention increases general practitioners' (GPs) detection sensitivity for probable mental disorders in young people.[96] While improvements in detection were demonstrated these related only to more clearly-detected cases and not to a more pragmatic clinical definition. The authors concluded that improving recognition of mental disorder among young people attending primary care is likely to require a multifaceted approach targeting young people and GPs.[96] Training is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for improved detection.

7–A role for supervision

7. IF staff are supported by on-going supervision THEN staff feel able to deliver a consistent approach to risk assessment LEADING TO a reduction in adverse events

Supporting Evidence

NICE guidelines specify that “Child and adolescent mental health service practitioners involved in the assessment and treatment of children and young people who have self-harmed should:…..have regular supervision” [14].

Evidence base: One clinical guideline, one service improvement project and one survey.

Successful suicide prevention requires that clinicians are confident when faced with suicide risk is a pertinent issue for suicide prevention.[75] There is conflicting evidence on whether clinicians focus on predicting the probability of suicide, despite little evidence supporting the utility of this approach.[75] A recent survey suggests that attitudes and behaviours towards the predictive ability of tools may differ between doctors and other health professionals.[38] However, the survey did not specify whether doctors were specialists or non-specialists or whether their experience was based on specialist training in mental health or rotations.

One NHS mental health provider implemented a service-wide, systems-level approach to suicidal risk (known as “suicide risk triage”).[75] with supervision as a key

component. This sought to address issues around clinicians' confidence when assessing suicide risk, identified through training sessions, which highlighted the value of shared responsibility with senior supervising colleagues when considering more challenging suicide risk assessments. By addressing the concerns of all clinical staff, through a formal supervision hierarchy this system-level approach sought to "minimise confounders of objective, person-specific clinical risk decision".[75] The supervision hierarchy was provided to support clinicians if they were unsure about the level of suicidal risk a service user presented with, the treatment plan they would develop for them, or if they felt that the risk was potentially life-threatening and therefore needed escalation for assessment and intervention.[75] Supervision arrangements included additional training for nominated clinicians within each team who were available to support/advise their colleagues when making difficult decisions around assessment and management of suicide risk. This support could be extended further up the hierarchy to trained clinicians and senior staff with extensive experience of managing clinical risk.[75] Clinicians affirmed the benefits of having a supervision structure in place, together with an organisation-wide approach for handling suicide risk cases.

8. Service User Involvement

8. IF Families and carers are involved in the assessment process THEN families and carers are given an opportunity to express their views on potential risk LEADING TO a collaboratively developed risk management plan

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report[38] which found that clinicians considered that closer contact with a patient's family is the second most important risk reduction factor in preventing suicide, after closer supervision of the patient. NICE guidance on *Self-harm in over 8s: long-term management* [CG 133] states that "if the service user agrees, families, carers and significant others should have the opportunity to be involved in decisions about treatment and care. Families, carers and significant others should also be given the information and support they need".[14]

Evidence base: One clinical guideline, one mixed-methods study, two qualitative studies, two service improvement projects and one survey.

One mixed-methods study from the UK reviewed risk assessment tools currently in use and concluded that personalised management plans should be collaboratively developed with patients and their families and carers.[83] Engaging carers in discussions on risk has been shown to improve carer satisfaction.[97] Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis[17] is one tool that includes structured interview/checklist assessment with "parenters". The rationale cited is the need to guard against any omissions, for whatever reason, from the young person. Specifically, its developers point to how mood troughs are more critical than averages when conducting the risk assessment and that talking to significant others (e.g. parents) can serve to elicit such information.

More broadly, involvement of service users and their carers in mental health care planning is largely welcomed by mental health professionals.[98] However, tensions between user and carer involvement and professional accountability remain to be resolved. Conventional staff training programmes are commonly viewed as deficient, requiring that user involvement depends for its success on individual, relational skills.[98] Notwithstanding a generally favourable professional view of user involvement, challenges remain in relation to a lack of effective implementation support.[98]

9. Inter-agency Communication

9. IF mental health staff communicate risk assessments to primary care THEN young people are directed to appropriate care LEADING TO successful health outcomes.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which identified a pressing need to improve access to and collaboration between primary care and mental health care services.

Evidence base: Three qualitative studies and one commentary.

Many UK studies describe issues that GPs have with mental health care services. Mental healthcare professionals are thought to tend to minimize GPs' assessments of patients' suicidal state. Adolescent contact with primary care presents an opportunity to conduct suicide screening and intervention. However, most primary care providers do not screen adolescents for suicide risk, perhaps because of suicide being a low base rate event.[99] Providers may feel that they lack formal psychiatric training or they may experience a general discomfort about screening adolescent patients for suicide risk.[99] Cumulatively, as many as 83% of adolescent suicide attempters are not identified as such by their primary care providers.[99]

GPs report feeling stuck with patients, because they rarely meet the criteria for review and, therefore, remain in primary care.[100, 101] A recent British study described how GPs feel professionally isolation; being "lost in a referral maze".[102] British GPs have also expressed the need for mental health staff based in GP practices.[102]

10. Personalisation and Individualisation

10. IF the management of risk is personal and individualised THEN young people do not see their care as 'protocol driven' and don't feel alienated LEADING TO their engagement with care.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which found that patients expressed a wish for "a personalised approach, not based on the completion of a checklist". The team highlighted their previous research to suggest that risk is often individual and risk management should be personalised [103, 104].

Evidence base: Two qualitative studies, one mixed-method study, one pilot study, one service improvement project, one confidential inquiry, one survey and one commentary.

Young people dislike assessment approaches that are inflexible or binary; perceiving them as failing to capture nuance in their mental states and potentially impacting negatively on access to healthcare.[59]. Instead, young people want to be treated in a holistic and individualised manner.[59]. This finding reinforces recommendations that methods that categorise patients into 'risk-level' groups should not be used to determine treatment outcomes, as they can miss key opportunities for intervention [18].

In particular, methods that feel impersonal to young people, such as ‘tick-box’ or checklist-style approaches, are unwelcome.[59]

A UK-based mixed-methods study, which examined risk assessment tools in current use, highlighted the need for management plans that are personalised and collaboratively developed with patients and their families and carers.[83] These findings are substantiated by contemporary qualitative research exploring conversations of self-harm in the emergency department.[105] Patients identified two main types of approach:

- A therapeutic interaction made people feel their life mattered and instilled hope for the future.
- A formulaic assessment focusing on risk made people feel their life did not matter and hopeless about the future (see Table 4).

Table 4 - Contrasting approaches to self-harm (Adapted from Xanthopoulou et al, 2021)[105]

Therapeutic interaction	**Formulaic assessment:**
unscripted conversation, really listening and acknowledging distress	checklist questions that are a barrier to trust, disclosure and listening
warmth, positive nonverbal communication that fosters trust and disclosure	feeling judged and unworthy of help;
difficult yet direct conversations helping people understand their feelings	trivial treatment suggestions
a co-produced treatment plan.	feeling unsafe to go home

Even though patients interviewed were 18 years and older (eligibility was 16+ years) this data explores staff approaches rather than patient-specific factors so is likely to be transferable conceptually to the experience of children and adolescents presenting to the emergency department.

In the wider context of safeguarding it has been observed that health and social care professionals are in constant tension, accountable for promoting individual autonomy whilst seeking to predict accurately the level of risk resulting from subsequent action.[106] This tension is equally present within risk assessment for children and adolescents and reflects a wider literature, which contends that the focus of mental health organisations is now on risk management and quality assurance and patient safety.[107] Even where this imperative is not explicit it is revealed in how the purpose of tools is explained. For example, Davies's structured assessment for adolescents in a crisis concludes by stating that "a structured interview or checklist of questions offers a fail-safe for clinicians to make sure that all important factors are considered when making an assessment".[17]

11. Integration within a whole-system approach

11. IF organisations involved in risk assessment utilise a whole system approach is used THEN this strengthens the standards of care for everyone, LEADING TO the safe management of supervision, delegation and onward referral.

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report which stated that risk assessment should form "one part of a whole system approach that should aim to strengthen the standards of care for everyone, ensuring that supervision, delegation and onward referral are all managed safely".[38]

Evidence base: One systematic review, one qualitative study, one survey and two commentaries.

The need for a whole system approach is noted by the most recent systematic review considered within this realist synthesis.[108] It noted the policy direction of numerous best practice and policy guidelines for the assessment of risk from the UK, US and Australia among others, all of which identified the need for "a whole system, multi-agency, and collaborative approach".[108] The same systematic review drew attention to "a clear lack of specificity as to how to implement the recommendations in practice".[108] Furthermore, the review pointed out how "no single model of risk assessment was discussed in more than one document",[108] substantiating the conclusions of variability and fragmentation. Research suggests that paternalistic professional attitudes, homogenisation of service users, and organisational structures prevent the cultural change required to shift to a strengths-based approach to risk [5, 49, 106, 109]

As a complementary activity the review team identified three "counter programme theories" which relate to how the risk assessment process might result in unintended consequences:

12. Trying to Predict

12. IF staff view risk assessment tools as a way of predicting future suicidal behaviour THEN staff incorrectly interpret individual levels of need for care

LEADING TO inappropriate use of restrictive practices such as involuntary hospitalisation, restraint, sedation and seclusion (for the service user)

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which reported that risk assessment has traditionally focused on prediction; patients being categorised into low, medium or high risk of a particular outcome.

Evidence base: Two clinical guidelines, three systematic reviews - one with meta-analysis, one narrative review, two cohort studies, one observational study, one mixed-methods study, two surveys and four commentaries.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines state that risk assessment tools and scales should not be used to predict future suicide or repetition of self-harm (risk screening), or to determine who should or should not be offered treatment.[14] The NCISH report[38] found that scores on checklists also determined management decisions; contrary to national guidelines for self-harm assessment.

The NCISH report[38] highlights research that suggests that categorising risk in such a way is unhelpful in guiding the treatment and management of a patient,[110, 111] and has poor predictive value [16, 112-115]. It is supported by a mixed-methods study in the UK, which collected views from clinicians, service-users and carers on the use of risk assessment tools.[83] Graney and colleagues highlight how most patients who died by suicide in the UK had been assessed as low risk in their last contact with mental health services.[83] They concluded that, in line with national guidance, risk assessment should not be seen as a way to predict future behaviour and risk screening should not be used as a means of allocating treatment [83]. The NICE guidelines suggest risk assessments might be used as prompts or measures of change.[18] Evidence suggests that risk screening tools are no more accurate at predicting risk than expert specialist mental health professional clinical judgement in non-acute psychiatric outpatients.[113] A later review suggested the pooled positive predictive value for suicide was 5%: for every 100

people rated at high risk, five would go on to die by suicide.[116] More importantly, risk scales would miss suicide deaths in the large 'low risk' group.[116]

Most tools identified in the NCISH survey[38] encouraged staff to make predictions of future behaviours and stratify risk, for example, into high, medium, and low or numeric risk categories. Overall, 80 (94%) tools used risk categorisation to inform care. In mental health services risk assessment has traditionally focused on prediction (risk screening). Around a third of nurses (n=15, 32%) and managers (n=11, 38%), but none of the doctors, thought tools had predictive value, compared to around two thirds of psychologists (n=20, 70%).[38]

Notwithstanding acknowledged risk factors for such harmful acts as suicide and violence, no evidence has substantiated that identifying and responding to risk factors is useful in predicting, preventing or reducing risk of harm.[20] Even where risk assessment is believed to be useful, incorrect interpretation of individual need for care[117] can lead to restrictive mental health practices, such as involuntary hospitalisation, restraint, sedation and seclusion. [20, 118] Unintended consequences of such practices themselves present competing risks, placing both patients and staff at risk of harm.[20, 119]

In summary, then, no widely accepted tools exist for clinically assessing a patient's risk of subsequent self-harm or suicide.[120] Specifically, within a child and adolescent population context, many promising measures for use in child and adolescent populations have insufficient psychometric data, and require further research. [120]

13. Trying to Score

13. IF clinicians use risk screening tools and scales in isolation within the risk assessment process THEN treatment decisions are determined by a score LEADING TO incorrect interpretation of individual need for care and inappropriate utilisation of child and adolescent mental health services (for the service).

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which found that, contrary to national guidance, scores on locally-used tools determined management

decisions. Indeed, one of the clinical messages of the report is that “Risk is not a number, and risk assessment is not a checklist. (Risk screening) Tools if they are used…should be considered part of a wider assessment process. Treatment decisions should not be determined by a score” [38].

Evidence base: One systematic review, three qualitative studies, one service improvement project, two surveys and six commentaries.

A recent systematic review surveyed the available tools and concluded that limitations in the use of risk screening tools in isolation as a predictor needs to be recognized.[108] The review concluded that no one risk screening scale was supported by sufficient evidence to sustain its use in clinical practice. The review authors argued that this lack of empirical evidence should be used to engineer a radical shift in the contemporary discourse in the patient safety literature on risk assessment. Furthermore, they claim that the focus on risk screening tools may deter the development of sound clinical judgment frameworks. Clinical judgement is considered essential to use of Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis.[17] Its originators reason that sometimes a person only ticks a few boxes when they are at significant risk of harming themselves. Weighting within the items of a tool may mean that these important indicators in isolation may fail to trigger a clinical threshold. Furthermore, the development team reason that “mood troughs”, not averages, are more critical within the risk assessment.[17]

Numerous writers have discussed the advantages and disadvantages of using risk assessment tools to assess risk.[8, 48] Survey research suggests that nurses favour ‘interpretative' approaches to assessment, relying on their own ‘instinct' to guide assessment. In contrast, other studies suggest that most respondents believe that risk assessment tools facilitate professional decision making.[5] Critics point out that despite claims that risk assessment tools help to manage risk, there is little evidence to support such assertions.[48] For instance, in a survey of 1,937 psychiatrists, 87% of respondents endorsed the view that tools provide a false sense of security, as there is little direct evidence that tools help to reduce adverse events”.[19]

The literature available suggests that intuition or the unstructured approach continues to form a key part of how nurses determine decisions about risk [121, 122], with some studies suggesting that nurses see risk assessment as the doctor's responsibility,[121] and try to offset clinical responsibility when practising risk assessment and management by referring decisions to a psychiatrist or the team.[123] In relation to risk assessment tools, only one study was located that reported nurses using validated tools or derivatives to guide their practice;[66] while some of the Community Mental Health Nurses (CMHNs) in this study reported using tools they still favoured clinical judgement and 'interpretative' approaches. Nurses in other studies, also report some ambivalence towards using tools, viewing them as a technology of psychiatry designed to erode clinical expertise or as bureaucratic instruments without value or purpose.[121, 124] Conversely, others propose that they facilitate discussion between practitioners about risk and enhance care documentation [121]. They are also viewed as providing a measure of legal protection from liability and an important way of documenting and justifying decisions [122]. However, nurses also view risk assessment approaches as little more than strategies to protect organizations, should an adverse event occur [123], contributing to defensive anti-therapeutic practices [125].

14. Trying to Do Things Differently

14. IF staff develop their own tools for risk assessment THEN checklists and scales lack formal psychometric evaluation LEADING TO limited clinical utility of tools for risk assessment and unnecessarily restrictive treatment options

Supporting evidence

This programme theory component is based on the NCISH report [38] which concluded that "there is little place for locally developed tools". Approximately two-thirds of NHS mental health organisations use locally devised adaptations that lack formal psychometric validation.[114]

Evidence base: One systematic review, three qualitative studies, two quantitative studies, one mixed methods study, one observational study, one cohort study, one service improvement project, two surveys and two commentaries.

Recent research confirms the limited clinical utility for predicting suicide and self-harm using risk screening scales [112, 113, 115]. Furthermore, the use of such scales may result in unnecessarily restrictive treatment options for those categorised as "high-risk".[126] Evidence reviewing the predictive value of widely used risk screening scales in the UK has highlighted the low specificity of such scales for suicide and self-harm, which may result in individuals remaining within mental health services for longer than necessary.[112] In such cases, where staff inappropriately identify suicide risk, targeted treatment to assist suicidality may be superseded by restrictive care planning, such as compulsory detainment and hospitalisation.[126]

Individuals with suicidality present with needs that are not exclusively mental-health-based, including societal, community, relationship and individual risk factors.[127] Assuming that suicidality is the result of a mental health diagnosis may place an unnecessary burden on mental health professionals to prevent suicide, as well as increased blame if an individual who does not seek help completes suicide.[128] Previous research estimates that, for those individuals who do have contact with healthcare services, only between 3% and 22% of individuals had reported suicidal intent at their final appointment with a healthcare professional before their suicide.[129-131] suggesting suicide risk identification is more complex than a simple dyadic relationship between suicide expression and psychiatric disorder. Unsurprisingly, UK suicide rates remain high, given the limited utility of suicide risk prediction methodologies that remain routine practice across mental health providers.

Linking programme theories to "what works"

Almost without exception the above programme theories focus on conducting a risk assessment that extends beyond a mere tick box exercise to embrace all elements of a thorough biopsychosocial assessment. An overarching line of argument encapsulating all fourteen programme theories might read:

> **If risk assessment to support the mental health of children and adolescents takes place within a wider assessment process (PT1) using simple accessible, standardised tools (PT1) that are not developed locally (PT14)**

and not used in isolation (PT13) THEN staff are able to focus on building relationships (PT2) and to feel comfortable when asking about suicidal thoughts (PT4). Consistent risk assessment processes (PT5) that gather good quality information (PT3), offer personalised and individualised risk management and do not seek to "predict" suicidal behaviour (PT12) are facilitated by family and carer involvement in assessment (PT8) and good communication with primary care. Staff are supported to deliver risk assessment within a context where they receive good quality on-going supervision (PT7) and where they have been appropriately trained to assess, formulate, manage and refer risk (PT6). As a consequence, staff gain increased knowledge, skills and self-efficacy, CAMHS services achieve a reduction in inappropriate referrals and more effective use of CAMHS services, ultimately leading to a reduction in rates of self-harm, symptoms precipitating suicidal ideation, and rates of suicide.

While success ("what works") can be conceived in terms of producing a treatment plan to manage the current and future needs of the child or adolescent patient it necessarily extends to the effectiveness of interventions to reduce self harm, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts. Such a link proves challenging to demonstrate.

The next section examines the tools and approaches that exist and the extent to which these demonstrate both the rigour and relevance required to use these tools in UK clinical practice.

Results 2: Approaches to Risk Assessment for Self Harm and Suicide

We used two approaches for identifying tools and approaches to identify self harm and suicide in children and adolescents. We looked for (i) primary studies that evaluated individual tools or approaches and we also sought to identify (ii) reviews of multiple tools and approaches. We identified 49 tools or approaches and eight reviews and mapped their contents within a mapping review.

Risk assessment tools and approaches for self-harm and suicidality

We identified 49 papers reporting tools or approaches to assessing the risk of self-harm and suicidality amongst children and adolescents (**Figure 4 – PRISMA diagram – primary studies; Figure 5 – PRISMA diagram - reviews**). Tools were all used in UK-based studies (development of the tool may have occurred elsewhere) or reported from surveys conducted in a UK context (**Table 5**). Nine of the tools and approaches are used for generic risk assessment within UK services according to recent UK or regional surveys [38, 114]. Five instruments have been developed specifically for use within a UK paediatrics setting. Fourteen scales were developed outside the UK for specific use with a child or adolescent target group. The remaining twenty-one were generic tools for suicide or aspects of harm that have been adapted, tested and/or used in a child and adolescent patient group.

Figure 4 - PRISMA diagram for mapping review - primary studies



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

Figure 5 - PRISMA diagram for mapping review - systematic reviews



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

Mapping assessment literature

The next section aims to map the included studies and guidelines on clinical risk assessments more generally (as opposed to the following section which focuses on the utility of scales or tools).

Twelve studies discussed an assessment process for risk assessment[70, 132-142] in contrast to studies that focus on specific risk assessment tools or scales. Four guidelines and associated papers on risk assessment were also identified.[14, 15, 143, 144]

Table 5 maps biological, psychological and social elements of assessment approaches to assessment approaches (including studies that also include a tool) for self-harm and suicidality focused assessments only. Quality assessment was undertaken on the empirical studies. One tool was excluded because it did not carry a suicide/self harm focus.[141]

Table 5 - Map of assessment studies according to biopsychosocial approach elements

Term given to assessment focus (Associated studies)	Biological approach	Psychological	Social approach	Biopsychosocial
Context CAMHS- child assessments				
Psychosocial assessment (of mental state, risks, and needs)[70, 132, 134, 137, 141]	○	●	●	○
Clinical assessment [138, 140, 142]	○	●	●	○
Context CAMHS-family assessments				
Extended family assessment [133, 136]	○	●	●	○
Context - Primary care				
Clinical Management - primary care [139]	○	●	●	○
Context - other professionals				
Screening for suicide and self-harm (Youth Justice system)[135]	○	●	○	○
Guidelines & associated studies				
Clinical assessment [144]	○	●	●	○

CAMHS assessment Self-harm in over 8s: long-term management [14] [143] Royal College of Psychiatrists Managing Self-Harm in Young People [15]	●	●	●	●
Special Educational Needs (Special Educational Needs code of practice, 2014)[145]				

This section begins by looking at elements of the guidelines identified in table 9. All elements are identified in the NICE (2011) guidance [14] which states that:

"A risk assessment is a detailed clinical assessment that includes the evaluation of a wide range of biological, social and psychological factors that are relevant to the individual and, in the judgement of the healthcare professional conducting the assessment, relevant to future risks, including suicide and self-harm"(p. 20).

This is reinforced by the Royal College of Psychiatrists guidelines for *Managing Self-Harm in Young People* [15] who present with acute self-harm in the emergency department, stating "Admission should be to a paediatric, adolescent or medical ward or to a designated unit. This is indicated regardless of the individual's toxicological state so that comprehensive physical and psychosocial assessments can occur and management/crisis intervention can be planned and initiated." The emphasis is, therefore, consistent with a psychosocial approach with physical assessment.

The 2021 National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health: Annual Report [144] emphasises psychological elements and so-called co-morbidities, but biological assessment is less clear. The guidance states "*Suicide in people aged under 25 Clinical services should ensure that services for children, young people, and young adults have the skills to respond to the clinical complexity of many younger patients, including combinations of personality disorder diagnosis, eating disorder, self-harm and*

alcohol or drug misuse. These co-morbidities add to suicide risk but can act as a reason for non-acceptance by services designed for single conditions" (p.8).

The Department of Education code of practice [145] specifies the role of schools in Mental health responsibilities towards children. The guidance provides statutory guidance for education and health services in the early identification and support of children and young people with mental health problems. "*Where there are concerns [about a child's mental health needs], there should be an assessment to determine whether there are any causal factors such as undiagnosed learning difficulties, difficulties with communication or mental health issues*" p.96 [145]. Schools should work closely with the local authority and other providers to agree the range of local services and clear arrangements for making appropriate requests (this includes CAMHS) (p.103). However, the guidance is not framed as a risk assessment [145].

In the context of CAMHS the *psychosocial assessment* term was used in five studies [70, 132, 134, 137, 141]. The psychosocial assessment was viewed as an integrated assessment of needs and risk that informs clinical management in line with clinical guidelines. A specific study about internet use and self-harm reports that clinicians found it acceptable to ask about internet use during psychosocial assessments to inform perceptions of risk and decision-making.[141] The term "clinical management" [134] was used which included reference to psychosocial assessment in the study of episodes of self-harm and repetition presenting to three UK centres over a 10 year period (2000 to 2009) to examine the relationship between four aspects of management and repetition of self-harm within 12 months. Provision of a psychosocial assessment by mental health staff was associated with a 40% lower risk of repetition following self-harm in two of the three study centres (p.3). A separate analysis found no association with a lower risk of repetition than psychosocial assessment alone than 1) psychosocial assessment and specialist community mental health follow up; 2) psychosocial assessment, medical admission, and specialist community mental health follow up; 3) psychosocial assessment and psychiatric admission.

Studies using the term clinical assessments[138, 140, 142] only referred to psychological and social elements, although not within an explicit psychosocial approach. Patton et al discuss how self-harm in adolescents is associated with continued behavioural, emotional, and social problems well into adulthood.[140] Horowitz and colleagues [138] imply that physical or biological concerns are missed in the case of youth suicides, finding *"Over one-third of the youth who killed themselves had a medical illness, most often a young person-specific condition such as asthma or acne. Without comorbid psychiatric diagnoses, these young patients…may easily pass through the healthcare system undetected"(p.e12).*

Two studies specifically involved family members in the assessment process [133, 136]. Participants in a psychoanalytic qualitative study to understand suicidal behaviour in young people referred to specialist CAMHS were offered an extended individual and family assessment.[133] The fractured reality potentially identified leads to incongruence in the young person's presentation, which may be misleading when assessing risk.

One cohort study of primary care clinical management assessments following episodes of self-harm stratified variables by sex, age group, and practice level deprivation.[139] Mental illness comorbidity was examined across a broad range of diagnoses.[139] This study focused on outcomes (self-harm episodes, clinical management and mortality) (discussed in another section in this report). However, it does convey the elements included in clinical management through assessment according to the likelihood of referral to mental health services and psychotropic drug prescribing. The importance of gaining "the social picture" are reiterated in papers without a specific self-harm or suicide focus.[146] One study of screening for self harm derived from the context of youth offending.[135] The role of youth justice staff is principally seen in signposting the young person to mental health services and then supporting them during their engagement with those services.[135]

Table 7 shows how tools from Davies, FACE, SDQ and WARRN tools map to outcomes from NICE (2011) recommendations.

Table 6 - Self-Harm and suicide Risk Assessment tool study characteristics and outcomes mapped to NICE (2011) recommendations for features of assessment

Study (CAMHS context featuring real-world practice)	Features of assessment (including RA tools) – and associated textual evidence	Previous incidences of self-harm	Identification of depressive symptoms	Diagnosis of other psychiatric illnesses	Social relationships and contexts	Identification of risk factors and	Identification of relationships	Identification of longer-term risks	Integrated care and risk management	Outcomes & role of RA tool (including changes reported in clinical encounter)

Table 7 - Studies classified as broad assessments

Study conducted to compare risk assessments by psychiatrists and mental health nurses following an episode of self-harm.[132]	Aim – to examine RA in relation to clinical management in practice. Psychiatric form included sociodemographic data, clinical information, precipitating factors, method of	●	?	●	●	●	●	?	?	Study – Standard RA form including detailed demographic and clinical data completed by the assessing psychiatrist or nurse. Outcomes compared:

	harm, circumstances of the act, a current mental state assessment, an RA and clinical follow-up arrangements. Patients classified as low, moderate or high risk (study focused on high risk patients).									Positive predictive value of RAs for subsequent self-harm. • Factors that informed RAs. • Immediate clinical management of patients assessed as 'high risk'. Positive predictive value of RAs for self-harm repetition 25% (95% CI: 20–31) among nurses and 23% (95% CI: 13–37) among psychiatrists. Strong agreement on factors associated with RA of high risk by both professions. Following RA of high risk, psychiatrists much more likely than nurses to admit people for inpatient treatment

										(RR = 5Æ6, 95% CI: 3Æ2–9Æ7).
137 General hospital-treated self-poisoning in England and Australia: Comparison of presentation rates, clinical characteristics and aftercare based on sentinel unit data	In Oxford, majority of patients **received a psychosocial assessment by psychiatric clinicians.** Patients not receiving assessment identified through emergency department and medical records. Comparison of presentation rates, clinical characteristics and aftercare based on sentinel unit data Demographic, **clinical and hospital management data** on each episode collected by clinicians using standardised forms. Data from assessments entered into an electronic database by trained blinded data entry staff.	●	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	Compared presentation rates, patient characteristics, psychosocial assessment and aftercare in UK and Australia.

To examine how the management that patients receive in hospital relates to subsequent outcome. Identified episodes of self-harm presenting to three UK centres (Derby, Manchester, Oxford) between 2000 - 2009). Examined relationship between four aspects of management (including psychosocial assessment) and repetition of self-harm within 12 months..	Four aspects of Management: • psychosocial assessment • medical admission • psychiatric admission • referral for specialist mental health follow-up Examined repetition of self-harm within 12 months	●	?	●	?	?	?	?	◌	Main outcome was repeat self-harm within 12 months of an individual's index episode during study period.
Psychosocial assessment investigated population-based rates of self-harm in children and adolescents by gender and age groups, trends in rates over time, methods used for self-	Psychosocial assessment and admission Admission to a hospital bed for self-harm presentations, diurnal and annual temporal patterns, clinical characteristics, aftercare and repetition of self-harm.	●	?	?	?	?	●	?	?	Psychosocial assessment and admission During 2005–2007 specialist psychosocial assessment occurred in 57.0 % (N = 1,500) of episodes (4 not known).

harm, diurnal and annual temporal patterns, clinical characteristics, aftercare and repetition of self-harm. Also examined adherence to national guidance on psychosocial assessment and admission of under-16 year-olds.	Relationship problems examined									Admission to a hospital bed for self-harm presentations occurred in 70.7 % (N = 1,063) in Oxford and Manchester. The majority of individuals aged under 16 years admitted (84.1 %), significantly more than those aged 16–18 years. Frequent repetition of self-harm (53.3 % had history of prior self-harm and 17.7 % repeated within a year). Relationship problems were predominant difficulties associated with self-harm.
Mental health assessment.[143] Specifically evaluating self-harm and suicide risk.	**Evaluating self-harm and suicide risk** (including through direct questioning) Format of assessments not informed by any specific theoretical approach.	●	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	• Young people not always routinely asked directly about self-harm or suicidal thoughts when they are assessed.

Purposeful sample of all consenting first assessment appointments within UK CAMHS. Initial multidisciplinary assessments followed institutional requirement and assessment guidelines. Children assessed by minimum of two practitioners including consultant, staff grade and trainee child and adolescent psychiatrists, clinical psychologists, assistant psychologists, community psychiatric nurses (CPNs), occupational therapists and psychotherapists).										Explores 15 cases where practitioners did not ask specifically about self-harm or suicidal ideation. • Two ways that mental health practitioners introduce topic: first, by building up to it by initially asking about general feelings, and second by stating that it is a requirement to ask everyone.

Qualitative psychoanalytic clinical research project Each clinician planned to offer an extended assessment to five cases fulfilling the inclusion criteria, i.e., a young person who had been referred to specialist CAMHS with self-harm or suicidal behaviour and who attended mainstream schooling, did not have a statement of special educational needs and was not suffering with anorexia nervosa.	Extended assessments – included history taking, *assessment of risk (including suicidality)*, familial relationships Risk assessments drew information from the following sources: **Physical presentation** . Emotional state . **Verbal description of circumstances and difficulties** . **Nature, history and frequency of suicidal behaviour** . Personal and family history . Emotional effect person has on his/her interviewer: the countertransference. **Accurate assessment of current and enduring risk**. Estimated risk of suicidal behaviour/death in terms of high and low risk, planned and impulsive acts, current and enduring risk.	?	●	?	●	●	?	?	○	Detailed case history is needed. .P.141 The use of the Truth Danger Theory and assessing risk-Estimating risk: Acknowledges that risk tools are only a 'useful adjunct' to clinical experience in assessing risk Findings revealed obstacles to accurate assessment of current and enduring risk: Lack of Congruence between components of a young person's presentation may lead to inaccurate assessment of their current and enduring risk.

Table 8 - Studies assessing tools and aspect(s) of wider assessment

Therapeutic assessment [147] Uses Therapeutic Assessment Quality Assurance Tool (TAQAT, primary outcome measure) [148]	1. Assessing risk and taking **standard psychosocial history** (approx. 1 hr). 2. Taking 10-min break to review information gathered and to prepare for rest of session, Followed by 30-min intervention covering: 1. Jointly constructing a cognitive analytic therapy diagram**.** 2. Identifying a target problem. 3. Considering and enhancing motivation for change. 4. Exploring potential ways of breaking vicious cycles. 5. Describing the diagram and the exits in an "understanding letter." In addition, the family receives usual assessment letter.	?	?	?	●	?	?	?	◌	Only those with non-suicidal self-harm showed improvement on Children's Global Assessment Scale score following brief therapeutic intervention. No interaction between treatment and suicidality. Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment used in sampling of RCT for suicidal and non-suicidal self-harm categories

	Family members involved in all stages of TA whenever possible.									
Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis [17] Structured assessment Three structured interviews as checklist of key questions to be asked by health professionals assessing suicide risk of children and adolescents in crisis situations. Questions allow for quick and comprehensive assessment, reminding clinicians of factors to consider when deciding if a risk is significant or not, and ensuring that factors are not neglected or overlooked.	Proposed structured interview/checklist assessment in 3 parts: - Part 1 is questions to ask the parenter(s) (term used for person(s) doing the parenting) - Part 2 is questions for the young person - Part 3 is questions for clinician to answer Questions address both fixed factors (e.g. age, gender etc) and fluid factors (e.g. **level of hopelessness)**. Includes questionnaire for parent/carer, to guard against omissions from young person. Questions for clinician are to help analyse information obtained during other structured interviews and face-to-face contact. Information can then be shared with colleagues, and informed clinical	○	●	○	○	●	?	?	●	From checklist: informed clinical judgement can be made on risk. From study: learning points and observations made by professionals in acceptability of checklist

	judgement can be made on the risk. If any significant risks are identified **then a risk management plan** is put into place.									
WARRN-A formulation-based risk assessment procedure for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) [82] Staff asked their opinion of WARRN training and the risk evaluation process.	Formulation-based RA: Personalised evidence-based explanation of "to who", "when", "where" and "why" there may be a risk. Examination of individual's previous **problem behaviours** is analysed to identify themes, contexts and motivations for the target behaviours. Hypothesising what behaviours may be risky (based on **case history**, interviews, **discussion with family and carers**, and other professionals, etc.), **identifying situational factors that may increase or decrease ris**k, along with **positive protective factors** that might mitigate against risk. Risk formulation feeds directly into **safety planning and risk management.**	?	?	?	●	●	?	?	?	Service evaluation of WARRN-A tool Clinicians reported increased clinical skills, increased confidence in their assessment and management of risk and in safety planning, the increased safety of service users and the general public, and a belief that WARRN had saved lives. Qualitative data showed that clinicians thought a common risk evaluation instrument across

										Wales and different agencies had created a common language and understanding that improved communication.
Psychosocial assessment & Suicide intent scale Problem drug use, drug misuse and self-harm. Psychosocial assessment by member of the general hospital psychiatric service. Mental health professionals carrying out psychosocial assessment complete 18-item checklist indicating whether on	Psychosocial assessment by a member of the general hospital psychiatric service. Following this assessment, the member of staff records detailed information about the patient and the episode of self-harm on a standard data entry form. Presence/absence of psychiatric and personality disorder is recorded, usually according to ICD-10 clinical criteria. The Suicidal Intent Scale (SIS) part of psychosocial assessment	●	?	●	●	?	●	?	?	18 Risk factors rather than outcomes Repetition within 12 months of the index episode of self harm More severe disorders being recorded. Clinical staff conducting psychosocial

not, in their opinion, specific problems are present.	Any number of 18 problem areas (e.g legal problems, alcohol consumption) may be recorded as present.									assessments tend to use a problem-orientated rather than a medical model approach.
Examines characteristics of 64 young men, consecutively admitted to Bluebird House, an NHS mixed gender, adolescent forensic, medium secure hospital	Focused on young men's **clinical presentations**, as informed by the Millon Adolescent Clinical Inventory, and their ICD10 diagnoses. - aids clinician in understanding the difficulties, Young men's responses clustered in three main groups (**Personality Patterns**, **Expressed Concerns** and **Clinical Syndromes**. p.24) Also examines their **risk profiles**, especially with regards to others, as informed by Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth findings and staff	●	?	?	○	○	○	?	?	Study outcomes: Trajectory for some young men into adult personality disorders, their presentation and prognosis compared to female counterparts, and how their presentation contrasts with adult male forensic populations.

	recorded incidents. *(Assessment is completed using information from multiple sources, including interviews with the adolescent, as well as their primary caregivers and from observations and incidents as recorded by staff during admission).* ***Risk information*** *was additionally derived from* ***'Incident forms' completed by nursing staff.***									
FACE-CARAS[149] - to record and analyse clinicians' views of the proposed FACE Child and Adolescent Risk Assessment Suite (CARAS).	Proposed FACE-CARAS assessment system: Screening questions (the "FACE Risk Profile") guide clinician to complete further specific schedules from choice of nine, given previous risk factors flagged and clinical experience of the rater. Both **historical (static) and current (dynamic) risk factors.** Provides anchor point descriptions so items can be coded as absent or representing a perceived low,	?	?	?	●	○	○	?	●	Qualitative study - Emerging themes highlighted need to add items such as criminality and fire-setting to the violence RA schedule; a structured approach for risk of sexual harm be utilised; and an eating disorder RA be included.

	moderate or high level of risk in that domain. Information used to develop a **risk formulation and management plan,** as well as assign global scores to a number of risk domains.									
SDQ[150] investigated associations between family reports of child mental (using self and parent SDQ) and clinician-reported levels of functioning (CGAS). Also used SDQ AVS, which attempts to adjust the estimated change for regression to the mean and other non-treatment related factors	Emphasises importance of taking account of multiple viewpoints when making **appraisals of functioning and symptom severity**. CGAS : clinician-rated scale of general functioning rated from 1 to 100, with 100 signifying superior functioning and 1 indicating extreme impairment [151] *SDQ:* standardised emotional and behavioural screening questionnaire comprising 25 items on five scales: **emotional symptoms**, hyperactivity, conduct, pro-social behaviour and **peer relationships** .[152]	●	●	●	○	○	●	?	○	Dataset of 161,979 episodes of care collected by the Child Outcomes Research Consortium (CORC) - self-harm represented 6.2% of sample. Outcomes in study associations between family reports of child mental (using self and parent SDQ) and

	SDQ AVS. The SDQ AVS estimates impact of treatment over and above what might be expected without intervention. *Presenting problems checklist.* Clinician-rated checklist developed by CORC. Includes hyperkinetic disorder, emotional disorder, conduct disorder, eating disorder, psychotic disorder, **self-harm,** autistic spectrum disorder, learning disability, developmental disability, habit disorder, substance disorder and other presenting problems.[153]									clinician-reported levels of functioning (CGAS). Small-to-medium correlations found between family and clinician ratings. Ratings diverged for the lowest-function CGAS bands. Regression analyses showed that prosocial ratings from both child and parent contributed to clinician ratings. Knowing child-reported emotional problem severity made parent ratings of emotions irrelevant to clinician judgements.

										Positive association between SDQ AVS and CGAS; as hypothesised, CGAS showed more change than SDQ AVS, suggesting that clinicians over-estimate change. Of measures included in study, parent SDQ was most prevalent in CORC data set.

This consideration commences by briefly reviewing the approaches specifically developed in the UK for children and adolescents (Table 9).

Table 9 - Tools and assessment methods for Self Harm and Suicide in Children and Adolescents in the UK

Developed in UK for Generic (i.e. Child, Adolescent and Adult) use	**Developed in UK for Children and Adolescents**	**Developed non-UK for Children & Adolescents**	**Developed non-UK**
1. Comp RA[1] 2. DiCES[2] 3. Galatean Risk Screening Tool (GRiST)[3] 4. Manchester Triage tool [154]**[Self harm]** **5.** Pierce Suicide Intent Scale [155] **[Suicide]** 6. Rio Risk Screen[4] 7. Sainsbury Clinical Risk Assessment Tool[5]	**10.** Children and Young People - Mental Health Safety Assessment Tool (CYP-MH SAT)[2] **[Acute settings]** **11.** Functional Analysis of Care Environments (FACE-CARAS) suite of tools [156] **[Generic Harm]** **12.** Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for	15. Adolescent Suicide Questionnaire [157] **[Suicide]** 16. Child-Adolescent Suicidal Potential Index [158] **[Suicide]** 17. Child Suicide Risk Assessment [159] **[Suicide]** 18. Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment (C-CASA)[147]	29. Adolescent Dissociative Experiences Scale (A-DES; version 1.0)[171] 30. Beck Hopelessness Scale 31. The Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule (CMIS)[172] 32. Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS) [151]

[1] Risk screening tool and the comprehensive risk assessment and management tool Northern Ireland's two-step risk assessment and management process.

[2] Describe the risk; Identify the options; Choose your preferred option(s); Explain your choice; Share your thinking

[3] Provides a 'structured and systematic' approach to risk assessment.

[4] A risk summary embedded within one of the electronic patient record systems.

[5] A clinical tool and practitioner manual developed by the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health25

8. Standard Tool for the Assessment of Risk; Version 2 (STAR V2)[6] 9. Skills-based training on risk management (STORM)[7]	Adolescents (RTSHIA)[3] [3] **[Community and Clinical Settings]** 13. Self Harm Questionnaire (SHQ) [69] 14. Wales Applied Risk Research Network WARRN[82] **[CAMHS][8]**	19. Columbia Suicide Screen [160] **[Suicide]** 20. Fairy Tales Test (FT)[161] 21. Reasons for living Inventory for adolescents RFLA)[162] 22. Self-Harm Risk Assessment for Children (SHRAC)[163, 164] **[Self-harm]** **23.** Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability: Adolescent Version (START:AV) [165, 166] **[Self Harm]** 24. Suicidal Behaviours Questionnaire for Children (SBQC)[167] **[Suicide]**	33. Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale [173] **[Suicide]** 34. Family Perceptions Scale (FPS) 35. Hamilton rating scale for depression (HAM-D)[174] 36. Life Orientation Inventory [175] 37. Modified Scale for Suicide Ideation (MSSI) [176] **[Suicide]** 38. Multi-Attitude Suicide Tendency Scale **[Suicide]** 39. Risk of Suicide Questionnaire (RSQ) [177] **[Suicide]** 40. SAD PERSONS scale (SPS)[178] [179] **[Suicide]**

[6] Established risk assessment tool using a combination of tick boxes and text boxes.

[7] Assessment focused on identifying the problem and developing solutions.

[8] A formulation-based assessment, allowing patients and clinicians to work together. Used by all 7 Local Health Boards in Wales

		25. Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire – Junior Version (SIQ- JR)[168] **[Suicide]** **26.** Suicidality Treatment Occurring Paediatrics - Suicidality Assessment Scale (STOP-SAS) [169] **[Suicide]** 27. Suicide Behaviour Interview (SBI) [170] **[Suicide]** 28. Suicide Ideation Questionnaire – Junior Version **[Suicide]**	**41.** Scale for Suicide Ideation (SSI)[180] **[Suicide]** **42.** Self Harm Questionnaire (SHQ) [69] **[Self Harm]** 43. Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)[152] 44. Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY)[181] 45. Suicide Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)[182] **[Suicide]** **46.** Suicide Intent Scale (SIS) [183] **[Suicide]** **47.** Suicide Probability Scale [184] **[Suicide]** 48. Suicide Risk Scale (SRS) [185] **[Suicide]** 49. Suicide Status Form-II (SSFII)[186] **[Suicide]**

Tools and approaches developed in UK for Children and Adolescents

Tools and approaches developed in the UK for Children and Adolescents are outlined in Table 9.

Children and Young People - Mental Health Safety Assessment Tool (CYP-MH SAT)

Contemporaneously (2018) with a scoping review of assessment tools of immediate risk of self-harm and suicide in children and young people by Carter and colleagues [1], the authors published a protocol for the development and psychometric evaluation of such an assessment tool; the Children and Young People-Mental Health Safety Assessment Tool (CYP-MH SAT).[2] The authors claimed this as the first UK-based study to develop an assessment tool to ascertain immediate risk of suicide and self-harm in children and young people presenting to acute paediatric hospital settings in mental health crisis. As a strength for the UK context, the protocol was tailored towards an English-speaking population, while recognising that further national and international testing and adaptations are required for generalisability. A corresponding weakness is its untried status with regard to ethnic minority populations within the UK population. The protocol used an opportunistic sample of self-selected experts to inform development of the assessment tool, recognizing that such experts might be more motivated to take part and/or exhibit allegiances that might lead them to respond in a particular way.

The resulting instrument underwent rebranding as the CYP-MH SAPhE instrument when it appeared in 2021 [50]. The published study sought to psychometrically assess the CYP-MH SAPhE Instrument for identification of immediate risk of self-harm in children and adolescents, aged 10–19 years, in acute paediatric wards or emergency departments. Through the scoping review and subsequent collaboration with expert academics and clinicians, an instrument was developed to assess immediate risk of suicide and/or self-harm in children and adolescents in mental health crisis to acute paediatric hospital settings and emergency departments. Testing of the instrument across three acute hospital sites (Paediatric

Emergency Departments and Acute Paediatric Wards) within the UK resulted in an eight-item instrument, weighted within two constructs (self-harm and suicidality). The authors justify development of separate self-harm and suicide facets based on extant literature that defines them as separate constructs. The authors claim that the strength of CYP-MH SAPhE lies in "its co-development by those in clinical practice" for use within a clinical practice setting.[50]

Despite recognised limitations (**see Validity**), the authors claim that the CYP-MH SAPhE instrument is a rapid and sensitive instrument to identify immediate risk of self-harm and suicidality in children and adolescents aged 10–19 years presenting to acute paediatric care. The authors conclude that the CYP-MH SAPhE Tool has "potential utility as a screener by the paediatric health professional in the inpatient ward or emergency department as part of a holistic assessment". Key to the authors' claim is the phrase "as part of a holistic assessment" – the role of stand-alone risk screening tools for risk prediction is no longer championed. They recommend that the CYP-MH SAPhE instrument requires further evaluation "to confirm its suitability and effectiveness in clinical practice".[50]

Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis

Having previously produced the DICES System for Risk Assessment in Mental Health and Risk Management in Mental Health, the team at the Association of Psychological Therapies (APT) decided to extend their work with a tool for children. The team devised a structured interview/checklist assessment in 3 parts for parenters ('parenter' is the term used for the person(s) doing the parenting), the young person themselves and the clinician. The questions address both fixed factors (e.g. age, gender etc) and fluid factors (e.g. current level of hopelessness at any specific point in time). Clinicians can then share information with colleagues and make an informed clinical judgement, recognising that a young person may only tick a few boxes even when they are at significant risk of harming themselves. Once significant risks are identified then a risk management plan is put into place.

At the time of information (July 2013) only about 30 people had received the structured interviews. Much of the claim for its utility is indirectly attributed from the DICES Series of checklists to which more than 6000 people had subscribed to use. Although most professionals welcomed a tool to ensure they 'covered all the bases', a minority thought that 'having a form to fill in' hampered the development of rapport and a relationship between the young person and the professional. Many (though not all) agreed that "it was good that the professional had some framework and structure to operate within", and that "nothing would be missed".

Clinical judgement is vital when assessing suicide risk. Fluid factors, such as hopelessness, are not easily weighted in statistical models Mood troughs, not averages, are more critical to an assessment; such information is only elicited by talking to the person and their 'significant others' (usually parents) and taking into account fluid factors such as hopelessness and how they say they feel. The team claim that a structured interview or checklist of questions offers a fail-safe for clinicians to make sure that all important factors are considered when making an assessment.

Functional Analysis of Care Environments (FACE-CARAS) suite of tools (45)

The FACE-CARAS (Functional Analysis in Care Environments - Child and Adolescent Risk-Assessment Suite) toolkit has been developed to support practitioners in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) in performing a structured risk assessment [149]. It covers multiple risk domains including violence, suicide, self-harm, experienced abuse, and exploitation. The FACE-CARAS suite involves comprehensive risk assessment including a risk scale – to produce a FACE Risk Profile and a clinical management plan (paper/electronic). Schedules enquire about both historical (static) and current (dynamic) risk factors.

FACE-CARAS comprises a suite of tools – the practitioner completes an overall risk profile before selecting other tools for a more in-depth assessment where indicated. The three step process comprises completing a Young Person’s Risk

Profile as a ‘screening’ step, then one or more Focused Schedules as indicated at the screening stage, and then the ‘Formulation and Management Plan’ section of the Young Person’s Risk Profile as appropriate to the Focused Schedule(s). Items are either coded as absent or as representing a perceived low, moderate or high level of risk in that domain. The resulting information is then used to develop a risk formulation and management plan, as well as to assign global scores to each of a number of risk domains.

The tool was designed for a youth mental health setting; the mean age of original sample was 15.94 (range 12.23–18.71) with 36 males/69 participants.[156] Predictive ability was tested with a sample of 123 young people with clinician-completed FACE-CARAS ratings. These were examined in a retrospective file review to extract data on a relevant list of adverse outcomes at three and at 6 months following the assessment.[65] Although this was not a prospective longitudinal study, researchers were blind to the clinicians' ratings, allowing valid testing of predictive power. The FACE-CARAS profile score was considered a good potential predictor of risks of self-harm, suicidal behaviours, serious self-neglect, abuse or exploitation by others, and violence to others at both 3 and 6 months. It was weakly "predictive" of accidental self-harm and no better than chance at signalling physical ill health.

Evaluation indicated the usefulness of the "profile summary" section of the tool as likely to generate clinically useful risk predictions, notwithstanding that guidance recommends that tools for risk assessment should not be used for risk screening in a predictive way.[14] In practice clinicians often did not complete the subscales - the authors therefore recommend further work.[156]

Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents (RTSHIA) [3]

Its originators claim that the Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents (RTSHIA), a self-report measure designed to assess adolescent RT and SH in community and clinical settings, offers an improvement over

existing measures by providing information about the full spectrum of potentially self-destructive behaviours alongside other significant information. As a self-report measure, they claim the benefits of standardized administration, wording and scoring and faster, more economical administration and scoring. Furthermore, they state that the quality of data produced by self-report measures compares to that from clinical interviews. People may be more comfortable admitting to sensitive thoughts and acts when asked to circle a response or write a brief explanation instead of providing a verbal report. Moreover, assuring participants of the confidentiality and anonymity of self-reports seems to be easier. In any case, few alternatives to self-report data exist when requesting personal and sensitive information from young people.

Furthermore, the RTSHIA was developed for, and validated in a clinical population of, adolescents because “behaviours defined by adults as risky or self-destructive do not have the same function in adolescents”. The study included a large and highly diverse sample of participants drawn from a wide range of age groups.

Another claimed advantage is that the RTSHIA assesses the frequency of self harm behaviour, as opposed to simply recoding its presence/absence.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the RTSHIA is primarily a self-report measure, and therefore dependent upon respondents’ comprehension of items, concentration ability and openness. Despite reassurance with regard to anonymity and confidentiality, participants may hesitate to give personal information to authority figures. In addition, younger adolescents, may feel that certain items are not applicable to them. Second, the wording of the questions does not discriminate between current and past history behaviours. Finally, concern has been expressed over whether the two scales are sufficiently comprehensive. Although, both scales have been shown to work, have good psychometric properties and appear reliable and valid, results are preliminary and need replication with different samples.

In summary, the RTSHIA responds to a need to supplement in-depth interview-based instruments and captures wider presentations of self-harm. It supports the need to rely on multiple assessment methods. The authors acknowledge the likely added value of obtaining interview data beyond self-report questionnaires. They suggest that the RTSHIA can be used as a primary screening measure to be supplemented by interviews or focused measures, especially in clinical settings, where in-depth information is required. For the present, the RTSHIA appears to offer potential for use as a multi-focused screening tool for identifying diverse problem behaviours/thoughts in adolescence and as a tool for assessing young people who self-harm. Although it is premature to draw conclusions about the utility of the scale, the RTSHIA currently represents a psychometrically sound, comprehensive tool with the potential for further empirical investigation.

Self Harm Questionnaire (SHQ) [69]

The Self-Harm Questionnaire (SHQ)[69] was designed to improve identification of self-harm in adolescents. The complete questionnaire consists of three screening questions enquiring about past incidents of self-harming behaviour or thinking, followed by 12 additional questions that are only presented to adolescents reporting previous self-harm.

Wales Applied Risk Research Network (WARRN) (41)

Wales Applied Risk Research Network (WARRN) is a formulation-based technique for the assessment and management of serious risk for users of mental health services, adopted across Wales. The developers of WARRN recognised that structured professional judgments were impractical to use in many NHS settings due to time constraints, the need for training on each instrument, and the multiplicity of possible risks faced by any service-user. The development team, therefore, aimed to develop a “formulation -based” approach to risk assessment to equip clinical staff with skills for implementation.

WARRN was previously in use in Adult mental health services across Wales. The “youth” version was modified in consultation with senior CAMHS staff from across Wales; the only changes required were to take a developmental framework to the assessment and to use age appropriate training vignettes. Training was implemented via a training the trainer cascade programme.

A service evaluation was conducted to evaluate WARRN and its impact across CAMHS in Wales. An online survey was disseminated to 88 NHS clinicians in CAMHS to evaluate their perceptions of the use and effectiveness of WARRN. Clinicians reported increased clinical skills, increased confidence in their assessment and management of risk and in safety planning, the increased safety of service users and the general public, and a belief that WARRN had saved lives. Qualitative data showed that clinicians thought a common risk evaluation instrument across Wales and different agencies had created a common language and understanding that improved communication both across and between agencies. WARRN appears well accepted in CAMHS services, exerting positive effects on service-user well-being and safeguarding with potential implementation in other services. However, this favourable view of the WARRN tool is based mainly on internal evaluations and remains to be replicated by independent evaluation teams.

Table 10 - Tools and approaches developed in UK for Children and Adolescents

Table 11 - Scales/Tools/Approaches used in a UK Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service context (n = 16)

Scale/tool/Approach	Focus of assessment	No. of items/ subscales	Population tested	Completion format	Response format

Children and Young People-Mental Health Self-harm Assessment in Paediatric healthcare Environments (CYP-MH SAPhE)[50] (formerly CYP-MH SAT)[2]	Self-harm in acute paediatric wards or emergency departments	8 items	163 CYP presenting at acute hospital settings with primary mental health (cases) or physical health (non-cases) conditions. [50]	Self-report	Likert scale and dichotomous items.
Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis[17]	Depression in children and young people	Proposed structured interview/ checklist assessment in 3 parts: - Part 1 is questions to ask the parenter(s) - Part 2 is questions to ask the young person - Part 3 is questions for clinician to answer Questions allow for quick and comprehensive assessment, reminding clinicians of factors to consider when deciding if risk is significant, and ensuring that factors are not neglected or overlooked.	Limited details of use (details from 2013)	Clinician completed	Three structured interviews with checklist of key questions for health professionals to ask when assessing suicide risk of children and adolescents in crisis situations.
Functional Analysis of Care Environments	Self-harm of various forms	Suite of tools:	Youth mental health setting [65, 149]; Mean age of 15.94 (range	Clinician report	Comprehensive risk assessment including risk scale –

(FACE-CARAS) suite of tools[156]		1. FACE Risk Profile (screening tool) 2. CASH: Child and Adolescent Self-Harm Schedule 3. SHARP: Sexual Harm Adolescent Risk Protocol 4. CRAY: Checklist for Risk Aggression in Youth 5. VAS: Vulnerability Assessment Schedule 6. SCRAP: Schedule for Risk of Aggression in Psychosis 7. LD VAS: Learning Disability Vulnerability Assessment Schedule 8. FEDS: FACE Eating Disorder Schedule (in-patient)	12.23–18.71) with 36 males/ 69 participants [156] Retrospective file review of records from 123 young people with FACE-CARAS ratings examined for outcomes at 3 and 6 months.[65] FACE-CARAS profile score good potential predictor of self-harm and suicidal behaviours at 3 and 6 months. Weakly "predictive" of accidental self-harm and no better than chance for physical ill health.		to produce FACE Risk Profile and clinical management plan. Schedules enquire about historical and current risk factors. Items coded as absent or as low, moderate or high risk. Information used to develop a risk formulation and management plan, and to assign global scores to risk domains.

		9. WARD SECURE: Repeated Risk Assessment (in-patient) 10. WARD OPEN: Repeated Risk Assessment (in-patient)			
Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents (RTSHIA)[3]	Adolescent RT and SH in community and clinical settings	Questionnaire includes two subscales assessing separately risk-taking behaviours and self-injurious behaviours.	651 young people from secondary schools in England (11.6 - 18.7 yrs) and 71 young people referred to mental health services for SH behaviour in London (11.9 - 17.5 yrs) completed RTSHIA along with standardized measures of adolescent psychopathology.	Self-report	Questionnaire that assesses simultaneously risk-taking and self-harm behaviours. Items are rated on a 4-point scale (0 = never; 3 = many times), referring to lifelong history.
Wales Applied Risk Research Network WARRN[82]	Serious risk (e.g. violence to others, suicide)	Not applicable (formulation-based approach; standardised paperwork and forms provided)	Not applicable (study evaluated clinician opinions)[82]	Clinician report; co-production with service user and family	Documented risk assessment and 'formulation'

				carers encouraged	

Table 5 presents summary information on the risk assessment scales and tools included in the review. Data for these tables were extracted from included primary studies and from the seminal scoping review (2019).[1] This scoping review from Carter (2019) originally reviewed 22 different tools. Our review team has not referred to the original papers reporting on the development of these tools, some of which date to the 1960s, or to the extensive literature on validation in different populations and settings. Our approach reflects a focus on use of the tools in clinical practice together with the resource constraints of this review. References to other studies are cited in the papers included in the tables.

The scoping review published in 2019 identified 26 risk assessment tools reported in 22 full text articles.[1] However, a high percentage (59%) of included studies were developed over 20 years ago. Concerns about psychometric properties are typically raised in connection with older tools and instruments.

Our analysis extended the comprehensive list of assessment tools included in the scoping review;[1] adding two recent tools [2, 3] and expanding beyond formal tools to include overall approaches. The original scoping review[1] started with 22 tools. This review added ten tools to those tools used for self-harm and suicide in a general population. We excluded tools previously included in the scoping review[1] to reflect only tools used in a UK context and to capture the primary focus on suicide. As reported in the scoping review, tools varied in length, response and scoring format, age ranges and degree of psychometric testing. [1] Most assessments were tested across broad age ranges, and so lack sensitivity to the age groups of particular interest to this review. The relative lack of tools for children, as opposed to adolescents, is noticeable although this imbalance does seem to follow the self-harm and suicide age trajectory. Some tools, such as the SIQ and the SIQ-JR have undergone age-based revisions/adaptations.[1]

The scoping review concluded that many tools were subject to limited psychometric testing, and no single tool was valid or reliable for use with children presenting in mental health crisis to non-mental health settings.[1] It recommended development of a “clinically

appropriate, valid and reliable tool that assesses immediate risk of self-harm and suicide in paediatric settings".[1]

Tool development continues to see different rationales in terms of whether to focus only on suicide risk or whether to incorporate risk items relating to self-harm. No measure assessed risk of self-harm in isolation.[1] As with much psychological tool development most assessment tools were tested only in the United States and primarily with inpatients. Where studies report psychometric testing in UK populations this is indicated in the accompanying tables.[1] UK guidelines remain unable to promote the use of any one assessment tool to safely manage immediate risk of self-harm or suicide to inform clinical decisions in acute paediatric settings. [187] The accompanying analysis indicates that the ongoing preoccupation to identify or develop such a tool has proved something of a distraction when attention should focus on a holistic biopsychosocial assessment conducted within a whole-system approach to assessment.

Table 12 - Characteristics of risk assessment scales and tools included in the review (adapted from Carter et al. 2019(5))

Scale/tool	Focus of assessment	No. of items/ subscales	Population tested	Completion format	Response format
Children's Global Assessment Scale (CGAS)[151] [Added]	Overall functioning	10 deciles	Samples from CAMHS services in England [150]	Clinician-rated	Scored within each decile to produce overall score (1-100)
Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment (C-CASA)[147] [Added]	Suicide and self-harm	8 items (categories)	12-18 years. 71% female; self-harm; UK [147]	Adverse event reports from trial sponsors	Categories ranging from 'completed suicide' to 'not enough information'
Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability: Adolescent Version (START:AV) [Added]	Aggression and self-harm	22 items in pilot version used for study	90 adolescents (55 male) with and without developmental disabilities; medium secure adolescent service in UK [165, 166]	Completed by multidisciplinary care team	3-point scale for each item as strength and vulnerability
Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire – Junior Version (SIQ-JR) (Reynolds, 1987a)*	Frequency and severity of suicidal ideation	15 items	11-18 years. Males/females; mixed ethnicity; students, psychiatric, suicide ideators, parentally bereaved; inpatients, school, outpatients, community	Self-report	7 point Likert scale continuum Scores: 0-6 Total score: 0-90. Cut off: 31

Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)(Reynolds, 1987b)*	Frequency and severity of suicidal ideation	30 items	13-19 years; males/females; mixed ethnicity; students, suicide attempters, suicide ideators, nonsuicidal controls. medical/surgical, psychiatric; Inpatient, emergency department, school, community.	Self-report	7 point Likert scale continuum Scores of 0-6 Total score 0-180. Cut off: 41
Suicide Intent Scale (SIS)[188]*	Suicide intent	20 items 2 Subscales	Ages not defined. Males/females; mixed ethnicity; psychiatric, non-suicide attempters, suicide attempters; Inpatient	Clinician-rated	3 item Likert scale Scores: 1-3 Total score: 1-60.
The Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule (CMIS)[172] [Added]	Maltreatment	5 categories (reduced to 4 for study)	11–17 years presenting to Emergency Assessment Service in Princess Alexandra Hospital, Essex (UK) Population includes overdose in addition to self harm [189]	Clinician-rated? (Semi-structured interview)	Appears to be yes/no
Suicidality Treatment Occurring Paediatrics - Suicidality Assessment Scale (STOP-SAS)*[169]	Suicide risk	14 items-Children 19 items adolescent, parents, clinician	8-18 year olds; males/females; mixed ethnicity; psychiatric [169], medicated [169]; outpatients [169]; Spain [169], UK [169], Italy[169], France [169], Germany [169], Netherlands[169]	Self-report; parent- report; clinician report	6 point Likert scale Adolescents, Parents, Clinicians: 0-5 scores Total score: 0-95; 4 point Likert scale

					Children: 0-3 scores; Total score: 0-42
Adolescent Dissociative Experiences Scale (A-DES; version 1.0)[171] [Added]	Developed as screening tool of serious dissociative and post-traumatic disorders among adolescents	30 self-administered items; four subscales capture (1) amnesia, (2) absorption and imaginative over-involvement, (3) passive influence and (4) depersonalisation	11-17 years. Presenting to Emergency Assessment Service in Harlow, Essex (United Kingdom) Population includes overdose in addition to self-harm[189]	Self-administered	Likert-type Scale from 0 to 10 ('0' = 'never' and '10' = 'always'). Mean score of 4+ indicates pathologically significant dissociation
Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY)[181] [Added]	Used in assessment of male/female adolescents. For use by professionals in diverse disciplines who conduct assessments and/or make intervention/ plans concerning violence risk in youth	24 items in three risk domains (Historical Risk Factors, Social/Contextual Risk Factors, and Individual/Clinical Factors). Collected details of young men's clinical presentations Adolescent Clinical Inventory, and	12-18 years. 64 young men, consecutively admitted to Bluebird House, an NHS mixed gender, adolescent forensic, medium secure hospital[190]	Information from multiple sources, including patient and carer interviews and institutional records	Each risk item has three-level rating structure with specific rating guidelines (Low, Moderate, or High). In addition to 24 risk factors, includes six Protective Factor items rated as

		ICD10 diagnoses.			Present/ Absent.
Family perceptions scale (FPS) [Added]	Questionnaire to allow family members to report perceived functioning across; nurture, problem-solving, behavioural boundaries, Responsibility and expressed emotion	29-item questionnaire	Compares self-reported family functioning of 21 adolescents presenting at four UK medical wards with self-harming behaviour with those obtained from a sample of adolescents drawn from the local community.[191]	Self-report questionnaire	Produces scores for five subscales, Likert-type scale: not true, somewhat true, certainly true
Hamilton rating scale for depression (HAM-D)[174] [Added]	Severity of depression	21 items	12-18 years. Admitted following an episode of self-harm [191]	Clinical interview	Score 0 - 4 for each item (higher score represents more severe depression); total score based on first 17 items
Self Harm Questionnaire (SHQ)[69] [Added]	Identification of self-harm	3 screening questions and 12 questions for those endorsing self-harm	12-17 years. 100 young people (71 female); UK Hospital Trust [69]	Self-report	Binary yes/no

Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire - SDQ [Added]	Emotions and behaviour	25 items on 5 scales	4-18 years; samples from 45 CAMHS services in the UK[150]	Parent/teacher and self-report versions	Produces score of 0-10 on each subscale
Therapeutic Assessment (TA)[1489] [Added]	Self-harm	Not reported	Clinicians (n = 24) involved in self-harm assessment[148]	Clinician assessment	Not reported

* See Carter et al. 2019 [1] for supplementary references

[9] TA is intervention of interest. Study used TAQAT to assess ability to perform TA

Validity

A review team member extracted data from overviews of reliability and validity testing of the tools as presented in included studies (Table 13). Internal consistency and test-retest reliability across the identified tools was generally moderate to good. As Carter observes,[1] this suggests consistency across the same construct (i.e. risk of suicide) meaning that the tools are able to produce similar scores when tested over a number of time points, respectively. Limitations in test-retest reliability continue to persist and this has been illustrated by studies that have shown that suicide/self-harm risk may be sensitive to change even within a matter of a few hours.

As Carter observes,[1] few assessment tools have investigated inter-rater reliability, thus little evidence exists to demonstrate that current assessment tools provide consistent results across different raters. There is little evidence of real-world testing with most being “tested with raters (i.e. clinician, self and parent) with limited scientific or clinical justification”.[1]

Face validity is typically considered prerequisite to other validity/reliability tests. However this is not exemplified by the patterns of development and testing demonstrated by the tools in this review and even where this has been attempted it has not generally been performed satisfactorily.[1] Little consideration has focused on developmental issues associated with the child and adolescent populations targeted by this review. Substantial differences in cognitive ability, perception and understanding between younger children and those closer to 18 years of age continue to throw doubt on the ability of current tools “to provide accurate representation of potential risk for children and adolescents across the age range”.[1] The authors of the CYP-MH SAPhE Instrument claim face validity given that it was acceptable and understandable to children and adolescents as evident from minimal missing data.[50]

The CYP-MH SAPhE Instrument possesses high internal consistency across two constructs (self-harm and suicidality) and high inter-rater reliability. CYP-MH SAPhE also demonstrated high congruent validity with a previously developed in-depth instrument designed to assess suicide risk, and high levels of discriminant validity

suggesting it can adequately discriminate between children and adolescents with a primary mental health crisis and those with a primary physical medical illness or injury.[50] Future exploration of 'Suicidality' is required to determine the robustness of this Factor given its poor reliability. In a psychometric evaluation of the Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents (RTSHIA), Risk-Taking and Self-Harm were validated as related, but different constructs, rather than elements of a single continuum. Inter-item and test-retest reliability were high for both components. The authors claim that robust psychometric data emerged in support of the measure's convergent, concurrent and divergent validity and its reliability with participants from the whole range of secondary education. Among a sample of psychiatric service inpatients and outpatients, the Self-Harm Questionnaire (SHQ) has demonstrated good concurrent and predictive validity.[69]

Generalisability of the CYP-MH SAPhE Instrument may be limited by use of a homogeneous sample of predominantly female children and adolescents, with white British ethnicity.[50] The Risk-Taking (RT) and Self-Harm (SH) Inventory for Adolescents (RTSHIA) is similarly limited in connection with its external validity and the generalisability of the findings. The samples, although diverse, were not all selected to be representative of the broader adolescent population.

The FACE-CARAS profile score was a good potential predictor of risks of self-harm, suicidal behaviours, serious self-neglect, abuse or exploitation by others, and violence to others at both 3 and 6 months.[65] It was weakly "predictive" of accidental self-harm and no better than chance at signalling physical ill health. Clinical use of the scale did not conform to research standards and often left subscales incompletely rated. Collectively, these limitations need to be comprehended and mitigated in future evaluations.

Table 13 - summary information on reliability and validity testing

Scale/tool	Reliability	Validity
Adolescent Dissociative Experiences Scale (A-DES; version 1.0)[171, 189]	Psychometric properties validated	Not reported
Child Maltreatment Interview Schedule (CMIS)[172, 189]	Not reported	Not reported
Children and Young People-Mental Health Self-harm Assessment in Paediatric healthcare Environments (CYP-MH SAPhE)[50]	Good inter-rater agreement (kappa = 0.65) but sometimes conducted up to 4 hours apart [50] allowing changes in clinical presentation.	Potentially reliable and valid instrument. Non-cases did not complete C-SSRS. Unable to establish convergent validity in those with a non-mental health-related primary presentation.
Children's Global Assessment Scale (C-GAS) [150]	Test-retest and inter-rater undertaken	Not reported
Columbia Classification Algorithm of Suicide Assessment (C-CASA)[147]	Inter-rater undertaken	Not reported
FACE-CARAS suite of tools [156]	Component schedules could be reliably rated, with near perfect to moderate agreement. Internal reliability consistency values (Cronbach's alpha) moderate to high in all cases	Not reported

Family perceptions scale (FPS)[191]	Not reported	Validated for use in adolescent populations[191]
Hamilton rating scale for depression (HAM-D) [174] [191]	Not reported	Well validated checklist, widely used in adolescent populations
Self Harm Questionnaire (SHQ) [69]	Inter-rater agreement (kappa) 0.78 (95% CI 0.60 to 0.96)	Concurrent validity tested by comparing SHQ results with young person's clinical record; no significant difference in predicting future self-harm over 3 months
Short-Term Assessment of Risk and Treatability: Adolescent Version (START:AV)[165, 166]	Inter-rater reliability undertaken	Not reported
Strengths and difficulties questionnaire –SDQ [150]	Extensively investigated	Extensively investigated
Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY) [181, 190]	Not reported	Validated risk assessment tool
Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire – Junior Version (SIQ-JR) [1, 182]	Internal consistency and test-retest undertaken	See Carter et al. (2019)[1] for details
Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)[1]	Excellent internal consistency	See Carter[1] for details
Suicidality Treatment Occurring Paediatrics- Suicidality Assessment Scale (STOP-SAS)[1, 169]	Excellent internal consistency; Inter-rater undertaken (medium-large effect size)	See Carter[1] for details
Suicide Intent Scale (SIS) [1, 188]	Good internal consistency	See Carter[1] for details

Therapeutic Assessment (TA) [148]	Not reported	Not reported
Wales Applied Risk Research Network (WARRN)[82]	Not reported	Not reported

Tools have also been identified for use in mental health crises beyond self-harm and suicide assessments. Those specific to particular populations with certain conditions or characteristics are listed. Since these do not apply to the entire child population they are not included within the tools on self-harm and suicidality.

Table 14 - Mental health crisis tools for general population of children /adolescents

Name of tool (Associated articles)	**Crisis/ MH condition**	**Other features of study**
The Anhedonia Scale[192"]	Loss of interest or pleasure (depression)	For adolescents Self-report scale Development and validation of tool
Children's Global Assessment* [150, 193]	Anxiety, depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, post-traumatic stress disorder	Child Anxiety Life Interference Scale, Children's Revised Impact of Events Scale and Children's Global Assessment [194] Predictors of change in global psychiatric functioning at an inpatient adolescent psychiatric unit [193] Compares clinician rating on CGAS and family ratings on SDQ [150]
Depression Anxiety Stress	Depression, anxiety, stress	Administered to caregivers, study applied 3 scales

Scale (DASS-21)[86]		
Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire (JVQ)[195, 196]	Emotional wellbeing, maltreatment	UK study uses using self-report measures to assess the emotional wellbeing of maltreated children, young people and young adults
NICE guidelines [85]	depression	Assessment and treatment of depression in children and young people in the United Kingdom. Study investigates whether guidelines around risk, parental mental health, questionnaire use and psychological and pharmacological intervention are implemented in CAMHS.
Me and My School Questionnaire [197]	General mental health, school	Self-report mental health measure for children and adolescents- Aims to assess its clinical sensitivity to justify its utility as a screening tool in schools.
Moods and Feelings Questionnaire – MFQ- C/P* [86, 198, 199]	Anxiety, self-harm and depression in young adulthood (including in sexual minorities)	Used in combination with 2 other scales- Used 11-item Version of RCADS to Identify Anxiety and Depressive Disorders in Adolescents [198] Analysed association of self-harm and depression in young adulthood in sexual minorities [199]
Paediatric Symptom Checklist for Youths (PSCY) [200]	General mental health, school	Mental health screening in school setting
Revised Children's Anxiety and	Suicide, Anxiety, depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and	To Identify Anxiety and Depressive Disorders in Adolescents In addition, they examined whether adding items assessing suicidal ideation (Moods and Feelings Questionnaire – MFQ- C/P) and

Depression Scale* [86, 194, 198]	post-traumatic stress disorder (Risk factors)	symptom impact and duration (items adapted from the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire – SDQ) [198]
Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC) [201]- shortened 26-item version [196]	Emotional wellbeing, childhood adversity (maltreatment and other types of victimization)	UK study using standardised scores from self-report measures, to assess emotional wellbeing of maltreated children, young people and young adults taking into account other types of childhood victimization, different perpetrators, non–victimization adversities and variables known to influence mental health.
Unusual experiences questionnaire (UEQ)[202]	Risk factors for mental health problems Screened for unusual, or 'psychotic-like', experiences are perceptions or beliefs	Used with Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire. Reports on feasibility of a routine screening methodology, and screening outcomes, in Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) in South East London, United Kingdom

Specific Populations

Amongst specific populations (Table 15) several mental health conditions were assessed. These included: Individuals with intellectual disabilities - behaviour problems;[203] Adolescents with possible paranoia;[204] Self-harm, children in care [205]; Self-harm and autism risk factors Autistic individuals [206]; Individuals with personality disorder in adolescents who self-harm [207]; Child well-being – used with children with a parent in military [208]; Scale –Depression [209]; Those who need a comprehensive needs assessment Adolescents with Intellectual Disabilities[210]; General mental health, Transgender and gender diverse youth [211]; Patients with persistent major depressive disorder (PMDD)-Depression screening [212]; Adult offenders and forensic psychiatric patients- Future violent behaviour [213]; Autistic individuals- Self-harm [206]; Inpatient CAMHS patients- Wellbeing (risk factors) [214] ; Adolescents in secure unit Violence (risk factors) [215] Individuals with autism, Severe

Intellectual disabilities-Self-harm [206, 216]; Detection of individuals with psychosis[217] and Adolescents at risk of psychosis, Psychosis[218, 219]

Table 15 - Tools applied with specific populations

Name of tool **Associated articles**	**Population**	**Other features of study**
Assessment of Concerning Behavior (ACB)[209]	Children and Young People with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)	Assess Mental Health and Concerning Behaviors in Children and Young People with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) [209]
Behavior Problems Inventory-Short Form[203]	Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities - behaviour problems	Includes UK children Comparison of scales to assess validity
Behaviour problems Bird Checklist of Adolescent Paranoia [204] [added to Carter et al (2019)][1]	Adolescents with possible paranoia	Evaluates psychometric properties of new measure, tests for measurement invariance, and assesses its potential for computerised adaptive testing (CAT). Participants from clinical sample recruited from community outpatient child and adolescent mental health service (n = 271) and adolescent inpatient unit (n = 30) in Oxfordshire (Bird et al., in review). Patients 11–17 years

Brief Assessment Checklist* [205]	Self-harm, children in care	Tool used with Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire to assess mental health of children in care
Challenging behaviour questionnaire * [206]	Self-harm and autism risk factors in Autistic individuals	Identifies “novel, robust and stable profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury” using multiple measures. -A demographic questionnaire detailing -The Challenging Behaviour Questionnaire (CBQ) -The Activity Questionnaire (TAQ) -Impulsivity associated with persistent self-injury at T2 analysis -The Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ) -The Repetitive Behaviour Questionnaire (RBQ) -The Self-Restraint Questionnaire

Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States (CAARMS)[218, 219]	Adolescents at risk of psychosis, Psychosis	Evaluated knowledge and attitudes of clinicians in a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service in relation to 'At-Risk Mental State' concept in psychosis through survey [218]
Developmental Behaviour Checklist (DBC–primary carer and teacher versions)[210]	Adolescents with Intellectual Disabilities	UK sample. Identification of those at risk and undertaking of a comprehensive needs assessment
Expanded ACEs Scale [211, 220]	General mental health, Transgender and gender diverse youth	Transgender and Gender Diverse Youth's Experiences of Gender-Related Adversity. Sample seeking services at a paediatric gender centre.
Gender Minority Stress and Resilience (GMSR) measure [211, 221, 222]	General mental health, Transgender and gender diverse youth	Transgender and Gender Diverse Youth's Experiences of Gender-Related Adversity. Sample seeking services at a paediatric gender centre.

General Health Questionnaire 12 (GHQ-12)[223] [208]	Child well-being – used with children with parent in military Scale -General mental health, well-being	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren and compares measures of adjustment with matched group of children with fathers deployed on military training (non-combat) deployment.
Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children and Adolescents (HoNOSCA)*[207]	Individuals with personality disorder in adolescents who self-harm	Evaluates personality disorder in repeated self-harm in adolescence and its impact on self-harm psychopathology and adaptation outcomes over 1 year. (n = 366) of adolescents presenting with repeated self-harm aged 12–17 years. Trial took place in eight child and adolescent mental health service (CAMHS) settings within North West England (2002-2006).
Parenting stress. The Parenting Stress Index/Short Form (PSI/SF)[208]	Children with a parent in military- Child well-being	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren and compares measures of adjustment with a matched group of children with fathers deployed on military training (non-combat) deployment.

Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9)[212]	Patients with persistent major depressive disorder (PMDD)- Depression screening-	187 secondary care patients with persistent major depressive disorder (PMDD) recruited to a randomised controlled trial (RCT) and allocated to either a specialist depression team arm or a general mental health arm; their PHQ-9 score was measured at baseline, 3, 6, 9 and 12 months.
Repetitive Behaviour Questionnaire (RBQ)[208]	Child well-being – used with children with parent in military Scale- Child behaviour	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren. Class teachers and parents (non-deployed) completed a measure of child behaviour and parents completed a measure of parenting stress and general health.
Self-esteem. The Self-Concept Inventory (one of five self-report scales in The Beck Youth Inventories for Children and	Children with parent in military - Child well-being Scale -Anxiety	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren. For details see above.

Adolescents (second edition; BYI-II)[208, 224]		
The Children's Revised Impact of Event Scale (CRIES-8)[208, 225]	children with a parent in military - Child well-being – Scale- General mental health, well-being, behaviour	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren. For details see above.
The Depression Self-Rating Scale (DSRS)[208, 226]	Child well-being – used with children with a parent in military Scale -Depression	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren and compares measures of adjustment with matched group of children with fathers deployed on military training (non-combat) deployment. Class teachers/parents (non-deployed) completed measure of child behaviour. Parents completed measure of parenting stress and general health.
The SAPROF, Historical, Clinical, Risk Management–20 (HCR-20) and Psychopathy	Adult offenders and forensic psychiatric patients- Future violent behaviour	Supplement to Historical Clinical Risk management - 20 to assess protective factors and their relationship to future violent behaviour in adult offenders and forensic psychiatric patients. Administered in a sample of 261

Checklist–Screening Version (PCLSV)[213]		patients in U.K. forensic, general inpatient, and community mental health settings.
The Screen for Child Anxiety-Related Disorders (SCARED)[227]; child version, 41 items)[208]	Children with parent in military - Child well-being Scale -Self esteem	Investigates impact of father's military deployment on child well-being in primary schoolchildren and compares measures of adjustment with a matched group of children with fathers deployed on military training (non-combat) deployment. Class teachers and parents (non-deployed) completed measure of child behaviour and parents completed measure of parenting stress and general health.
The Self- Restraint Questionnaire*[206]	Autistic individuals- Self-harm	Identified novel, robust and stable profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury through use of several measures. Measures as detailed above.
The Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ) [206]	Autistic individuals- Self-harm	Identified novel, robust and stable profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury through use of several measures. Measures as detailed above.

The Social Connectedness Scale [214]	Inpatient CAMHS patients-Wellbeing (risk factors)	Sought to evaluate utility and acceptability of a measure of social connectedness in inpatient CAMHS.
The Structured Assessment of Violence Risk in Youth (SAVRY)[181] [215]	Adolescents in secure unit Violence (risk factors)	UK study- Characteristics of female patients admitted to an adolescent secure forensic psychiatric hospital
The Wessex behaviour rating system (used to assess self-help adaptive functioning) [206, 216]	Individuals with autism, Severe Intellectual disabilities-Self-harm	Identified profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury through use of several measures.[206] Measures as detailed above.
Transdiagnostic risk calculator for automatic detection of psychosis[228]	Detection of individuals with psychosis	Paranoia assessment protocol

Summary

Pile and colleagues (2020) contextualise risk assessments amongst NICE guideline recommendations for depression.[85] (Risk assessment appropriately completed; Cases requiring a full risk screen; Consideration of parental mental health; Parental mental health issues identified; Self-report questionnaire administered; Evidence-based psychological intervention offered; Currently or previously prescribed antidepressant medication). This conceptualisation of risk assessment tools and those used to meet the broader requirements of the guidelines, has informed the parameters of this review. This was an important step as the studies identified in this review (either as research on the efficacy of risk related tools or research about application of tools), do not tend to differentiate between tools applied within risk assessments, screening, and self-report questionnaires.[85] Therefore, this review includes tools that help to clinicians to build a picture of risk, as opposed to only tools that are referred to as risk assessment checklist tools. NICE guidelines for self-harm in the over-8s consider risks that include: previous incidences of self-harm, identification of depressive symptoms, diagnosis of other psychiatric illnesses, social relationships and contexts history, identification of risk factors and protective factors, identification of relationships (un)supportive, and identification of longer-term risks. Risk assessment tools may be considered to help structure risk assessments as long as they include the areas identified in NICE recommendation 1.3.6 (1.3.13).

Another recommendation is to develop an integrated care and risk management plan which could be viewed as a outcome (see outcomes analysis section below).

Use to assess self-harm or suicide

Several individual tools assess the risk of suicidal thoughts or self-harm within a broader set of tools to assess general mental health issues (Children's Global Assessment*; Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale*, obsessive compulsive inventory for

children, Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale), or as tools for a particular population (Brief Assessment Checklist* [205] (children in care) Challenging behaviour questionnaire, The Self- Restraint Questionnaire- Laverty; Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children and Adolescents (HoNOSCA)- individuals with personality disorder [207].

Combinations of tools

Three studies describe application of a combination of tools.[194, 206, 208, 229]. Laverty used a combination of The Revised Children's Anxiety and Depression Scale, the Obsessive Compulsive Inventory for Children, the Children's Revised Impact of Events Scale, the Columbia Suicide Severity Rating Scale, the KIDSCREEN-10, the Children's Global Assessment Scale, and the Child Anxiety Life Interference Scale to create a behaviour profile assessment to enable clinicians to identify characteristics associated with persistent self-injury through the use of several measures.[206] Laverty et al reported on self-harm but specifically for individuals with autism. The authors identified a novel, robust and stable profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury through the use of several measures (a demographic questionnaire detailing; The Challenging Behaviour Questionnaire (CBQ); The Activity Questionnaire (TAQ); Impulsivity; The Social Communication Questionnaire (SCQ); The Repetitive Behaviour Questionnaire (RBQ) and The Self-Restraint Questionnaire).

Pexton et al's study investigates the impact of father's military deployment to Afghanistan on child well-being in primary schoolchildren and compares measures of adjustment with a matched group of children with fathers deployed on military training (non-combat) deployment.[208] Class teachers and parents (non-deployed) completed a measure of child behaviour and parents completed a measure of parenting stress and general health. Oliver et al (2012) explored early risk markers for self-injury and aggression through high frequency repetitive or ritualistic behaviours.[216]

Making the Connection: Effect of Risk Assessment on Mental Health Outcomes

Prospective studies examining the association between high risk, as identified by risk assessment tools, and death by suicide are notably lacking.[230] Empirical studies have been unable to demonstrate that categorising patients at low risk or high risk of future fatal or non-fatal self-harm can contribute to a reduction in overall rates of these adverse events. [48] A systematic review of 11 studies aimed to evaluate the ability of 10 separate risk tools to predict the future episodes of suicide/self-harm in adolescents. The majority of the studies were rated with an unclear risk of bias. Meta-analysis was not possible due to high heterogeneity between studies and tools. The ability of the tools to correctly identify adolescents going on to attempt self-harm/suicide ranged from 27% (95% CI 10.7% to 50.2%) to 95.8% (95% CI 78.9% to 99.9%)[16]. The authors conclude that the predictive ability of these tools varies greatly. As a practical consequence, no single tool is considered suitable for predicting a higher risk of suicide or self-harm in adolescent populations.

Table 16 - Study characteristics of predictive ability of scales

Study ID	Country	Setting	Tool	Design
Ballard et al (2017) [231]	USA	Emergency Department	Ask Suicide Screening Questions (ASQ)	Retrospective
Cha et al (2016) [232]	USA	Inpatient unit	Self-Injurious Thoughts and Behaviours Interview (SITBI) Self-Injury Implicit Association Test (SI-IAT)	Prospective
Chitsabesan et al (2003) [233]	UK	Home	Suicide Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)	Prospective

Czyz et al (2016) [234]	USA	Emergency Department	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS) Self-Assessed Expectation of Suicide Risk Scale	Retrospective
Gipson et al (2015) [235]	USA	Emergency Department	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)	Prospective
Horwitz et al (2015) [236]	USA	Emergency Department	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)	Retrospective
King et al (2014) [237]	USA	Inpatient unit	SIQ-Junior (SIQ-JR)	Prospective
King et al (2010) [238]	USA	Inpatient unit	Beck Hopelessness Scale SIQ-Junior (SIQ-JR)	Prospective
Ougrin & Boege (2013) [69]	UK	Mixed inpatient/ outpatient clinics	Self-Harm Questionnaire (SHQ)	Prospective
Posner et al (2013)[173]	USA	Open treatment trial	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)	Prospective
Yen et al (2013) [239]	USA	Inpatient unit	Suicide Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)	Prospective

Table 17 - Predictive ability of scales

Study ID	Outcomes	Measures	Measurement Period
Ballard et al (2017) [231] [Ask Suicide Screening Questions (ASQ)]	Predictive ability for suicide	Sensitivity 95.8%, Specificity 5.8%, Positive Predictive Value 16.8% and Negative Predictive Value 87.5%.	6 months
Cha et al (2016) [232] [SI-IAT and SITBI]	Repeat Self Harm Repeat Self Harm	SI-IAT - (unadjusted OR 3.10, 95% CI 0·39 to 9.94, p ≥ 0·05) SITBI - (adjusted OR 1.82, 95% CI 1.25 to 2.65, p = 0.002)	3 months 3 months
Chitsabesan et al (2003) [233] [Suicide Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)]	Accuracy to classify patient as high/low risk for self-harm repetition	Sensitivity 27.3%, Specificity 99.2%, Positive Predictive Value 85.7% and Negative Predictive Value 85.6%	6 months follow up
Czyz et al (2016) [234] [Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)]	Future suicide attempt	Unadjusted OR ranged from 1.09 (95% CI 1.01 to 1.17) to 3.85 (95% CI 1.07 to 13.86) for every 1-point increase in score. Adjusted OR ranged from 1.15 (95% CI 1.03 to	-

		1.29) to 1.51 (95% CI 1.24 to 1.84) for every 1-point increase in score.	
Gipson et al (2015) [235] [Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)]	Future suicide attempt	Unadjusted OR from 1.09 (95% CI 1.01 to 1.17) to 3.85 (95% CI 1.07 to 13.86) for every 1-point increase in score. Adjusted OR from 1.15 (95% CI 1.03 to 1.29) to 1.51 (95% CI 1.24 to 1.84) for every 1-point increase in score.	-
Horwitz et al (2015) [236] [Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)]	Future suicide attempt	Unadjusted OR from 1.09 (95% CI 1.01 to 1.17) to 3.85 (95% CI 1.07 to 13.86) for every 1-point increase in score. Adjusted OR from 1.15 (95% CI 1.03 to 1.29) to 1.51 (95% CI 1.24 to 1.84) for every 1-point increase in score.	-
King et al (2014) [237] [SIQ-Junior (SIQ-JR)]	Future suicide attempt	For every 1-point increase in score, RR of no future attempt was 0.93	-
King et al (2010) [238] [SIQ-Junior (SIQ-JR)]	Future suicide attempt	For every 10-point increase in score, unadjusted HR of future suicide attempt was 1.30 (95% CI 1.14 - 1.48, $p \leq 0.001$). Subsequent multivariate regression	-

		model reported adjusted HR of 1.23 (95% CI 1.08 - 1.40, p = 0.003).	
Ougrin & Boege (2013) [69] [Self-Harm Questionnaire (SHQ)]	Predictive validity for self-harm	Sensitivity 94.7% Specificity 34.6% Positive Predictive Value 25.4% and Negative Predictive Value 96.6%.	3 months
Posner et al (2013)[173] [Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)]	Future suicide attempt	Unadjusted OR from 1.09 (95% CI 1.01 to 1.17) to 3.85 (95% CI 1.07 to 13.86) for every 1-point increase in score. Adjusted OR from 1.15 (95% CI 1.03 to 1.29) to 1.51 (95% CI 1.24 to 1.84) for every 1-point increase in score.	
Yen et al (2013) [239] [Suicide Ideation Questionnaire (SIQ)]	Future suicide attempt	In univariate regression, statistically significant HR of 1.01 (95% CI 1.00 - 1.02, p≤0.05) for high/low suicidal intent score. After multivariate analysis, despite HR being same at 1.01 (95% CI 1.00 to 1.02, p≥0.05), no longer statistically significant.	

Growing evidence suggests that combinations of risk factors do not accurately identify those at greatest risk of further self-harm and suicide [240]. A five-hospital multicentre prospective cohort study of adults referred to psychiatric liaison services following self-harm tested predictive utility of items from five risk scales.[240] Even though some individual items outperformed the scale from which they were derived, no items were superior to clinician or patient risk estimations. This finding, in adult populations adds confirmation to the fact that risk assessment scales should play little role in the management of people who have self-harmed [240]. There is every reason to believe that these methodological limitations translate equally to a paediatric context, potentially even more so given developmental variability within the child and adolescent age groups.

Impact on mental health assessment processes and outcomes

Other studies seek to make a connection between tools and scales and other health or health service outcomes, beyond self-harm and suicide. Generally, these links are supported by isolated studies and are not based on strong and consistent evidence. Pile et al (2020) investigated whether NICE guidelines impact upon the implementation of risk assessment in CAMHS for children with depression.[85] Findings showed adherence to NICE guidance was mostly good at around one year.[85] Subsequently, a decrease was observed in correct completion of risk assessments.[85] The study also reported a significant decrease in the number of cases where a full risk screen (for those at higher risk) was completed. The authors note that compliance and consistency to the guidelines needs to increase to standardise risk monitoring and communication between services.[85]

Terrelong and Fugard (2017) demonstrated the importance of multi-informant data gathering and integrating multiple clinician perspectives when monitoring outcomes. [150] Welsh et al (2011) identified a need for further training for CAMHS clinicians in relation to the psychosis risk syndrome.[218] One study assessed symptoms and tracked progress[207] using the Health of the Nation Outcome Scales for Children and Adolescents (HoNOSCA) to assess global functioning.[207] The study evaluated personality disorder in repeated self-harm in adolescents and its impact on self-harm psychopathology and adaptation outcomes over one year. Another study of symptom-based outcomes assessed the clinical sensitivity of the Me and My School

questionnaire (a self-report measure for children aged eight years).to justify its utility as a screening tool in schools.[197] Sinclair et al used the Paediatric Symptom Checklist for Youths (PSCY) to assess the mental health surveillance of adolescents, within a school setting.[200]

Phillips et al (2019) analysed the utility and acceptability of a tool on social connectedness- a concept linked with well-being and risk in young people in relation to subjective well-being and recovery outcomes.[214] The Developmental behaviour checklist (DBC–primary carer and teacher versions) was applied to adolescents with intellectual disabilities[210] to identify those at risk. The study also used a clinical interview to assess service utilisation and medication prescribing.

Kennedy and colleagues[193] aimed to identify personal and environmental factors that influence outcome in an adolescent unit that accepts both emergency and planned admissions. This study explores risk assessment tools indirectly as one of several predictors of outcomes. Similarly, Laverty and colleagues used risk assessment tools to create a profile of behavioural characteristics associated with persistent self-injury. Findings support an early intervention strategy targeted towards individuals identified at higher risk of developing self-injurious behaviour.[206]

Fusar-Poli et al (2019) proposed a protocol for real world detection of Individuals at Risk of Psychosis.[228] Tarren-Sweeny et al linked the use of checklist tools to improved mental health screening for children in care using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Brief Assessment Checklists [205]. Tarver et al [209] and Bird et al (2020) similarly focus on instruments of potential use in clinical practice.[204]

Rojan et al (2012) assess accuracy of a tool for evaluation and research purposes. Gin and colleagues (2018) applied a checklist to screen for distressing 'psychotic-like' or unusual experiences (UEDs) in under 18s.[202]

Chapter 4 Discussion

This review has revealed, through two complementary evidence syntheses, that considerable diversity exists in connection with risk assessment in children and adolescents. Diversity exists at every level; from why professionals view risk

assessment as important, how it should be done, how it could be used and what tool(s) should be used and indeed whether formal tools should be used at all. Some clear principles have emerged and these have been confirmed by the clinical informants to the review.

For whom and in what circumstances do risk assessments change the clinical encounter?

Risk assessment is an important, indeed essential, stage of the clinical encounter and results in useful deliverables such as the formulation, the care plan and definite plans for follow up. Several meta-analyses of quantitative studies, together with qualitative studies, reveal that young people who present in relation to self harm or attempted suicide do not generally respond poorly to being asked about their intent. However, certain types of self harm carry particular stigma, such as cutting, and need to be handled with sensitivity. Evidence further suggests that young people prefer not to be thought of as being a 'risk'. The use of the term in the context of a clinical encounter evokes other words like danger and safety and elicits fear and anxiety.

What impact does risk assessment have?

The review of the predictive ability of tools for assessing risk of self harm reveals that their predictive ability is consistently poor. Factors that are thought to have an association with future self-harm or suicide ideation are diffuse, the evidence on their influence is inconsistent and, therefore, tools have included different permutations of these factors. Conversely, consistently-reported factors such as previous suicide history might be expected to be explored through any thorough risk assessment process and are not dependent upon use of any specific tool. Nevertheless, attempts continue in the pursuit of a tool that will meet the diverse needs of emergency departments, general paediatric settings and specialist CAMHS services. However, many contemporary approaches are shifting instead to a focus on a holistic risk assessment process with a view to making the process consistent and complete.

The realist review strongly supports the need for risk assessment for self harm and suicide to take place within a wider assessment process (PT1). Consistent risk assessment processes (PT5) should gather good quality information (PT3), offer

personalised and individualised risk management and not seek to “predict” suicidal behaviour Tools that are used to inform and structure the overall process should be simple, accessible and standardised (PT1). These tools should be locally-applicable but not developed locally (PT14) and, rather than being used in isolation these tools should support the wider biopsychosocial assessment that includes, but does not focus on, risk (PT13).

NICE recommendations offer a structure for reviewing the risk assessment process and deciding whether it is complete and fit for purpose. Recommendations for content include: Previous incidences of self-harm, Identification of depressive symptoms, Diagnosis of other psychiatric illnesses, Social relationships and contexts (history), Identification of risk factors and protective factors, Identification of (un) supportive relationships; Identification of longer-term risks and an Integrated care and risk management plan. Many, but not all, of these features are present within existing risk assessment approaches.

The realist synthesis confirms that the quality of the clinical encounter is an important contributor to the risk assessment process; a health professional can make a difference through a successful interaction with a young person. Staff should be enabled so that they can focus on building relationships (PT2) and are able to feel comfortable when asking about suicidal thoughts (PT4). Risk assessment processes are facilitated by family and carer involvement in assessment (PT8) and good communication with primary care. Staff should therefore be supported to deliver risk assessment within a context where they receive good quality on-going supervision (PT7) and where they have been appropriately trained to assess, formulate, manage and refer risk (PT6). As a consequence, staff are able to gain increased knowledge, skills and self-efficacy, CAMHS services are likely to achieve a reduction in inappropriate referrals and more impactful use, ultimately leading to a reduction in rates of self-harm, symptoms precipitating suicidal ideation, and rates of suicide.

Strengths of the Evidence

A large number of tools and approaches have been identified by this review. Subsequent to the previous scoping review,[1] additional tools have been produced and validated,[2, 3] As seen from the foregoing analysis there is emerging consensus

(i) that no single tool meets current clinical needs, (ii) that tools are not to be used for prediction and (iii) in agreeing the components of a wide-ranging and comprehensive biopsychosocial assessment.

Limitations of the Evidence

Individually, some of the tools for risk screening demonstrate strong psychometric properties. However, in the context of risk assessment they lack the very psychometric property that is critical to their successful use; their predictive ability, both individually and collectively, is poor. As a consequence, the identification of wider approaches to risk assessment is likely to prove more valuable to the reader.

This review confirms previous findings from earlier reviews, namely identification of key gaps and deficits in the evidence base. Principal among these is the limited availability of psychometrically tested assessment tools in specific contexts and regions. However, recent publication of a tool developed specifically for assessing risk of self-harm in acute paediatric settings seeks to address one identified gap.[50] However, this development in some ways counters widespread recognition that no single tool is likely to meet clinical needs.

Many risk instruments for child and adolescent self harm and suicide have been developed in other countries and thus may not be valid or culturally suitable for a UK-based CAMHS population. Even tools developed for and in the UK may not meet the specific requirements of ethnic minority populations. Additionally, many were developed in paper format and cannot always be meaningfully entered into electronic patient records, as increasingly adopted within the UK NHS.

Strengths of the Review

Findings from this mapping review and realist synthesis are based on comprehensive and extensive searches of seven databases, supported by reference checking and forward citation chaining. The review has built upon existing reviews to provide and extend a summary of the characteristics, and ratings of reliability and validity of assessments tools of immediate self and suicide risk in children and adolescents. Use of a systematic review methodology, albeit within time and resource constraints, has served to mitigate the acknowledged deficiencies of

previous scoping reviews. This increases the confidence that significant additional risk assessment tools, that have been developed and psychometrically tested, have not been overlooked. Moreover, by extending beyond the terms ‘self-harm’ and ‘deliberate self-harm’ in the search strategy we have been able to identify additional studies that might otherwise have been missed through use of alternative terminology. Fourteen empirical studies that evaluated a tool were quality assessed to ensure consistency of approach.

Limitations of the Review

The focus of the review was on mapping the topic and then analysing what contributes to effective risk assessment processes. The heterogeneous studies exploring specific risk assessment tools prevented the use of meta-analysis. However, the review team did harness existing systematic reviews where these could contribute to an understanding of the limitations of the evidence base. Furthermore, the realist synthesis was conducted within a resource-constrained context. As a consequence the evidence base was limited to a small number of indicative studies mobilised around each of the fourteen programme theories. Generation of the candidate programme theories was undertaken using one main source[38] and several subordinate sources (see **Table 14**) and interpretation was undertaken by one experienced reviewer, although corroborated by other team members.

Time constraints, combined with ethical challenges, meant that it was not possible to access either children and young people (CYP) or families of CYP who have accessed mental health services in the standing PPI group. The absence of meaningful involvement of users of mental health services for children and young people in the design and implementation of this review is a recognised challenge in rapid synthesis activities. Undoubtedly further user involvement could help200 in specifying the language and concepts used and in assisting with applicability and relevance of the study. The review questions were generated using Department of Health and Social Care prioritisation processes and were not amenable to further specification by a PPI group.

Lessons learned

Experience when conducting this review confirms the review context as one of many where tensions between the risk averse operational culture of the NHS and drivers towards patient-centred care are currently playing out. The checklists have become apparatus that is associated in the minds of patients, family members and professionals with a tick box mentality that shows little interest in the individualised needs of the patient. An initial focus on tools and checklists has, through literature review and consultation with clinical experts, become an imperative for a holistic exploration of the risk assessment process. The thorough biopsychosocial assessment offers a professionally-acceptable alternative to checklist-based approaches but is increasingly "squeezed out" by time and resource constraints. However, these options do not represent genuine alternatives because of the absence of evidence that risk assessment bears any relation to the eventual prognosis of child and adolescent service users. Structured professional judgement remains an important component of the decision-making process and so the precise choice of a tool by which to structure this process may be less critical than the overall process itself. Having recognised that choice of process may be informed by training and personal preference it should be acknowledged that consistency of approach both within and across organisations may also prove an important consideration with potential benefits highlighted by the standardised WARRN approach across Wales.

Implications for service delivery / policy and practice

Much of the literature highlights the absence of a universally accepted suicide/self-harm risk assessment tool validated for use in inpatient paediatric settings where there may be an immediate risk of self-harm or suicidal behaviour (i.e. within hours of the triage assessment). Despite attempts to develop additional tools for risk assessment, recent additions share many of the limitations of their precursors in relation to different types of reliability and validity, of which predictive validity is foremost. Equally importantly, none of these additional tools overcome persistent challenges, namely that: (i) no single tool can carry the onerous requirements for biopsychosocial assessment, including a specific requirement to assess young

people at risk for self-harm and suicide, and (ii) multi-agency whole system approaches to risk assessment may be facilitated by the availability of suitable tools but are not ensured by them.

Healthcare professionals working within paediatric inpatient settings find themselves reliant on their own clinical judgement. In contrast to staff working in CAMHS who have received training in difficult aspects of handling the child or adolescent at risk for self-harm or suicide, many front-line staff may lack experience and training in this sensitive and critical area of service delivery. Risk assessment tools offered as the default choice within their setting may not have been developed for the specific needs of this population/setting. Staff perceptions need to be changed through further training regarding what constitutes a risk assessment. Over-estimation of risk may lead to inappropriate utilisation of resources at the possible expense of more immediate priorities. Conversely, underestimation of risk may lead to non-intervention, potentially leading to self-harm consequences and distress for families and to affected care staff, themselves.

Future research

Mental health problems among young people continue to increase and this is likely to continue as the long-term impacts of the pandemic are felt within CAMHS. At present, those making mental health risk assessments on the frontline do not have a first-choice suicide/self-harm risk assessment tool. As a consequence, healthcare professionals working across diverse paediatric settings employ diverse approaches and typically have to depend heavily upon their own clinical judgement. Staff may also find themselves using a risk assessment framework/tool that has not been developed for the specific needs of this population/setting or using the tool for purposes that are not intended. An inaccurate assessment of risk may result in either over or under estimation of risk rating, inappropriate safety management strategies and inefficient utilisation of CAMHS and resources. It remains to be seen whether recent development of the CYP-MH SAPhE Instrument [2] fulfils its promise and, indeed whether its utility extends beyond the immediate acute paediatric care context for which it has been designed. More importantly, any preferred instrument

must be used within an overall psychosocial assessment, not simply as a tick box exercise.

Before further research is commissioned, consultation needs to take place with children, young people and their families to establish the next steps for future research. With a focus on an overall risk assessment process for self harm and suicide, not on further development of checklist-based spproaches, it remains to be established how the fourteen propositions can best be implemented in practice to enhance the clinical encounter and ameliorate mental health outcomes.

Further research is also required to evaluate the value to young person, health professional and health service of a complete and holistic assessment not simply provision of an alternative tool. An evaluated approach to overall assessment could then be used to support safety management decisions across acute paediatric care settings.

Chapter 5 Conclusions

Overall, the evidence in this review suggests that risk assessment procedures that are sensitive to the values and preferences of young persons are likely to elicit more complete information and to contribute to a more positive relationship between health professionals and the young patients themselves. However, it is not possible to link the outcomes from the risk assessment process directly to clinical outcomes, particularly given the variability of the available tools and the considerable range in technical performance that these tools deliver. Features that are likely to enhance the value of the risk assessment process itself include involvement of the family, where appropriate, and the incorporation of an approach to risk assessment within a thorough biopsychosocial assessment. In addition, benefits seem to accrue within and across organisations when standardisation of processes, but not necessarily tools, is secured.

While the UK research base is not as broadly populated as that for the USA, in terms of development and validation of tools, it remains to be seen whether these should function primarily within a context of research and service evaluation, rather than possessing clinical utility. Little evidence was available to evaluate the interaction between clinician and child or adolescent. This is perhaps not surprising given the vulnerability of young people, which may impede or even thwart some forms of qualitative research, and also the critical context of the interaction in terms of non-specialist health staff in emergency settings under time-critical and resource pressures. Nevertheless, training, possibly to include role play, and supervision by experienced staff may help to improve the quality and consistency of the clinical encounter. Lessons remain to be learnt from training initiatives and potentially from the Lincolnshire whole system approach to management of self- harm and suicide.

We believe that further studies evaluating the utility of specific tools and instruments are not warranted, although additional evaluations of risk assessment processes more widely would benefit from further qualitative insights. In particular, health

systems and organisational leadership initiatives could benefit from close examination of risk management more broadly, in particular how the theoretical tensions between risk minimisation and patient centred care are enacted at a practical and operational level.

What this study adds

This study confirms that the technical development of tools generally, and of tools and instruments for risk assessment in particular, should not be allowed to deflect the research agenda away from holistic (individually) and whole-system (organisationally) imperatives. In particular it provides research-based corroboration for insights gained from national surveys and articulated individually and collectively by clinical experts. It also validates recommendations in clinical guidelines in relation to the need to avoid using risk assessment tools for prediction or for determining clinical management decisions.

Key learning points

The value of realist synthesis is evidenced in being able to explore how insights generated from a national survey play out in the published literature. In particular, realist synthesis was able to engage with diverse types of evidence to fill in knowledge gaps not addressed by documentation of validation studies as performed by earlier scoping and systematic reviews. Nevertheless, realist synthesis accrues most value when it addresses what works questions *in conjunction with* a focus on contexts and mechanisms and not simply as a supplement to existing effectiveness data.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge input from Dr Bernadka Dubicka, consultant and research lead in Pennine Care Foundation Trust, Greater Manchester and Chair of the Royal College of Psychiatrists (RCPsych) Child and Adolescent Faculty.

Author contributions

The lead reviewer and lead author is Anna Cantrell, who manages the project, and the second reviewer is Dr Katie Sworn. Professor Andrew Booth is the Co-Director of the Evidence Synthesis Centre and chief methodologist for the project. Professor Booth is the guarantor for the data and compiled the final report. Duncan Chambers provided additional reviewer input as required. Professor Scott Weich and Dr Elizabeth Taylor Buck provided subject expertise.

Ethics statement / approval(s)

The review did not involve people participating in research either directly (e.g. interviews, questionnaires) and/or indirectly (e.g. permitting people access to data).

Information governance

This review was conducted under School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR) Information Governance procedures. All staff members are compliant with University of Sheffield policies and procedures and have submitted to regular training in relevant aspects of governance.

Data sharing statement

All available data can be obtained on request from the corresponding author.

Funding statement

Support/Sources: NIHR Health Services & Delivery Research Funding Programme

Sponsor: NIHR Health Services & Delivery Research

Role of sponsor or funder

The sponsor identified the original topic through prioritisation processes and commissioned the Evidence Synthesis Centre to conduct the review. Following input into the protocol, the funder had no further input into the process or findings of the review.

References

1. Carter T, Walker GM, Aubeeluck A, et al. Assessment tools of immediate risk of self-harm and suicide in children and young people: A scoping review. *J Child Health Care* 2019; 23: 178-199. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't

Review. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1367493518787925.

2. Manning JC, Walker GM, Carter T, et al. Children and Young People-Mental Health Safety Assessment Tool (CYP-MH SAT) study: Protocol for the development and psychometric evaluation of an assessment tool to identify immediate risk of self-harm and suicide in children and young people (10-19 years) in acute paediatric hospital settings. *BMJ Open* 2018; 8: e020964. 20180412. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020964.

3. Vrouva I, Fonagy P, Fearon PR, et al. The risk-taking and self-harm inventory for adolescents: development and psychometric evaluation. *Psychol Assess* 2010; 22: 852-865. DOI: 10.1037/a0020583.

4. Coffey M, Cohen R, Faulkner A, et al. Ordinary risks and accepted fictions: how contrasting and competing priorities work in risk assessment and mental health care planning. *Health Expect* 2017; 20: 471-483. 20160617. DOI: 10.1111/hex.12474.

5. Downes C, Gill A, Doyle L, et al. Survey of mental health nurses' attitudes towards risk assessment, risk assessment tools and positive risk. *Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing* 2016; 23: 188-197.

6. Stewart A and MacIntyre G. Safeguarding Adults: Key Issues and Concepts. In: MacIntyre G, Stewart, A. and McCusker, P. ((ed) *Safeguarding Adults: Key Themes and Issues*. London: Palgrave, 2017, pp.13-34.

7. Jones J and Plowman C. Risk assessment: A multidisciplinary approach to estimating harmful behaviour in mentally disordered offenders. *Multidisciplinary working in forensic mental health care* 2005: 133-150.

8. Doyle M and Dolan M. Violence risk assessment: combining actuarial and clinical information to structure clinical judgements for the formulation and management of risk. *Journal of psychiatric and mental health nursing* 2002; 9: 649-657.

9. Homaifar B, Matarazzo B and Wortzel HS. Therapeutic risk management of the suicidal patient: augmenting clinical suicide risk assessment with structured instruments. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*® 2013; 19: 406-409.

10. Bouch J and Marshall JJ. Suicide risk: structured professional judgement. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* 2005; 11: 84-91.

11. Cramer RJ and Kapusta ND. A social-ecological framework of theory, assessment, and prevention of suicide. *Frontiers in psychology* 2017: 1756.

12. Pisani AR, Murrie DC and Silverman MM. Reformulating suicide risk formulation: from prediction to prevention. *Academic Psychiatry* 2016; 40: 623-629.

13. Boyce P, Carter G, Penrose-Wall J, et al. Summary Australian and New Zealand clinical practice guideline for the management of adult deliberate self-harm (2003). *Australasian Psychiatry* 2003; 11: 150-155.

14. (NICE). NIfHaCE. *Self-harm in over 8s: long-term management. Clinical guideline.* 2011. London.

15. Psychiatrists RCo. *Managing Self-Harm in Young People (Guideline number CR192)*. 2014.

16. Harris IM, Beese S and Moore D. Predicting future self-harm or suicide in adolescents: a systematic review of risk assessment scales/tools. *BMJ Open* 2019; 9: e029311. Systematic Review. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029311.

17. NICE. *Davies's structured interview for assessing adolescents in crisis*. 2013.

18. Health. NCCfM. *Self-harm. The NICE guideline on longer-term management*. 2011. London: National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health. : The British Psychological Society and The Royal College of Psychiatrists.

19. Psychiatrists RCo. Rethinking risk to others in mental health services. Royal College of Psychiatrists London, 2008.

20. Wand T, Isobel S and Derrick K. Surveying clinician perceptions of risk assessment and management practices in mental health service provision. *Australasian Psychiatry* 2015; 23: 147-153.

21. Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.

22. Shuttleworth J, Britton J, Keenan A, et al. Thinking psychoanalytically about mental health services for children, adolescents, and their parents. *Psychoanalysis, the NHS, and mental health work today*. Routledge, 2018, pp.35-60.

23. Aromatario O, Van Hoye A, Vuillemin A, et al. Using theory of change to develop an intervention theory for designing and evaluating behavior change SDApps for healthy eating and physical exercise: the OCAPREV theory. *BMC public health* 2019; 19: 1-12.

24. Fletcher A, Jamal F, Moore G, et al. Realist complex intervention science: applying realist principles across all phases of the Medical Research Council framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions. *Evaluation* 2016; 22: 286-303.

25. Pawson R. *The science of evaluation: a realist manifesto*. sage, 2013.

26. Ford JA, Wong G, Jones AP, et al. Access to primary care for socioeconomically disadvantaged older people in rural areas: a realist review. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6: e010652.

27. Booth A, Wright J and Briscoe S. Scoping and searching to support realist approaches. *Doing realist research London: Sage* 2018: 147-166.

28. Pawson R and Manzano-Santaella A. A realist diagnostic workshop. *Evaluation* 2012; 18: 176-191.

29. Astbury B and Leeuw FL. Unpacking black boxes: mechanisms and theory building in evaluation. *American journal of evaluation* 2010; 31: 363-381.

30. Rycroft-Malone J, McCormack B, Hutchinson AM, et al. Realist synthesis: illustrating the method for implementation research. *Implementation Science* 2012; 7: 1-10.

31. Minian N, Corrin T, Lingam M, et al. Identifying contexts and mechanisms in multiple behavior change interventions affecting smoking cessation success: a rapid realist review. *BMC public health* 2020; 20: 1-26.

32. Greenhalgh J and Manzano A. Understanding 'context'in realist evaluation and synthesis. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2021: 1-13.

33. Saul JE, Willis CD, Bitz J, et al. A time-responsive tool for informing policy making: rapid realist review. *Implementation Science* 2013; 8: 1-15.

34. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, et al. RAMESES publication standards: realist syntheses. *BMC medicine* 2013; 11: 1-14.

35. Ayiku L, Levay P, Hudson T, et al. The medline UK filter: development and validation of a geographic search filter to retrieve research about the UK from OVID medline. *Health Info Libr J* 2017; 34: 200-216. 20170713. DOI: 10.1111/hir.12187.

36. De Brún A and McAuliffe E. Identifying the context, mechanisms and outcomes underlying collective leadership in teams: building a realist programme theory. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2020; 20: 261. 20200330. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-020-05129-1.

37. Booth A, Hock E, Preston L, et al. *Social Care Access for adult BAME and LGBT+ populations: a rapid realist review*. 2021. Southampton: National Institute for Health Research.

38. NCIi S and SiM H. The assessment of clinical risk in mental health services. *Manchester: The University of Manchester* 2018.

39. Crawford MJ, Aldridge T, Bhui K, et al. User involvement in the planning and delivery of mental health services: a cross-sectional survey of service users and providers. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2003; 107: 410-414. DOI: 10.1034/j.1600-0447.2003.00049.x.

40. Self-Harm N. the short-term physical and psychological management and secondary prevention of self-harm in primary and secondary care, CG16. *London: NICE* 2004.

41. Eberhart NK, Cerully JL, Shearer AL, et al. *Evaluation Approaches for Mental Health Prevention and Early Intervention Programs*. RAND, 2017.

42. Last A, Henley W, Norman S, et al. Innovations in Practice: Feasibility of the development and well-being assessment as an adjunct to clinical assessment in child and adolescent mental health services. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health* 2013; 19: 142-146. DOI: 10.1111/camh.12017.

43. Reeves K, Charter E and Ford T. Measurement Issues: Is standardised diagnostic assessment feasible as an adjunct to clinical practice? A systematic

review. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health* 2015; 21: 51-63. DOI: 10.1111/camh.12089.

44. Wand T. Positioning mental health nursing practice within a positive health paradigm. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 2012; 22: 116-124. DOI: 10.1111/j.1447-0349.2012.00848.x.

45. Boland B and Bremner S. Squaring the circle: developing clinical risk management strategies in mental healthcare organisations. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* 2013; 19: 153-159. DOI: 10.1192/apt.bp.111.010009.

46. McCallum J and Eagle K. Risk Assessment: A Reflection on the Principles of Tools to Help Manage Risk of Violence in Mental Health. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law* 2014; 22: 378-387. DOI: 10.1080/13218719.2014.959155.

47. Kumar S and Simpson AIF. Application of Risk Assessment for Violence Methods to General Adult Psychiatry: A Selective Literature Review. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2005; 39: 328-335. DOI: 10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01579.x.

48. Wand T. Investigating the evidence for the effectiveness of risk assessment in mental health care. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing* 2012; 33: 2-7. DOI: 10.3109/01612840.2011.616984. .

49. Clancy L, Happell B and Moxham L. The language of risk: common understanding or diverse perspectives? *Issues Ment Health Nurs* 2014; 35: 551-557. DOI: 10.3109/01612840.2014.880139.

50. Manning JC, Carter T, Walker G, et al. Assessing risk of self-harm in acute paediatric settings: a multicentre exploratory evaluation of the CYP-MH SAPhE instrument. *BMJ Open* 2021; 11: e043762. Multicenter Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-043762.

51. MacDonald S, Sampson C, Biddle L, et al. Theorising health professionals' prevention and management practices with children and young people experiencing self-harm: a qualitative hospital-based case study. *Sociol Health Illn* 2021; 43: 201-219. 20201028. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9566.13211.

52. Kapur N and Goldney RD. *Suicide Prevention*. Oxford University Press, 2019.

53. Vandewalle J, Beeckman D, Van Hecke A, et al. Contact and communication with patients experiencing suicidal ideation: A qualitative study of nurses' perspectives. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2019; 75: 2867-2877. DOI: 10.1111/jan.14113.

54. Clancy L, Happell B and Moxham L. Perception of risk for older people living with a mental illness: Balancing uncertainty. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 2015; 24: 577-586. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12175.

55. Felton A, Repper J and Avis M. The construction of people with mental health problems as risk objects: Findings of a case study inquiry. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing* 2018; 25: 558-568. DOI: 10.1111/jpm.12501.

56. White MR, Stein-Parbury J, Orr F, et al. Working with consumers who hear voices: The experience of early career nurses in mental health services in Australia. *Int J Ment Health Nurs* 2019; 28: 605-615. 20181217. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12566.

57. Anderson M and Standen PJ. Attitudes towards suicide among nurses and doctors working with children and young people who self-harm. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2007; 14: 470-477. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2850.2007.01106.x.

58. Suarez N and Saunders K. Assessment and management of self harm. *BMJ* 2012; 344.

59. Bellairs-Walsh I, Perry Y, Krysinska K, et al. Best practice when working with suicidal behaviour and self-harm in primary care: a qualitative exploration of young people's perspectives. *BMJ Open* 2020; 10: e038855. 20201028. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-038855.

60. Stallman HM. Coping planning: a patient-centred and strengths-focused approach to suicide prevention training. *Australas Psychiatry* 2018; 26: 141-144. 20171002. DOI: 10.1177/1039856217732471.

61. McAndrew S and Warne T. Hearing the voices of young people who self-harm: implications for service providers. *Int J Ment Health Nurs* 2014; 23: 570-579. 20141111. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12093.

62. Neufeld SA, Jones PB and Goodyer IM. Child and adolescent mental health services: longitudinal data sheds light on current policy for psychological interventions in the community. *Journal of Public Mental Health* 2017.

63. Roisman GI, Masten AS, Coatsworth JD, et al. Salient and emerging developmental tasks in the transition to adulthood. *Child Dev* 2004; 75: 123-133. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2004.00658.x.

64. Cutcliffe JR and Barker P. Considering the care of the suicidal client and the case for 'engagement and inspiring hope' or 'observations'. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2002; 9: 611-621. DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2850.2002.00515.x.

65. Evans SA, Young D and Tiffin PA. Predictive validity and interrater reliability of the FACE-CARAS toolkit in a CAMHS setting. *Crim* 2019; 29: 47-56. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2104.

66. Godin P. 'You don't tick boxes on a form': A study of how community mental health nurses assess and manage risk. *Health, risk & society* 2004; 6: 347-360.

67. Vassilev I and Pilgrim D. Risk, trust and the myth of mental health services. *Journal of Mental Health* 2007; 16: 347-357.

68. Flintoff A, Speed E and McPherson S. Risk assessment practice within primary mental health care: A logics perspective. *Health (London)* 2019; 23: 656-674. 20180413. DOI: 10.1177/1363459318769471.

69. Ougrin D and Boege I. Brief report: the Self Harm Questionnaire: a new tool designed to improve identification of self harm in adolescents. *Journal of adolescence* 2013; 36: 221-225.

70. Hawton K, Bergen H, Waters K, et al. Epidemiology and nature of self-harm in children and adolescents: findings from the multicentre study of self-harm in England. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2012; 21: 369-377. Multicenter Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00787-012-0269-6.

71. Kleiman EM, Turner BJ, Fedor S, et al. Examination of real-time fluctuations in suicidal ideation and its risk factors: Results from two ecological momentary assessment studies. *J Abnorm Psychol* 2017; 126: 726-738. 20170508. DOI: 10.1037/abn0000273.

72. Higgins A, Doyle L, Downes C, et al. There is more to risk and safety planning than dramatic risks: Mental health nurses' risk assessment and safety-management practice. *Int J Ment Health Nurs* 2016; 25: 159-170. 20151202. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12180.

73. Dazzi T, Gribble R, Wessely S, et al. Does asking about suicide and related behaviours induce suicidal ideation? What is the evidence? *Psychol Med* 2014; 44: 3361-3363. Editorial

Comment. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0033291714001299.

74. DeCou CR and Schumann ME. On the Iatrogenic Risk of Assessing Suicidality: A Meta-Analysis. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 2018; 48: 531-543. 20170705. DOI: 10.1111/sltb.12368.

75. Brown S, Iqbal Z, Burbidge F, et al. Embedding an evidence-based model for suicide prevention in the national health service: A service improvement initiative. *International journal of environmental research and public health* 2020; 17: 4920.

76. Rothes IA and Henriques MR. Health professionals' explanations of suicidal behaviour: Effects of professional group, theoretical intervention model, and patient suicide experience. *OMEGA-Journal of death and dying* 2017; 76: 141-168.

77. Rothes I and Henriques M. Health Professionals Facing Suicidal Patients: What Are Their Clinical Practices? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2018; 15. DOI: 10.3390/ijerph15061210.

78. Horowitz L, Ballard E, Teach SJ, et al. Feasibility of screening patients with nonpsychiatric complaints for suicide risk in a pediatric emergency department: a good time to talk? *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2010; 26: 787-792. DOI: 10.1097/PEC.0b013e3181fa8568.

79. Ballard ED, Bosk A, Snyder D, et al. Patients' opinions about suicide screening in a pediatric emergency department. *Pediatr Emerg Care* 2012; 28: 34-38. DOI: 10.1097/PEC.0b013e31823f2315.

80. Ross AM, White E, Powell D, et al. To Ask or Not to Ask? Opinions of Pediatric Medical Inpatients about Suicide Risk Screening in the Hospital. *J Pediatr* 2016; 170: 295-300. 20151224. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpeds.2015.11.052.

81. Mathias CW, Michael Furr R, Sheftall AH, et al. What's the harm in asking about suicidal ideation? *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 2012; 42: 341-351. 20120430. DOI: 10.1111/j.1943-278X.2012.0095.x.

82. Gray NS, Tiller J and Snowden RJ. WARRN-A formulation-based risk assessment procedure for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS): The view of clinicians. *Journal of Forensic Practice* 2019; 21: 228-239. Empirical Study; Interview; Qualitative Study; Quantitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFP-06-2019-0025.

83. Graney J, Hunt IM, Quinlivan L, et al. Suicide risk assessment in UK mental health services: a national mixed-methods study. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; 7: 1046-1053. 20201112. DOI: 10.1016/s2215-0366(20)30381-3.

84. Burns J, Dudley M, Hazell P, et al. Clinical management of deliberate self-harm in young people: the need for evidence-based approaches to reduce repetition. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2005; 39: 121-128.

85. Pile V, Shammas D and Smith P. Assessment and treatment of depression in children and young people in the United Kingdom: Comparison of access to services and provision at two time points. *Clin* 2020; 25: 119-132. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1359104519858112.

86. Orchard F, Pass L, Marshall T, et al. Clinical characteristics of adolescents referred for treatment of depressive disorders. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health* 2017; 22: 61-68. DOI: 10.1111/camh.12178.

87. Michail M and Tait L. Exploring general practitioners' views and experiences on suicide risk assessment and management of young people in primary care: a qualitative study in the UK. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6: e009654. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009654.

88. Crawford T, Geraghty W, Street K, et al. Staff knowledge and attitudes towards deliberate self-harm in adolescents. *Journal of adolescence* 2003; 26: 619-629.

89. Jahn DR, Quinnett P and Ries R. The influence of training and experience on mental health practitioners' comfort working with suicidal individuals. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 2016; 47: 130.

90. LoParo D, Florez IA, Valentine N, et al. Associations of Suicide Prevention Trainings with Practices and Confidence among Clinicians at Community Mental Health Centers. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 2019; 49: 1148-1156. 20180802. DOI: 10.1111/sltb.12498.

91. Oordt MS, Jobes DA, Fonseca VP, et al. Training mental health professionals to assess and manage suicidal behavior: Can provider confidence and practice behaviors be altered? *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 2009; 39: 21-32.

92. Timson D, Priest H and Clark-Carter D. Adolescents who self-harm: professional staff knowledge, attitudes and training needs. *J Adolesc* 2012; 35: 1307-1314. 20120615. DOI: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.05.001.

93. Anderson M, Standen PJ and Noon JP. A social semiotic interpretation of suicidal behaviour in young people. *J Health Psychol* 2005; 10: 317-331. DOI: 10.1177/1359105305051418.

94. Schuberg K, Jobes D, Ballard E, et al. Pre/post/post evaluations of CAMS-trained VA clinicians. *Program Chairs & Committees* 2009; 30: 42.

95. McLaughlin S, Bailey D, Bonner G, et al. Improving confidence in suicide risk assessment. *Nurs Times* 2014; 110: 16-18.

96. Ambresin AE, Otjes CP, Patton GC, et al. Training General Practitioners to Detect Probable Mental Disorders in Young People During Health Risk Screening. *J Adolesc Health* 2017; 61: 302-309. 20170607. DOI: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2017.03.015.

97. Jackson H, Wray J, Gardiner E, et al. Involving carers in risk assessment: a study of a structured dialogue between mental health nurses and carers. *J Res Nurs* 2019; 24: 330-341. 20190808. DOI: 10.1177/1744987119851533.

98. Bee P, Brooks H, Fraser C, et al. Professional perspectives on service user and carer involvement in mental health care planning: a qualitative study. *Int J Nurs Stud* 2015; 52: 1834-1845. 2015/07/26. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2015.07.008.

99. Horowitz LM, Ballard ED and Pao M. Suicide screening in schools, primary care and emergency departments. *Curr Opin Pediatr* 2009; 21: 620-627. DOI: 10.1097/MOP.0b013e3283307a89.

100. Leavey G, Mallon S, Rondon-Sulbaran J, et al. The failure of suicide prevention in primary care: family and GP perspectives - a qualitative study. *BMC Psychiatry* 2017; 17: 369. 20171121. DOI: 10.1186/s12888-017-1508-7.

101. Saini P, Windfuhr K, Pearson A, et al. Suicide prevention in primary care: General practitioners' views on service availability. *BMC Res Notes* 2010; 3: 246. 20101001. DOI: 10.1186/1756-0500-3-246.

102. Saini P, Chantler K and Kapur N. General practitioners' perspectives on primary care consultations for suicidal patients. *Health Soc Care Community* 2016; 24: 260-269. 20150209. DOI: 10.1111/hsc.12198.

103. Suicide NCIi and Illness HbPwM. Making Mental Health Care Safer: Annual Report and 20-year Review. University of Manchester Manchester, UK, 2016.

104. Rahman MS and Kapur N. Quality of risk assessment prior to suicide and homicide. *The Psychiatric Bulletin* 2014; 38: 46-47.

105. Xanthopoulou P, Ryan M, Lomas M, et al. Psychosocial Assessment in the Emergency Department. *Crisis* 2021 20210527. DOI: 10.1027/0227-5910/a000786.

106. King E, Davies K and Abendstern M. Positive risk taking: debating the research agenda in the context of adult protection and COVID. *The Journal of Adult Protection* 2021.

107. Clancy L and Happell B. Tensions of difference: reconciling organisational imperatives for risk management with consumer-focused care from the perspectives of clinicians and managers. *J Clin Nurs* 2014; 23: 3177-3187. 20140223. DOI: 10.1111/jocn.12564.

108. Saab MM, Murphy M, Meehan E, et al. Suicide and Self-Harm Risk Assessment: A Systematic Review of Prospective Research. *Arch Suicide Res* 2021: 1-21. 20210701. DOI: 10.1080/13811118.2021.1938321.

109. Wilson SC, Carryer J and Brannelly T. New risks: the intended and unintended effects of mental health reform. *Nurs Inq* 2016; 23: 200-210. 20160201. DOI: 10.1111/nin.12130.

110. Large MM, Ryan CJ, Carter G, et al. Can we usefully stratify patients according to suicide risk? *BMJ* 2017: j4627. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.j4627.

111. Resolution N. Learning from suicide related claims: a thematic review of NHS Resolution data. *London, UK: NHS Resolution* 2018.

112. Chan MK, Bhatti H, Meader N, et al. Predicting suicide following self-harm: systematic review of risk factors and risk scales. *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 2016; 209: 277-283.

113. Quinlivan L, Cooper J, Meehan D, et al. Predictive accuracy of risk scales following self-harm: multicentre, prospective cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry* 2017; 210: 429-436. Multicenter Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1192/bjp.bp.116.189993.

114. Quinlivan L, Cooper J, Steeg S, et al. Scales for predicting risk following self-harm: an observational study in 32 hospitals in England. *BMJ Open* 2014; 4: e004732.

115. Steeg S, Quinlivan L, Nowland R, et al. Accuracy of risk scales for predicting repeat self-harm and suicide: a multicentre, population-level cohort study using routine clinical data. *BMC Psychiatry* 2018; 18: 113. Comparative Study

Multicenter Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1693-z.

116. Carter G, Milner A, McGill K, et al. Predicting suicidal behaviours using clinical instruments: systematic review and meta-analysis of positive predictive values for risk scales. *Br J Psychiatry* 2017; 210: 387-395. 20170316. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.116.182717.

117. Granello DH. The process of suicide risk assessment: Twelve core principles. *Journal of Counseling & Development* 2010; 88: 363-370.

118. Gerson R, Malas N and Mroczkowski MM. Crisis in the emergency department: the evaluation and management of acute agitation in children and adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics* 2018; 27: 367-386.

119. Darby C and Cardwell P. Restraint in the care of children. *Emergency Nurse* 2011; 19.

120. Haney EM, O'Neil ME, Carson S, et al. *Suicide risk factors and risk assessment tools: A systematic review*. 2012. Washington, DC.

121. Muir-Cochrane E, Gerace A, Mosel K, et al. Managing risk: clinical decision-making in mental health services. *Issues Ment Health Nurs* 2011; 32: 726-734. DOI: 10.3109/01612840.2011.603880.

122. Woods P. Risk assessment and management approaches on mental health units. *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2013; 20: 807-813. 20121204. DOI: 10.1111/jpm.12022.

123. Manuel J and Crowe M. Clinical responsibility, accountability, and risk aversion in mental health nursing: a descriptive, qualitative study. *Int J Ment Health Nurs* 2014; 23: 336-343. 20140218. DOI: 10.1111/inm.12063.

124. Gerace A, Curren D and Muir-Cochrane E. Multidisciplinary health professionals' assessments of risk: how are tools used to reach consensus about risk assessment and management? *J Psychiatr Ment Health Nurs* 2013; 20: 557-563. 20121210. DOI: 10.1111/jpm.12026.

125. Stickley T and Felton A. Promoting recovery through therapeutic risk taking. *Mental Health Practice* 2006; 9.

126. Mulder R, Newton-Howes G and Coid JW. The futility of risk prediction in psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry* 2016; 209: 271-272. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.116.184960.

127. Turecki G and Brent DA. Suicide and suicidal behaviour. *Lancet* 2016; 387: 1227-1239. 2015/09/15. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00234-2.

128. Pridmore S, Ahmadi J and Reddy A. Suicide in the absence of mental disorder. *Working Paper of Public Health* 2012; 1. DOI: 10.4081/wpph.2012.6772.

129. The last appointment before suicide: is suicide intent communicated? *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1995; 152: 919-922. DOI: 10.1176/ajp.152.6.919.

130. Matthews K, Milne S and Ashcroft GW. Role of doctors in the prevention of suicide: the final consultation. *Br J Gen Pract* 1994; 44: 345-348.

131. Pearson A, Saini P, Da Cruz D, et al. Primary care contact prior to suicide in individuals with mental illness. *Br J Gen Pract* 2009; 59: 825-832. DOI: 10.3399/bjgp09X472881.

132. Murphy E, Kapur N, Webb R, et al. Risk assessment following self-harm: comparison of mental health nurses and psychiatrists. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2011; 67: 127-139. Comparative Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05484.x.

133. Anderson J, Hurst M, Marques A, et al. Understanding suicidal behaviour in young people referred to specialist CAMHS: A qualitative psychoanalytic clinical research project. *Journal of Child Psychotherapy* 2012; 38: 130-153. Empirical Study; Interview; Qualitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0075417X.2012.684484.

134. Kapur N, Steeg S, Webb R, et al. Does clinical management improve outcomes following self-harm? Results from the multicentre study of self-harm in England. *PLoS ONE* 2013; 8: e70434. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0070434.

135. Knowles SE, Townsend E and Anderson MP. Youth Justice staff attitudes towards screening for self-harm. *Health & Social Care in the Community* 2012; 20: 506-515. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2524.2012.01061.x.

136. Taylor PJ and Wood AM. Discrepancies in parental and self-appraisals of prosocial characteristics predict emotional problems in adolescents. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology* 2013; 52: 269-284. DOI: 10.1111/bjc.12013.

137. Hiles S, Bergen H, Hawton K, et al. General hospital-treated self-poisoning in England and Australia: Comparison of presentation rates, clinical characteristics and aftercare based on sentinel unit data. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research* 2015; 78: 356-362. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.01.006.

138. Horowitz L and Bridge JA. Analysis of multisource data establishes wide-ranging antecedents of youth suicide in England. *Evidence Based Mental Health* 2017; 20: e12-e12. DOI: 10.1136/eb-2016-102565.

139. Morgan C, Webb RT, Carr MJ, et al. Incidence, clinical management, and mortality risk following self harm among children and adolescents: cohort study in primary care. *BMJ* 2017; 359: j4351. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4351.

140. Patton G and Borschmann R. Responding to the adolescent in distress. *The Lancet* 2017; 390: 536-538. Note. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736%2817%2931331-4.

141. Padmanathan P, Biddle L, Carroll R, et al. Suicide and Self-Harm Related Internet Use. *Crisis: Journal of Crisis Intervention & Suicide* 2018; 39: 469-478. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000522.

142. O'Reilly M. Social media and adolescent mental health: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Journal of Mental Health* 2020; 29: 200-206. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09638237.2020.1714007.

143. O'Reilly M, Kiyimba N and Karim K. "This is a question we have to ask everyone": asking young people about self-harm and suicide. *Journal of Psychiatric & Mental Health Nursing* 2016; 23: 479-488. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12323.

144. NCISS. *National Confidential Inquiry into Suicide and Safety in Mental Health: Annual Report: England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales 2021*. 2021. University of Manchester.

145. Education Do. *Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years*. 2014. UK Department of Education & UK Department of Health

146. Jobanputra S and Singh S. *What are general practitioners' views on the management of adolescents with mental health disorders? A qualitative study*. Report no. 1473-9879, 2020. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Taylor & Francis Ltd.

147. Ougrin D, Zundel T, Kyriakopoulos M, et al. Adolescents with suicidal and nonsuicidal self-harm: Clinical characteristics and response to therapeutic assessment. *Psychological Assessment* 2012; 24: 11-20. Empirical Study; Quantitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0025043.

148. Ougrin D, Zundel T, Ng AV, et al. Teaching therapeutic assessment for self-harm in adolescents: training outcomes. *Psychol Psychother* 2013; 86: 70-85. Comparative Study

Randomized Controlled Trial. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8341.2011.02047.x.

149. Daniel MR, Weir S and Tiffin PA. A novel CAMHS risk assessment system: Clinicians' views. *Journal of Forensic Practice* 2013; 15: 182-191. Empirical Study; Interview; Focus Group; Qualitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFP-09-2012-0011.

150. Terrelonge DN and Fugard AJ. Associations between family and clinician ratings of child mental health: A study of UK CAMHS assessments and outcomes. *Clin* 2017; 22: 664-674. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1359104517713240.

151. Shaffer D, Gould MS, Brasic J, et al. A children's global assessment scale (CGAS). *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 1983; 40: 1228-1231. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.1983.01790100074010.

152. Goodman R. The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1997; 38: 581-586. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01545.x.

153. Wolpert M, Ford T, Trustam E, et al. Patient-reported outcomes in child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS): use of idiographic and standardized measures. *Journal of Mental Health* 2012; 21: 165-173. Multicenter Study. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.3109/09638237.2012.664304.

154. Mackway-Jones K. Pain assessment as part of the triage process. *Emergency Triage, Manchester Triage Group London, BMJ Publishing Group[Google Scholar]* 1997.

155. Pierce DW. Suicidal intent in self-injury. *The British journal of psychiatry* 1977; 130: 377-385.

156. Tiffin PA, Kitchen CEW and Weir S. Innovations in Practice: Piloting a new child and adolescent risk assessment suite in the UK. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health* 2015; 20: 225-229. DOI: 10.1111/camh.12110.

157. Horowitz LM, Bridge JA, Teach SJ, et al. Ask Suicide-Screening Questions (ASQ): a brief instrument for the pediatric emergency department. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 2012; 166: 1170-1176. DOI: 10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.1276.

158. Pfeffer CR, Jiang H and Kakuma T. Child–Adolescent Suicidal Potential Index (CASPI): A screen for risk for early onset suicidal behavior. *Psychological Assessment* 2000; 12: 304.

159. Larzelere RE, Andersen JJ, Ringle JL, et al. The child suicide risk assessment: a screening measure of suicide risk in pre-adolescents. *Death studies* 2004; 28: 809-827.

160. Shaffer D, Scott M, Wilcox H, et al. The Columbia SuicideScreen: Validity and Reliability of a Screen for Youth Suicide and Depression. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry* 2004; 43: 71-79. DOI: 10.1097/00004583-200401000-00016.

161. Orbach I, Feshbach S, Carlson GA, et al. Attitudes toward life and death in suicidal, normal, and chronically ill children: An extended replication. *Journal of*

Consulting and Clinical Psychology 1984; 52: 1020-1027. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006x.52.6.1020.

162. Osman A, Downs WR, Kopper BA, et al. The Reasons for Living Inventory for Adolescents (RFL-A): development and psychometric properties. *J Clin Psychol* 1998; 54: 1063-1078. DOI: 10.1002/(sici)1097-4679(199812)54:8<1063::aid-jclp6>3.0.co;2-z.

163. Angelkovska A. *The development and validation of an instrument to identify risk of self-harm in children*. University of Western Australia, 2007.

164. Angelkovska A, Houghton S and Hopkins S. Differential profiles of risk of self-harm among clinically referred primary school aged children. *School Psychology International* 2012; 33: 646-660.

165. Sher MA and Gralton E. Implementation of the START:AV in a secure adolescent service. *Journal of Forensic Practice* 2014; 16: 184-193. DOI: 10.1108/JFP-04-2013-0021.

166. Sher MA, Warner L, McLean A, et al. A prospective validation study of the START:AV. *Journal of Forensic Practice* 2017; 19: 115-129. Empirical Study; Quantitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JFP-10-2015-0049.

167. Cotton CR and Range LM. Suicidality, hopelessness, and attitudes toward life and death in clinical and nonclinical adolescents. *Death Stud* 1996; 20: 601-610. DOI: 10.1080/07481189608252765.

168. Reynolds WM and Mazza JJ. Assessment of Suicidal Ideation in Inner-City Children and Young Adolescents: Reliability and Validity of the Suicidal Ideation Questionnaire-JR. *School Psychology Review* 1999; 28: 17-30. DOI: 10.1080/02796015.1999.12085945.

169. Flamarique I, Santosh P, Zuddas A, et al. Development and psychometric properties of the Suicidality: Treatment Occurring in Paediatrics (STOP) Suicidality Assessment Scale (STOP-SAS) in children and adolescents. *BMC Pediatr* 2016; 16: 213. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't.

170. Reynolds WM. Development of a semistructured clinical interview for suicidal behaviors in adolescents. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1990; 2: 382-390. DOI: 10.1037/1040-3590.2.4.382.

171. Armstrong JG, Putnam FW, Carlson EB, et al. Development and validation of a measure of adolescent dissociation: The Adolescent Dissociative Experiences Scale. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease* 1997; 185: 491-497.

172. Vizzard E. Interviewing children: A review of theory and practice. In: Hollin C and Howells K (eds) *Clinical Approaches to Sex Offenders and Their Victims*. New York: Wiley, 1991, pp.117-129.

173. Posner K, Brown GK, Stanley B, et al. The Columbia–Suicide Severity Rating Scale: initial validity and internal consistency findings from three multisite studies with adolescents and adults. *American journal of psychiatry* 2011; 168: 1266-1277.

174. Hamilton M. The Hamilton Depression Scale—accelerator or break on antidepressant drug discovery. *Psychiatry* 1960; 23: 56-62.

175. Range LM and Lewis LS. Life Orientation Inventory: A method of assessing suicide risk. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* 1992; 10: 296-297.

176. Miller IW, Norman WH, Bishop SB, et al. The Modified Scale for Suicidal Ideation: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 1986; 54: 724-725. DOI: 10.1037/0022-006x.54.5.724.

177. Horowitz LM, Wang PS, Koocher GP, et al. Detecting suicide risk in a pediatric emergency department: development of a brief screening tool. *Pediatrics* 2001; 107: 1133-1137. DOI: 10.1542/peds.107.5.1133.

178. Patterson WM, Dohn HH, Bird J, et al. Evaluation of suicidal patients: the SAD PERSONS scale. *Psychosomatics* 1983; 24: 343-345, 348-349. DOI: 10.1016/s0033-3182(83)73213-5.

179. Bolton JM. Suicide risk assessment in the emergency department: out of the darkness. *Depress Anxiety* 2015; 32: 73-75. 20141124. DOI: 10.1002/da.22320.

180. Beck AT, Kovacs M and Weissman A. Assessment of suicidal intention: the Scale for Suicide Ideation. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 1979; 47: 343-352. DOI: 10.1037//0022-006x.47.2.343.

181. Borum R, Bartel P and Forth A. *Manual for the structured assessment of violence risk in youth (SAVRY©): version 1.1*. University of South Florida, 2003.

182. Reynolds WM. Suicidal ideation questionnaire (SIQ). *Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources* 1987.

183. Harriss L and Hawton K. Suicidal intent in deliberate self-harm and the risk of suicide: the predictive power of the Suicide Intent Scale. *J Affect Disord* 2005; 86: 225-233. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2005.02.009.

184. Cull JG and Gill WS. Suicide Probability Scale. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. American Psychological Association (APA), 1982.

185. Plutchik R, van Praag HM, Conte HR, et al. Correlates of suicide and violence risk 1: The suicide risk measure. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 1989; 30: 296-302. DOI: 10.1016/0010-440x(89)90053-9.

186. Conrad AK, Jacoby AM, Jobes DA, et al. A Psychometric Investigation of the Suicide Status Form II with a Psychiatric Inpatient Sample. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior* 2009; 39: 307-320. DOI: 10.1521/suli.2009.39.3.307.

187. Horowitz LM, Bridge JA, Pao M, et al. Screening youth for suicide risk in medical settings: time to ask questions. *Am J Prev Med* 2014; 47: S170-175. DOI: 10.1016/j.amepre.2014.06.002.

188. Beck AT, Resnik AT and Lettieri DJ. Suicide Intent Scale. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. American Psychological Association (APA), 1974.

189. Hoyos C, Mancini V, Furlong Y, et al. The role of dissociation and abuse among adolescents who self-harm. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2019; 53: 989-999. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0004867419851869.

190. Hill SA, Argent SE, Lolley J, et al. Characteristics of male patients admitted to an adolescent secure forensic psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*

and Psychology 2016; 27: 21-37. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2015.1094117.

191. Palmer E, Welsh P and Tiffin PA. Perceptions of family functioning in adolescents who self-harm. *Journal of Family Therapy* 2016; 38: 257-273. DOI: 10.1111/1467-6427.12069.

192. Watson R, McCabe C, Harvey K, et al. Development and validation of a new adolescent self-report scale to measure loss of interest and pleasure: The Anhedonia Scale for Adolescents. *Psychological Assessment* 2021; 33: 201-217. Empirical Study; Qualitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pas0000977.

193. Kennedy J, Hembry P, Green D, et al. Predictors of change in global psychiatric functioning at an inpatient adolescent psychiatric unit: A decade of experience. *Clin* 2020; 25: 471-482. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1359104519898215.

194. Krause KR, Chung S, Adewuya AO, et al. International consensus on a standard set of outcome measures for child and youth anxiety, depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and post-traumatic stress disorder. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2021; 8: 76-86. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't

Systematic Review. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30356-4.

195. Hamby S, Finkelhor D, Ormrod R, et al. The juvenile victimization questionnaire (JVQ): Child self-report version. *Durham, NH: Crimes against Children Research Center* 2004.

196. Radford L, Corral S, Bradley C, et al. The prevalence and impact of child maltreatment and other types of victimization in the UK: findings from a population survey of caregivers, children and young people and young adults. *Child Abuse Negl* 2013; 37: 801-813. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.02.004.

197. Patalay P, Deighton J, Fonagy P, et al. Clinical validity of the Me and My School questionnaire: a self-report mental health measure for children and adolescents. *Child Adolesc Psychiatry Ment Health* 2014; 8: 17. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1753-2000-8-17.

198. Radez J, Waite P, Chorpita B, et al. Using the 11-item Version of the RCADS to Identify Anxiety and Depressive Disorders in Adolescents. *Res Child Adolesc Psychopathol* 2021; 49: 1241-1257. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-021-00817-w.

199. Irish M, Solmi F, Mars B, et al. Depression and self-harm from adolescence to young adulthood in sexual minorities compared with heterosexuals in the UK: a population-based cohort study. *The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health* 2019; 3: 91-98. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-4642%2818%2930343-2.

200. Sinclair J and Holden S. The mental health surveillance of adolescents, within a school setting. *Mental Health Review Journal* 2013; 18: 83-92. DOI: 10.1108/MHRJ-10-2012-0028.

201. Briere J, Johnson K, Bissada A, et al. The Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (TSCYC): Reliability and association with abuse exposure in a multi-site study. *Child Abuse Negl* 2001; 25: 1001-1014.

202. Gin K, Banerjea P, Abbott C, et al. Childhood unusual experiences in community Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services in South East London: Prevalence and impact. *Schizophrenia Research* 2018; 195: 93-96. DOI: 10.1016/j.schres.2017.08.046.

203. Rojahn J, Rowe EW, Sharber AC, et al. The Behavior Problems Inventory-Short Form for individuals with intellectual disabilities: Part II: reliability and validity. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research* 2012; 56: 546-565. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01506.x.

204. Bird JC, Loe BS, Kirkham M, et al. The assessment of paranoia in young people: Item and test properties of the Bird Checklist of Adolescent Paranoia. *Schizophrenia Research* 2020; 220: 116-122. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.schres.2020.03.046.

205. Tarren-Sweeney M, Goemans A, Hahne AS, et al. Mental health screening for children in care using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Brief Assessment Checklists: Guidance from three national studies. *Developmental Child Welfare* 2019; 1: 177-196. Empirical Study; Quantitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2516103219829756.

206. Laverty C, Oliver C, Moss J, et al. Persistence and predictors of self-injurious behaviour in autism: a ten-year prospective cohort study. *Mol Autism* 2020; 11: 8. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13229-019-0307-z.

207. Ayodeji E, Green J, Roberts C, et al. The influence of personality disorder on outcome in adolescent self-harm. *Br J Psychiatry* 2015; 207: 313-319. Journal Article; Multicenter Study; Randomized Controlled Trial. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.113.138941.

208. Pexton S, Farrants J and Yule W. The impact of fathers' military deployment on child adjustment. The support needs of primary school children and their families separated during active military service: A pilot study. *Clin* 2018; 23: 110-124. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1359104517724494.

209. Tarver J, Vitoratou S, Mastroianni M, et al. Development and Psychometric Properties of a New Questionnaire to Assess Mental Health and Concerning Behaviors in Children and Young People with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD): The Assessment of Concerning Behavior (ACB) Scale. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2021; 51: 2812-2828. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04748-1.

210. Hassiotis A and Turk J. Mental Health Needs in Adolescents with Intellectual Disabilities: Cross-Sectional Survey of a Service Sample. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities* 2012; 25: 252-261. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-3148.2011.00662.x.

211. Price MA, Hollinsaid NL, Bokhour EJ, et al. Transgender and Gender Diverse Youth's Experiences of Gender-Related Adversity. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*. DOI: 10.1007/s10560-021-00785-6.

212. Guo B, Kaylor-Hughes C, Garland A, et al. Factor structure and longitudinal measurement invariance of PHQ-9 for specialist mental health care patients with persistent major depressive disorder: exploratory Structural Equation Modelling. *Journal of affective disorders* 2017; 219: 1-8. Journal: Article. DOI: 10.1016/j.jad.2017.05.020.

213. Haines A, Brown A, Javaid SF, et al. Assessing Protective Factors for Violence Risk in U.K. General Mental Health Services Using the Structured Assessment of Protective Factors. *Int J Offender Ther Comp Criminol* 2018; 62: 3965-3983. Validation Study. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0306624X17749449.

214. Phillips K, Whatson BL, Wells E, et al. Capturing the impact of adolescent inpatient admissions: The Social Connectedness Scale. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 2019; 24: 631-641. DOI: 10.1177/1359104518807745.

215. Hill SA, Brodrick P, Doherty A, et al. Characteristics of female patients admitted to an adolescent secure forensic psychiatric hospital. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology* 2014; 25: 503-519. Empirical Study; Quantitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2014.933863.

216. Oliver C, Petty J, Ruddick L, et al. The association between repetitive, self-injurious and aggressive behavior in children with severe intellectual disability. *J Autism Dev Disord* 2012; 42: 910-919. Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10803-011-1320-z.

217. Fusar-Poli P, Werbeloff N, Rutigliano G, et al. Transdiagnostic risk calculator for the automatic detection of individuals at risk and the prediction of psychosis: Second replication in an independent national health service trust. *Schizophrenia Bulletin* 2019; 45: 562-570. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sby070.

218. Welsh P, Mediavilla JL and Tiffin PA. Attitudes and knowledge of child and adolescent mental health clinicians in relation to the psychosis risk syndrome. *Early Interv Psychiatry* 2011; 5: 355-359. Evaluation Study

Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-7893.2011.00285.x.

219. Welsh P and Brown S. 'I'm not insane, my mother had me tested': The risk and benefits of being labelled 'at-risk' for psychosis. *Health, Risk & Society* 2013; 15: 648-662. Empirical Study; Interview; Qualitative Study. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13698575.2013.848846.

220. Karatekin C and Hill M. Expanding the Original Definition of Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). *J Child Adolesc Trauma* 2019; 12: 289-306. 20181112. DOI: 10.1007/s40653-018-0237-5.

221. Hidalgo MA, Petras H, Chen D, et al. The Gender Minority Stress and Resilience Measure: Psychometric Validity of an Adolescent Extension. *Clin Pract Pediatr Psychol* 2019; 7: 278-290. DOI: 10.1037/cpp0000297.

222. Testa RJ, Habarth J, Peta J, et al. Development of the gender minority stress and resilience measure. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity* 2015; 2: 65.

223. Goldberg DP. User's guide to the General Health Questionnaire. *Windsor* 1988.

224. Beck J. Manual for the beck youth inventories. San Antonio, TX: Harcourt Assessment, 2005.

225. Dyregrov A, Kuterovac G and Barath A. Factor analysis of the impact of event scale with children in war. *Scand J Psychol* 1996; 37: 339-350. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.1996.tb00667.x.

226. Birleson P. The validity of depressive disorder in childhood and the development of a self-rating scale: a research report. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 1981; 22: 73-88. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1981.tb00533.x.

227. Birmaher B, Khetarpal S, Brent D, et al. The Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders (SCARED): scale construction and psychometric characteristics. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 1997; 36: 545-553. DOI: 10.1097/00004583-199704000-00018.

228. Fusar-Poli P, Oliver D, Spada G, et al. Real world implementation of a transdiagnostic risk calculator for the automatic detection of individuals at risk of psychosis in clinical routine: Study protocol. *Frontiers in Psychiatry* 2019; 10. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2019.00109.

229. Hurrell RA, Fullwood C, Keys J, et al. Psychosocial screening at paediatric BEEC clinics: a pilot evaluation study. *J Pediatr Urol* 2015; 11: 79.e71-76. Evaluation Study. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jpurol.2014.10.013.

230. Goldston DB. *Assessment of suicidal behaviors and risk among children and adolescents*. National Institute of Mental Health Bethesda, MD, 2000.

231. Ballard ED, Cwik M, Van Eck K, et al. Identification of at-risk youth by suicide screening in a pediatric emergency department. *Prevention science* 2017; 18: 174-182.

232. Cha CB, Augenstein TM, Frost KH, et al. Using Implicit and Explicit Measures to Predict Nonsuicidal Self-Injury Among Adolescent Inpatients. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2016; 55: 62-68. 20151030. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaac.2015.10.008.

233. Chitsabesan P, Harrington R, Harrington V, et al. Predicting repeat self-harm in children--how accurate can we expect to be? *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2003; 12: 23-29. DOI: 10.1007/s00787-003-0302-x.

234. Czyz EK, Horwitz AG and King CA. SELF-RATED EXPECTATIONS OF SUICIDAL BEHAVIOR PREDICT FUTURE SUICIDE ATTEMPTS AMONG ADOLESCENT AND YOUNG ADULT PSYCHIATRIC EMERGENCY PATIENTS. *Depress Anxiety* 2016; 33: 512-519. 20160425. DOI: 10.1002/da.22514.

235. Gipson PY, Agarwala P, Opperman KJ, et al. Columbia-suicide severity rating scale: Predictive validity with adolescent psychiatric emergency patients. *Pediatric Emergency Care* 2015; 31: 88-94. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0000000000000225.

236. Horwitz AG, Czyz EK and King CA. Predicting Future Suicide Attempts Among Adolescent and Emerging Adult Psychiatric Emergency Patients. *J Clin Child*

Adolesc Psychol 2015; 44: 751-761. 2014/05/28. DOI: 10.1080/15374416.2014.910789.

237. King CA, Jiang Q, Czyz EK, et al. Suicidal ideation of psychiatrically hospitalized adolescents has one-year predictive validity for suicide attempts in girls only. *J Abnorm Child Psychol* 2014; 42: 467-477. DOI: 10.1007/s10802-013-9794-0.

238. King CA, Kerr DC, Passarelli MN, et al. One-year follow-up of suicidal adolescents: parental history of mental health problems and time to post-hospitalization attempt. *J Youth Adolesc* 2010; 39: 219-232. 20091206. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-009-9480-2.

239. Yen S, Weinstock LM, Andover MS, et al. Prospective predictors of adolescent suicidality: 6-month post-hospitalization follow-up. *Psychol Med* 2013; 43: 983-993. 20120830. DOI: 10.1017/s0033291712001912.

240. Taylor AK, Steeg S, Quinlivan L, et al. Accuracy of individual and combined risk-scale items in the prediction of repetition of self-harm: multicentre prospective cohort study. *BJPsych Open* 2020; 7: e2. 20201202. DOI: 10.1192/bjo.2020.123.

241. Quinlivan L, Cooper J, Meehan D, et al. Predictive accuracy of risk scales following self-harm: multicentre, prospective cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry* 2017; 210: 429-436. 20170316. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.bp.116.189993.

242. Royal College of Psychiatrists. *Self-harm, suicide and risk: helping people who self-harm.* . 2010. London: Royal College of Psychiatrists,

.

243. Rees N, Rapport F and Snooks H. Perceptions of paramedics and emergency staff about the care they provide to people who self-harm: Constructivist metasynthesis of the qualitative literature. *J Psychosom Res* 2015; 78: 529-535. 20150316. DOI: 10.1016/j.jpsychores.2015.03.007.

244. Erps KH, Ochs S and Myers CL. School psychologists and suicide risk assessment: Role perception and competency. *Psychology in the Schools* 2020; 57: 884-900.

245. Health NCCfM. Self-harm: the short-term physical and psychological management and secondary prevention of self-harm in primary and secondary care. In: 2004, British Psychological Society.

246. Gipson P and King C. Health behavior theories and research: Implications for suicidal individuals' treatment linkage and adherence. *Cognitive and behavioral practice* 2012; 19: 209-217.

247. Olfson M, Gameroff MJ, Marcus SC, et al. Emergency treatment of young people following deliberate self-harm. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2005; 62: 1122-1128. DOI: 10.1001/archpsyc.62.10.1122.

248. Sisler SM, Schapiro NA, Nakaishi M, et al. Suicide assessment and treatment in pediatric primary care settings. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs* 2020; 33: 187-200. 20200622. DOI: 10.1111/jcap.12282.

249. Goodyer IM. *Suicide in children and adolescents*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

250. Practice parameter for the assessment and treatment of children and adolescents with suicidal behavior. American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2001; 40: 24s-51s. DOI: 10.1097/00004583-200107001-00003.

251. O'Reilly M, Karim K, Stafford V, et al. Identifying the interactional processes in the first assessments in child mental health. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health* 2015; 20: 195-201. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/camh.12077.

252. Barbot B, Eff H, Weiss SR, et al. The role of psychopathology in the relationship between history of maltreatment and suicide attempts among children and adolescent inpatients. *Child Adolesc Ment Health* 2021; 26: 114-121. 20200518. DOI: 10.1111/camh.12393.

253. Vatne TM, Finset A, Ørnes K, et al. Application of the verona coding definitions of emotional sequences (VR-CoDES) on a pediatric data set. *Patient Educ Couns* 2010; 80: 399-404. DOI: 10.1016/j.pec.2010.06.026.

254. Bennardi M, McMahon E, Corcoran P, et al. Risk of repeated self-harm and associated factors in children, adolescents and young adults. *BMC Psychiatry* 2016; 16: 421. 20161124. DOI: 10.1186/s12888-016-1120-2.

255. Bridge JA, Olfson M, Fontanella CA, et al. Emergency Department Recognition of Mental Disorders and Short-Term Risk of Repeat Self-Harm Among Young People Enrolled in Medicaid. *Suicide Life Threat Behav* 2018; 48: 652-660. 20170822. DOI: 10.1111/sltb.12377.

256. Sayal K, Roe J, Ball H, et al. Feasibility of a randomised controlled trial of remotely delivered problem-solving cognitive behaviour therapy versus usual care for young people with depression and repeat self-harm: lessons learnt (e-DASH). *BMC Psychiatry* 2019; 19: 42. 20190124. DOI: 10.1186/s12888-018-2005-3.

257. Troya MI, Cully G, Leahy D, et al. Investigating the relationship between childhood sexual abuse, self-harm repetition and suicidal intent: mixed-methods study. *Bjpsych Open* 2021; 7. DOI: 10.1192/bjo.2021.962.

258. Smith GL and McGuinness TM. Adolescent Psychosocial Assessment: The HEEADSSS. *J Psychosoc Nurs Ment Health Serv* 2017; 55: 24-27. DOI: 10.3928/02793695-20170420-03.

259. Armstrong M. CAMHS Self-Harm Teams and Crisis/Liaison Teams; What CAMH Nurses Bring to the Acute Moments in Young People's Lives. *Nursing Skills for Children and Young People's Mental Health*. Springer, 2020, pp.155-174.

260. NICE. Depression (amended): Management of depression in primary and secondary care. *CG23* 2007.

261. Health NCCfM. Depression: The NICE guidelines on the treatment and management of depression in adults Clinical Guideline CG90 (Updated ed.). *London: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence* 2010.

262. Richardson LP, McCauley E, Grossman DC, et al. Evaluation of the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 Item for detecting major depression among adolescents. *Pediatrics* 2010; 126: 1117-1123. 20101101. DOI: 10.1542/peds.2010-0852.

263. Fiedorowicz JG, Weldon K and Bergus G. Determining suicide risk (hint: a screen is not enough). *J Fam Pract* 2010; 59: 256-260.

264. Gibbons R. Psychological Models for Case Formulation. In: *Seminars in the Psychotherapies* 2021, p.58. Cambridge University Press.

265. Weerasekera P. *Multiperspective case formulation: A step towards treatment integration*. Krieger Publishing Company, 1996.

266. House A and Owens D. General hospital services in the UK for adults presenting after self-harm: little evidence of progress in the past 25 years. *Br J Psychiatry* 2020; 217: 661-662. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.2020.85.

267. Kapur N. Services for self-harm: progress and promise? *Br J Psychiatry* 2020; 217: 663-664. DOI: 10.1192/bjp.2020.104.

268. Kendall T, Taylor C, Bhatti H, et al. Longer term management of self harm: summary of NICE guidance. *Bmj* 2011; 343: d7073. 20111123. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.d7073.

269. Harris IM, Beese S and Moore D. Predicting repeated self-harm or suicide in adolescents and young adults using risk assessment scales/tools: a systematic review protocol. *Syst* 2019; 8: 87. Systematic Review. DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1007-7.

Appendices

Appendix 1 – MEDLINE search strategy

Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process, In-Data-Review & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Daily <1946 to September 02, 2021>

Search Strategy:

---

1 exp adolescent/ (2119054)

2 Child/ (1772715)

3 (adolescen* or boy? or boyfriend or boyhood or girlfriend or girlhood or child* or girl? or juvenil* or kid? or minors or minors* or paediatric* or peadiatric* or pediatric* or puber* or pubescen* or school* or teen* or underage? or under-age? or youth*).ti,ab,kf. (2241109)

4 or/1-3 (3895754)

5 suicide/ or suicidal ideation/ or suicide, attempted/ (61686)

6 Self-Injurious Behavior/ or Self Mutilation/ (11693)

7 (suicid* or parasuicid* or auto mutilat* or automutilat* or self destruct* or selfdestruct* or self harm* or selfharm* or self immolat* or selfimmolat* or self inflict* or selfinflict* or self injur* or selfinjur* or selfmutilat* or self mutilat* or self poison* or selfpoison* or (self adj2 (cut or cuts or cutting or cutter? or burn or burns or burning or bite or bites or biting or hit or hits or hitting)) or head bang* or headbang*).ti,ab,kf,kw. (97846)

8 Crisis Intervention/ (5851)

9 cris?s.ab,ti. (73370)

10 Mental Health/ (46480)

11 Mental Disorders/ (169157)

12 mental health.ti,ab. (165684)

13 exp Mental Health Services/ (100187)

14 or/5-13 (534832)

15 4 and 14 (154687)

16 Risk Assessment/ (287241)

17 ((risk* or psychosocial) adj3 assessment*).ab,ti. (93939)

18 (((assess* or predict* or risk*) adj2 (form*1 or checklist* or check list* or index* or indices or interview* or instrument* or inventor* or item*1 or measure* or psychometric* or question* or scale* or score* or scoring or self report* or subscale* or test* or tool*)) or (comprehensive adj (assessment* or evaluation*))).ti,ab. (382459)

19 or/16-18 (691499)

20 15 and 19 (10340)

21 exp United Kingdom/ (378288)

22 (national health service$ or nhs$).ab,in,ti. (226818)

23 (english not ((published or publication$ or translat$ or written or language$ or speak$ or literature or citation$) adj5 english)).ti,ab. (41605)

24 (gb or "g.b." or britain$ or (british$ not "british columbia") or uk or "u.k." or united kingdom$ or (england$ not "new england") or northern ireland$ or northern irish$ or scotland$ or scottish$ or ((wales or "south wales") not "new south wales") or welsh$).ab,in,jw,ti. (2218033)

25 (bath or "bath's" or ((birmingham not alabama*) or ("birmingham's" not alabama*) or bradford or "bradford's" or brighton or "brighton's" or bristol or "bristol's" or carlisle* or "carlisle's" or (cambridge not (massachusetts* or boston* or harvard*)) or ("cambridge's" not (massachusetts* or boston* or harvard*)) or (canterbury not zealand*) or ("canterbury's" not zealand*) or chelmsford or "chelmsford's" or chester or "chester's" or chichester or "chichester's" or coventry or "coventry's" or derby or "derby's" or (durham not (carolina* or nc)) or ("durham's" not (carolina* or nc)) or ely or "ely's" or exeter or "exeter's" or gloucester or "gloucester's" or hereford or "hereford's" or hull or "hull's" or lancaster or "lancaster's" or leeds* or leicester or "leicester's" or (lincoln not nebraska*) or ("lincoln's" not nebraska*) or (liverpool not

(new south wales* or nsw)) or ("liverpool's" not (new south wales* or nsw)) or ((london not (ontario* or ont or toronto*)) or ("london's" not (ontario* or ont or toronto*)) or manchester or "manchester's" or (newcastle not (new south wales* or nsw)) or ("newcastle's" not (new south wales* or nsw)) or norwich or "norwich's" or nottingham or "nottingham's" or oxford or "oxford's" or peterborough or "peterborough's" or plymouth or "plymouth's" or portsmouth or "portsmouth's" or preston or "preston's" or ripon or "ripon's" or salford or "salford's" or salisbury or "salisbury's" or sheffield or "sheffield's" or southampton or "southampton's" or st albans or stoke or "stoke's" or sunderland or "sunderland's" or truro or "truro's" or wakefield or "wakefield's" or wells or westminster or "westminster's" or winchester or "winchester's" or wolverhampton or "wolverhampton's" or (worcester not (massachusetts* or boston* or harvard*)) or ("worcester's" not (massachusetts* or boston* or harvard*)) or (york not ("new york*" or ny or ontario* or ont or toronto*)) or ("york's" not ("new york*" or ny or ontario* or ont or toronto*))))).ti,ab,in. (1540924)

26 (bangor or "bangor's" or cardiff or "cardiff's" or newport or "newport's" or st asaph or "st asaph's" or st davids or swansea or "swansea's").ti,ab,in. (61304)

27 (aberdeen or "aberdeen's" or dundee or "dundee's" or edinburgh or "edinburgh's" or glasgow or "glasgow's" or inverness or (perth not australia*) or ("perth's" not australia*) or stirling or "stirling's").ti,ab,in. (227664)

28 (armagh or "armagh's" or belfast or "belfast's" or lisburn or "lisburn's" or londonderry or "londonderry's" or derry or "derry's" or newry or "newry's").ti,ab,in. (29131)

29 or/21-28 (2786627)

30 (exp africa/ or exp americas/ or exp antarctic regions/ or exp arctic regions/ or exp asia/ or exp oceania/) not (exp great britain/ or europe/) (3072494)

31 29 not 30 (2647369)

32 20 and 31 (1310)

33 limit 32 to yr="2011 -Current" (892)

34 limit 33 to english language (889)

****

Appendix 2 - Risk Assessment Pathway

This risk assessment pathway is based largely upon NICE guidance and descriptive papers that outline the steps of the risk assessment process. This work underpinned the realist synthesis allowing identification of critical points that lead to variation in outcomes. Table 7 in the main report provides a condensed version of this process.

The Overall Pathway

Non-mental health professionals, such as paediatricians and registered children's nurses, are increasingly involved in conducting an initial assessment of these children.[1] Not only must they identify the immediate physical and emotional health needs of these children but they also need to assess any immediate risk of suicide and self-harm. In contrast with specialist mental healthcare delivered by professionals (including psychiatrists, nurses, social workers and psychologists) with specialist training, skills and knowledge[2] these health professionals receive little specialist mental health training.[88]

Risk assessment is a critical step towards a formulation, treatment plan and successful intervention. Not only does it seek to respond appropriately to children and adolescents at risk of self-harm, suicidal ideation and suicide attempt, it is also important in managing those children who might not currently require the most urgent level of response, potentially diverting staff resources from where they are needed at that particular point in time.

As this report makes clear, evidence suggests that risk assessment tools are no more accurate at predicting risk than expert specialist mental health professional clinical judgement. Assessments focus on immediate (i.e. hours or days) risks of self-harm or suicide while in receipt of acute paediatric care. Additionally, assessments are performed in time-limited circumstances in children and adolescents with potentially dynamic and fluctuating mental health.[1] Therefore, when implementing a plan of care where immediate risks can be mitigated, healthcare professionals require appropriate support and guidance. NICE guidelines feature numerous risk assessment components.[14] Previous incidents of self-harm is the most common characteristic incorporated into risk assessments.

Setting

Children or adolescents at risk are most likely to present to primary care, and accident and emergency departments. Acute paediatric care settings place unique demands upon assessment of risk for suicide or self-harm.[1] Paediatricians and registered children's nurses lead initial triage and care of children and adolescents in acute paediatric settings, including emergency departments and paediatric inpatient wards.[2]

Self-harm is one of the top five causes of acute medical admission to hospitals,[242] yet only a minority (10–20%) present to hospital.[243] Prevalence is probably between 1% and 5% of the general population. In addition, significant concerns may be raised within a school context or when the family or individual engages with social services. Teachers and other school personnel who interact with students daily have a unique opportunity and responsibility to be aware of, and recognize, signs of suicide.[244], Typically, their response is to try to ensure that the young person seeks to access health or mental health services.

Initial triage and care

NICE (2004) guidelines on self harm advocate that children and adolescents who self harm should be assessed for risk.[88, 245] This initial stage seeks to ensure that children and adolescents are appropriately assessed such that they are safe until definitive and expert mental health assessment is undertaken. Nursing professionals identify providing care for children and adolescents experiencing mental health crisis as one of the most complex and stressful duties undertaken in practice.[95] Poor experience and outcome at this acute phase may trigger a knock-on negative impact on adherence with follow-up and future mental health. Non-adherence to follow-up is, in turn, a predictor of poor outcomes, seen not only in repeated self-harm and suicide but also in numerous diverse psychosocial outcomes.[246]

Assessment

Where immediate physical care is not required, children or adolescents may spend over 5 hours in emergency departments before receipt of specialised healthcare or assessment.[50] A health professional assessing children and adolescents who are experiencing a mental health crisis should (i) identify the main clinical and

demographic features known to be associated with their mental health crisis and(ii) identify the key psychological characteristics associated with risk, in particular depression, hopelessness and continuing suicidal intent.[245] In addition, they should address any immediate physical health needs.[247] The health professional should ensure the safety of the child or adolescent until expert assessment is undertaken by specialist mental health professionals.[2]

Risk assessment requires identification of any positive risk factors as well as any relevant protective factors. A structured assessment comprises multiple steps:[58]

(1) Take a chronological history of the event.[248]

(2) Identify mental or physical illness by history and examine the patient's mental state.

(3) Conduct a risk assessment and, finally, based on the risk assessment

(4) Identify management options.

Invariably health professionals have to conduct assessments in time limited circumstances and with children and adolescents with potentially changing mental health status. Therefore, they focus the assessment on identifying the most pertinent risks (i.e., immediate risk of self-harm or suicide). They also take into account risk factors, coping abilities and assessment of lethality of previous suicidal and self-harm behaviour.[249] Such factors can help staff to differentiate between high-risk and low-risk suicidal and self-harm behaviours.[250] For each young person staff will also consider their emotional regulation ability, communication style, readiness to engage and to accept help, and where they are positioned in their illness/recovery trajectory. Key components include introductions, reasons for attendance, problem presentation, decision-making and session closure.[251] Health professionals try to identify relevant stress factors that might have influenced the patient, which could be targeted for future management.[58] Risk factors can include a heightened vulnerability for stigma, guilt, and acute distress.[252] Furthermore, they consider the seriousness of the patient's intent.[248] Assessment explores the person's family, social situation, and child protection issues.

Risk assessment should also consider the developmental age of the children and adolescents as children can often find verbal expression difficult, especially when in emotional distress.[253] Where young persons find it difficult to disclose feelings or emotions (e.g., adolescent males), risk assessment tools may offer a mechanism by which they can express and describe their feelings and distress. Otherwise a young person may simply choose not to engage at all. Furthermore, the risk assessment should include assessment of previous A&E presentations[1] as this represents one of the strongest predictors of future A&E re-attendance.[254]

Biopsychosocial assessment

Most sources endorse a thorough biopsychosocial assessment [164, 255-257]. This may be challenging given time pressures. A holistic biopsychosocial assessment, that includes but does not focus upon risk assessment, may not be viewed as important within a culture that focuses on risk aversion. Mental health professionals need to be vigilant for a broad range of biopsychosocial factors when conducting a risk assessment.[252] If health professionals outside of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (such as paediatricians and children's nurses) are to implement a plan of care that seeks to mitigate immediate risks, they need to be supported in making an informed assessment.

The HEEADSSS assessment is considered by some as a practical, youth-relevant strategy for adolescent patients who attend A&E with self-harm/mental health concerns.[258] The HEEADSSS assessment provides a systematic approach to developing rapport with the young person and performing a holistic, biopsychosocial resilience and risk assessment across the domains of home, education, eating (and/or employment), activities, drugs and alcohol, sexuality, suicide, and mental health and safety.

Perspectives of Health Professionals

NICE clinical guidelines (CG 16) state that children and young people should be assessed by professionals experienced in the assessment of children and young people who self-harm.[14] Mental health nurses may be concerned about the influence of risk assessment on their relationship with service users and may feel that they have to emphasize risk avoidance in order to maintain safety.[5, 54]

General Practitioners (GPs)

GPs should respect the young person's desire for privacy. They should ensure that young people are aware of how their information is collected, stored and used, and doing so is likely to result in improved disclosure of suicidal behaviours and/or self-harm.[59] Time constraints pose a significant barrier to empathetic listening and sensitive discussion. The challenge for GPs and other time-pressured individuals is how to ensure that young people experience a positive therapeutic interaction during their engagement with services. Youth-friendly care, including being non-judgemental, genuine, respectful, empathetic, and listening, may help to promote a sense of connection and being cared for, and inspire hope. Positive interactions may also address barriers to disclosure and identification of suicidal behaviour and/or self-harm, laying a foundation for open and honest communication.

GPs may feel that they lack the confidence and skills to enquire about and discuss suicidality and self-harm with young people.[59] They may also worry about possible negative outcomes associated with asking about these issues. Negative reactions from GPs to a disclosure could serve to escalate or exacerbate the young person's symptoms. Young people, and GP themselves, have expressed how they would welcome training for GPs in communication skills to overcome this obstacle to providing patient-centred care [59]. Indeed, some anxiety over negative outcomes seems to stem from recognition that GPs could conduct these assessments and then refer to CAMHS services.

CAMHS staff

Different CAMHS across the UK have different structures and teams. Often CAMHS services may include self-harm teams or crisis/liaison teams whose role is to undertake urgent hospital/community assessments.[259] The majority of staff in these teams are mental health nurses.[259] Staff working within CAMHS report feeling more effective than A&E staff and teachers in responding to adolescent self-harm behaviour.[92] In feeling more effective they also felt less negative. It has been suggested that CAMHS staff may have invested more in the therapeutic relationship with young people and thereby have a better understanding than staff assigned to treat those who self-harm medically.[92]

Intervention

Risk assessment tools and scales are usually checklists to be completed and scored by a health professional or, sometimes, by the service user. They are designed to give a crude indication of the level of risk (for example, high or low) of a particular outcome, most often suicide. The use of risk scales for suicidal ideation or behaviour is controversial.[114] Some clinical guidance advises the use of risk scales over locally developed proformas, but others argue that scales should only be used to structure assessments and not to predict future risk of suicidal behaviour or decide upon aftercare [16, 240]. Quinlivan and colleagues investigated the use of risk scales following self-harm within National Health Service (NHS) emergency departments and specialist mental health treatment settings. The most frequently used suicide risk assessment instruments were unvalidated, locally developed scales [114]. Indeed, 22 of 32 (68.8%) English hospitals included in the study used an unvalidated instrument. The authors concluded that there is presently little consensus among clinicians and hospital systems regarding the best instrument to use to assess suicide risk.[114] In the remaining third of English hospitals included in the study, the SAD PERSONS scale (SPS) emerged as the most frequently used standardized approach to suicide risk assessment. The SAD PERSONS scale has been implemented despite evidence suggesting it is no better than chance at predicting future suicide attempts among ED psychiatric patients.[179] There is growing evidence that risk scales do not accurately predict repeat self-harm and suicide.[16115, 240] and this has been demonstrated specifically in scales for children and adolescents.[16]

Currently, GPs may use the patient health questionnaire (PHQ-9) for assessing and monitoring depression[260] and 'biopsychosocial assessments' to assess patients' risk.[261] Biopsychosocial assessments are designed to offer a holistic assessment about diverse factors, not exclusively risk of self-harm and suicide. A study of the usability of the PHQ-9 in an adolescent population (13-17 year olds) concluded that it is an excellent tool for screening depression with this age range in primary care settings.[262] Psychosocial assessment instruments have been developed to provide health care professionals in multidisciplinary contexts with a framework with which to discuss young people’s psychological, social, behavioral, and environmental

concerns. NICE guideline (CG 133) suggests areas to be included in a structured risk assessment.[14]

The NICE guideline (CG 133) cautions that a health professional:[14]

- Should not use risk assessment tools and scales to predict future suicide or repetition of self-harm.
- Should not use risk assessment tools and scales to determine who should and should not be offered treatment or who should be discharged.
- May use risk assessment tools to help structure risk assessments as long as they include the areas identified in Box 2.

Evidence confirms that health professionals should not be afraid of discussing suicide with the patient; doing so does not make a suicide attempt more likely to happen again.[263] When discussing the outcome of the incident, a health professional should ask whether the patient regrets either their attempt or the failure of their attempt, and how they are likely to act in the future if the same stress factor presents itself.[58] This approach is a useful marker of risk, although determined patients may be able to hide their emotions and future intent.

Follow Up

Young people emphasise the importance of follow-up after a presentation involving risk of suicidal behaviour or self-harm. Active follow-up by GPs can "provide an opportunity for further assistance, strengthen the therapeutic relationship and potentially mitigate isolation, hopelessness and increased vulnerability that can occur with disengagement".[59] Health professionals should use information gained to plan follow up in the form of:

(i) a care plan, and

(ii) a risk management plan in conjunction with the person who self-harms and their family, carers or significant others if agreed with the person.

They should provide copies for the service user and share them with their GP. If there is disagreement between health and social care professionals and the person who self-harms about their needs or risks, the young person could be given the opportunity to write this in their notes.

Risk formulation

Health professionals should begin by summarising key areas of needs and identifying the risks and triggers, and how these interact. The information gained is then used to develop a risk formulation and management plan.[149] The risk formulation is a brief summarising statement of an estimate of the nature and level of perceived risks, the target of these risks and the time-scale of the risk prediction.[149] Typically the risk formulation (i) identifies 'why' someone engages in problematic behaviour not just 'if' they will engage in it, and (ii) goes beyond simply identifying risk factors to thinking about how key variables interact and connect in the expression of risk.[38] Twenty-nine (34%) of 85 services surveyed used the 'five Ps model' (facilitating the understanding of a case, its context and the way in which factors interact)[264] to underpin risk formulation [265].

Longer-term treatment and management of self-harm

Mental health services (including community mental health teams and liaison psychiatry teams) are generally responsible for the routine assessment and the longer-term treatment and management of self-harm.[266, 267] In children and young people this should be the responsibility of the CAMHS. The following section is largely based upon the NICE Guideline (CG 133)[14] and an associated commentary.[268]

Care plans

Care plans should be multidisciplinary and developed collaboratively with the person who self-harms and, provided the person agrees, with their family, carers or significant others.[268] Members of the team should discuss, agree and document the aims of longer-term treatment in the care plan.[14] They should review the person's care plan with them, including the aims of treatment, and revise it at agreed intervals of not more than one year.

Risk management plans

A risk management plan should be clearly identifiable within the overall care plan and should:[14]

- address each of the long-term and more immediate risks identified in the risk assessment

- address specific factors (psychological, pharmacological, social and relational) identified as associated with increased risk, with the agreed aim of reducing the risk of repetition of self-harm and/or the risk of suicide
- include a crisis plan outlining self-management strategies and how to access services during a crisis when self-management strategies fail
- ensure consistency with the long-term treatment strategy.

The team should inform the person who self-harms of the limits of confidentiality and that information in the plan may be shared with other professionals.[14] Risk management plans should be updated, to include monitoring changes in risk and specific associated factors for the service user, and evaluation of the impact of treatment strategies over time.

Appendix 3 - Evidence Included from Realist Synthesis

Table 18 - Evidence Included from Realist Synthesis

Publication Identifier	Relevance	Publication/ Study Type	Aim	Results	Implications
Ambresin et al (2017)[96] Australia and Switzerland	***	RCT	To investigate whether training intervention increases general practitioners' (GPs) detection sensitivity for probable mental disorders in young people.	GPs' detection sensitivity improved after intervention if having probable mental disorder was defined as high K10 score and self-perceived mental illness (odds ratio: 2.81; 95% confidence interval: 1.23-6.42). No significant difference in sensitivity of GPs' detection for preferred definition, high K10 or self-perceived mental illness (.37 in both; odds ratio: .93; 95% CI: .47-1.83). Detection accuracy comparable (specificity: .84 vs. .87, positive predictive values: .54 vs. .60, and negative predictive values: .72 vs. .72).	Improving recognition of mental disorder among young people attending primary care is likely to require a multifaceted approach targeting young people and GPs.

Anderson & Standen (2007)[57]	***	Questionnaire study	To investigate the attitudes towards suicide in nurses and doctors who work with children and young people who self-harm	179 nurses and doctors working in accident and emergency; paediatric medicine and adolescent inpatient mental health services. Nurses and doctors indicated agreement on Mental Illness, Cry for Help, Right to Die, Impulsivity, Normality and Aggression scales, and less agreement on the Religion and Moral Evil scale. Only scores for Mental Illness statistically different by professional group	Complex attitudes need to be take into account in training for healthca professionals and in the developm of contemporary suicide preventio policy.
Ballard et al (2012)[79]	***	Qualitative study	To understand how children react to suicide screening in an emergency department (ED) to inform implementation strategies.	106/156 patients (68%) presented to ED with non-psychiatric complaints and 50 (32%) presented with psychiatric complaints. All patients answered the question of interest, and 149 (96%) of 156 patients supported idea that nurses should ask youth about suicide in the ED. Most frequently endorsed themes:	Pediatric patients in the ED suppo suicide screening after being aske number of suicide-related questio Further work should evaluate the impact of suicide screening on referral practices and link screenin efforts with evidence-based interventions.

				(1) identification of youth at risk (20%), (2) desire to feel known and understood by clinicians (20%), (3) connection of youth with help/resources (18%), (4) prevention of suicidal behavior (16%), and (5) lack of other individuals to speak to about these issues (12%).	
Bee et al (2015)[98]	*	Qualitative interviews and focus groups with data combined and subjected to framework analysis.	To explore professional perceptions of delivering collaborative mental health care-planning and involving service users and carers in their care.	Care-planning reveals philosophical tensions between user involvement and professional accountability. Professionals emphasised individual, relational skills as core facilitator of involvement, highlighting important deficiencies in conventional staff training programmes.	User-involved care-planning is poo defined and lacks effective implementation support. It requires greater recognition of the historica and contemporary contexts in whic statutory mental healthcare occurs
Boland & Bremner (2013)[45]	*	Opinion piece	To explore challenges of developing clinical risk management practice and	Explores how clinical risk relates to clinical quality. Benefits of standardisation explored. Highlights complexities and conflicts of	Using concepts from strategic planning and psychology, suggests an approach to respond to these factors at a local level to achieve

			policy within large mental healthcare organisations.	implementing standardised procedures, given evidence base, and difficulties when applying to clinical practice.	better outcomes for service users a clinicians.
Brown et al (2020)[75]	***	Quality improvement initiative	To outline novel systems-level approach to objectively differentiate level of severity for each suicide risk presentation and provide fast-track pathways for all, including life-threatening cases.	Organisation-wide bespoke "suicide risk triage" system utilising Collaborative Assessment and Management of Suicidality (CAMS) was implemented across all services. Preliminary impacts on suicidality, suicide rates and service user outcomes were described.	Implemented in English NHS secondary care mental health provider open-access 24/7 crisis a home treatment service.
Burns et al (2005)[84]	**	Systematic review	To examine the evidence for the effectiveness of clinical interventions designed to reduce the repetition of self-harm in adolescents and young adults.	Three RCTs, four clinical control trials and three quasi-experimental studies were identified. Group therapy, trialled in a RCT, was only programme which led to a significant reduction in rates of repetition of self-harm. Attendance at follow-up did not improve significantly regardless of the intervention. One	The evidence base for treatments designed to reduce the repetition o self-harm in adolescents and youn adults is very limited. Expensive interventions such as intensive aftercare offer no clear benefit ove routine aftercare. Given that self-harm among young people is a common clinical problem further g

				clinically controlled trial of intensive intervention resulted in poorer attendance at follow-up. One quasi-experimental study of family therapy resulted in significant reduction in suicidal ideation.	quality treatment studies are warranted. Process evaluation required to determine which indivic components of any given intervent are effective.
Carter et al (2017)[116]	**	Systematic review and meta-analysis	To identify studies of predictive instruments and to calculate POSITIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE estimates for suicidal behaviours.	For all scales combined, pooled POSITIVE PREDICTIVE VALUEs were: suicide 5.5% (95% CI 3.9-7.9%), self-harm 26.3% (95% CI 21.8-31.3%) and self-harm plus suicide 35.9% (95% CI 25.8-47.4%). Sub-analyses on self-harm found pooled POSITIVE PREDICTIVE VALUEs of 16.1% (95% CI 11.3-22.3%) for high-quality studies, 32.5% (95% CI 26.1-39.6%) for hospital-treated self-harm and 26.8% (95% CI 19.5-35.6%) for psychiatric in-patients.	No 'high-risk' classification was clinically useful. Prevalence impos a ceiling on POSITIVE PREDICTIV VALUE. Treatment should reduce exposure to modifiable risk factors and offer effective interventions for selected subpopulations and unselected clinical populations.

Chan et al (2016)[112]	**	Systematic review and meta-analysis	To undertake first systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective studies of risk factors and risk assessment scales to predict suicide following self-harm.	Twelve studies on risk factors and 7 studies on risk scales included. Four risk factors emerged from meta-analysis, with robust effect sizes that showed little change when adjusted for confounders. These included: previous episodes of self-harm (hazard ratio (HR) = 1.68, 95% CI 1.38-2.05, K = 4), suicidal intent (HR = 2.7, 95% CI 1.91-3.81, K = 3), physical health problems (HR = 1.99, 95% CI 1.16-3.43, K = 3) and male gender (HR = 2.05, 95% CI 1.70-2.46, K = 5). Studies evaluated only three risk scales (Beck Hopelessness Scale (BHS), Suicide Intent Scale (SIS) and Scale for Suicide Ideation). Meta-analyses where possible (BHS, SIS) were based on sparse data and high heterogeneity was observed.	The four risk factors that emerged, although of interest, are unlikely to of practical use being comparative common in clinical populations. No scales have sufficient evidence to support their use. Use of these scales, or an over-reliance on the identification of risk factors in clinic practice, may provide false reassurance and is, therefore, potentially dangerous. Comprehensive psychosocial assessments of the risks and need that are specific to the individual should be central to management people who have self-harmed.

				Positive predictive values ranged from 1.3 to 16.7%.	
Clancy et al (2014)[49]	*	Qualitative, exploratory approach using individual interviews and focus groups	To enhance understanding of how risk is conceptualised within an older persons' setting.	Language of risk was major theme. This language, familiar to providers of services, was not familiar to consumers and carers. A reframing of risk is necessary to reflect consumers' and carers' experiences and understandings.	Approach will be essential in promoting consumer and carer participation within recovery-based services, reflecting significant goal government policy.
Clancy & Happell (2014)[107]	*	Qualitative exploratory methods.	To understand the impact of risk management and assessment on the delivery of mental health care from the perspectives of managers and clinicians.	Identified tensions between accountability and attending to risk issues and consumer-centred care, with concerns being raised that procedural and bureaucratic accountability influence (often negatively) provision of care. Different perspectives of Clinicians and managers have different perspectives in relation to how they	Prioritising risk management may interfere with capacity of clinicians and managers to provide quality a consumer-focused mental health care. Deeper examination and reconceptualisation of role and importance of risk in mental health care needed to ensure service delivery remains consumer-focuse

				see evidence-based practice contributing to risk.	
Crawford et al (2003)[88]	***	Questionnaire survey	To investigate knowledge, attitudes and training needs concerning self-harm in adolescents, amongst professionals involved in the assessment and management of adolescence who self-harm.	Mean percentage of correctly answered knowledge questions, across all professional groups, was 60%. With regard to knowledge, over three-quarters of participants were unaware that homosexual young men and those who had been sexually abused are at greater risk of self-harm. One third of staff were unaware that adolescents who self-harm are at increased risk of suicide. Staff who felt more effective felt less negative towards this group of patients.	Forty-two per cent of the participar wanted further training in self harm amongst adolescents.
Cutcliffe & Barker (2002)[64]	*	Discussion paper	To explore contested positions regarding appropriate care for the person who is at risk of suicide; summarized as the	Describes policy context of care for the suicidal client. Focuses on 'observations' and identifies well-established, empirically based drawbacks to approach. Then	Reiterates need to replace 'observations' with 'engagement-h inspiration' as principal approach t

			'engagement and hope inspiration' position and the 'observations' position.	focuses on 'engagement, inspiring hope' and points out key processes of engagement: forming a relationship, a human-human connection, conveying acceptance and tolerance, and hearing and understanding. Considers criticisms of engagement-inspiring hope approach in detail.	caring for suicidal mental health clients.
Dazzi et al (2014)[73]	**	Literature review	To conduct review of published literature examining whether enquiring about suicide induces suicidal ideation in adults and adolescents, and general and at-risk populations.	No studies found statistically significant increase in suicidal ideation among participants asked about suicidal thoughts. Findings suggest acknowledging and talking about suicide may reduce, rather than increase suicidal ideation, and may lead to improvements in mental health in treatment-seeking populations.	Recurring ethical concerns about asking about suicidality could be relaxed to encourage and improve research into suicidal ideation and related behaviours without negativ affecting the well-being of participants.

DeCou & Schumann (2018)[74]	**	Systematic review and meta-analysis	To quantitatively synthesized research concerning iatrogenic risks of assessing suicidality	Thirteen articles met inclusion criteria. Evaluation of pooled effect of assessing suicidality for negative outcomes did not demonstrate significant iatrogenic effects.	Findings support appropriateness universal screening for suicidality, and should allay fears that assessi suicidality is harmful.
Downes et al (2016)[5]	**	Anonymous survey with 13 attitudinal statements, rated on five-point Likert scale, completed by 381 mental health nurses working in adult services in Ireland.	To explore mental health nurses' attitudes towards completing RAs, use of tools as an aid, and therapeutic or positive risk.	Indicates strong support for RA. Nurses believe that RA tools facilitate professional decision making but express concern that use of tools may negatively impact upon therapeutic engagement with service users. Most participants have positive attitudes towards therapeutic risk, believing service users have the right to take informed risks within recovery-orientated care.	Relevance limited by adult service and context of Ireland.
Felton et al (2018)[55].	*	Case study inquiry, using interviews with	To explore how practitioners, experience potential tensions arising from delivering	Hilgartner's theory of risk explains how risk dominates identity of people with mental health problems	To undermine dominance of risk, professionals should reconnect wit the subjective experiences of peop

		mental health professionals and observations in acute ward and assertive outreach team.	recovery-orientated care and enforcing containment.	at cost of recovery. This results in increased monitoring, surveillance and medication to enact control.	with mental health problems and challenge the acceptance of risk a central to their role.
Flintoff et al (2019)[68]	*	Discourse theory	To present an analysis of audio recordings of risk assessments completed within a primary care mental health service.	Assessments function according to social logics of well-oiled administration and preservation, whereby bureaucratic processes are prioritised, contingency ironed out or ignored, and a need to manage potential risks to the service are dominant operational frames.	Observed processes obscure or background problems with risk assessment, by generating practic that favour and offer protection to assessors, at the expense of those being assessed, to challenge state aims of risk assessment practice.
Godin (2004)[66]	**	Interviews with 20 community mental health nurses from various	To develop greater understanding of how community mental health nurses, who have become frontline operatives of new regime of community mental health care, reflect on and	Some nurses considered standardised methods of risk assessment to be too reductive, stifling and unnecessary, whilst others found them useful and informative. 'Professional intuition' was valued by many as an	Highly rational new regime of community mental health care ("epidemiological clinic") has not h a totalising effect on work of community mental health nurses.

		geographical and practice areas	practise risk assessment and risk management.	alternative method of risk assessment, particularly when assessing their own safety. Though their risk assessments concentrated on assessment of patients' potential to harm others or themselves, some thought about risk in terms of risks faced by their clients from iatrogenic consequences of treatment and psychiatric care, and of victimisation within a hostile community.	
Granello (2010)[117]	**	Discussion paper	To articulate guiding principles of the process of suicide assessment	Contains 12 core process principles that highlight broader philosophical tenets to guide suicide risk assessment.	Twelve principles serve as to complement the current focus on content in suicide assessment.
Graney et al (2020)[83]	***	Survey of views from clinicians, service-users and carers on use of	To examine which suicide RA tools are in use in UK; establish views of clinicians, carers, and service users on the use of these tools; and identify how risk assessment	Obtained 156 RA tools from all 85 UK NHS mental health organisations. 85 tools included in analysis. Little consistency in use of instruments. 39% of organisations use locally developed tools. Most	Comprehensive coverage of UK mental health organizations

		risk assessment tools	tools have been used with mental health patients before suicide.	tools aimed to predict self-harm or suicidal behaviour and scores used to determine management decisions. Clinicians described positive (facilitating communication and enhancing therapeutic relationships) and negative views (inadequate training and time-consuming nature). Patients/carers reported positive views, but emphasised little involvement and lack of clarity on what to do in a crisis.	
Harris et al (2019)[16, 269]	***	Systematic review of cohort studies, case–control studies and randomised controlled trials	To evaluate the ability of risk tools to predict the future episodes of suicide/self-harm in adolescents.	Predictive ability of 10 tools (across 11 studies) varies greatly. No single tool is suitable for predicting higher risk of suicide or self-harm in adolescent populations.	First systematic review to explore of tools to predict future self-harm/ future suicide attempts in an adolescent population. High heterogeneity means that meta-analysis was not possible. Results highlight need for further risk prediction work.

Higgins et al (2016)[72]	**	Self-completed survey administered to 381 mental health nurses in Ireland. (See Downes et al [5] (above)	To explore mental health nurses' practices and confidence in RA and safety planning	Nurses focus on risk to self and risk to others. Risk from others and 'iatrogenic' risk were less frequently considered. Results demonstrate lack of engagement with respect to collaborative safety planning, identification and inclusion of protective factors, and inclusion of positive risk-taking opportunities. Respondents report lack of confidence working with positive risk taking and involving family/carers in RA and safety-planning.	Relevance limited by adult service and context of Ireland.
Horowitz et al (2010)[78]	***	Suicide screening using Suicide Ideation Questionnaire	To determine the feasibility of screening children for suicide risk when they present to the emergency department (ED) with non-psychiatric complaints	For patients entering ED for non-psychiatric reasons (n = 106), 5.7% (n = 6) reported previous suicidal behavior, and 5.7% (n = 6) reported clinically significant suicidal ideation. No significant differences for mean length of stay in ED for non-psychiatric patients with positive	Suicide screening of non-psychiatr patients in the ED is feasible in ter of acceptability to parents, prevale of suicidal thoughts and behaviour practicality to ED flow, and patient opinion. Future efforts should addr brief screening tools validated on non-psychiatric populations.

				triggers and those who screened negative . 96% of participants agreed that suicide screening should occur in the ED.	
Horowitz et al (2009)[99]	**	Case studies	To review suicide screening in three different settings: schools, primary care clinics and emergency departments (EDs)	Valid, brief and easy-to-administer screening tools can be utilized to detect risk of suicide in children and adolescents. Targeted suicide screening in schools, and universal suicide screening in primary care clinics and EDs may be most effective way to recognize and prevent self-harm.	Settings must be equipped to manage youth who screen positive with effective and timely interventions. Most importantly, impact of suicide screening in vari settings needs to be further assessed.
Jackson et al (2019)[97]	***	Before-after study. Carer-nurse risk consensus scores measured pre- and post-introduction of a	To investigate the impact of an intervention on consensus between nurses and carers on perceptions of risk	Findings support increasing carer contribution to discussions regarding risk. Further work required to embed carer involvement.	

		structured dialogue			
Jahn et al (2016)[89]	*	Quantitative survey	To identify what may contribute to fear of patient death by suicide by examining relations between suicide-focused training, professional experience, fear of suicide-related outcomes, comfort with and skills in working with suicidal patients, and knowledge of suicide risk and protective factors.	Practitioners who worked with suicidal patients reported more knowledge of suicide risk and protective factors but did not report significantly different fear of patient death by suicide or patient suicide attempt than practitioners who did not work with suicidal patients.	Results suggest that suicide-focus training may be critical to reducing practitioner fear of negative suicide related outcomes and increasing comfort working with suicidal individuals. Providing such training may improve practitioners' knowle and skills, enhancing clinical outcomes.
Kleiman et al (2017)[71]	*	Ecological studies	To examine: (a) How does suicidal ideation vary over short periods of time?, and (b) To what degree do risk factors for suicidal ideation vary over short periods and are such changes associated	For nearly all participants, suicidal ideation varied dramatically over course of most days: more than one-quarter of all ratings of suicidal ideation were a standard deviation above/below previous response from few hours earlier. Nearly all participants had at least 1 instance	These studies represent the most fine-grained examination of suicida ideation ever conducted. Results advance understanding of how suicidal ideation changes over sho periods and provide a novel metho

			with changes in suicidal ideation?	of intensity of suicidal ideation changing from one response to the next. Across both studies, risk factors for suicidal ideation (e.g. hopelessness, burdensomeness, and loneliness) varied considerably over just a few hours and correlated with suicidal ideation, but limited in predicting short-term change in suicidal ideation.	of improving the short-term predict of suicidal ideation.
Last et al (2013)[42]	***	Questionnaire(s)	To explore whether completion of structured diagnostic assessments as an adjunct to clinical assessment avoids placing too great a burden to parents and services, and if the resulting information is useful to practitioners.	Most parents found interview easy to understand. Many reported that experience of completing the interview changed how they thought about their child's difficulties in a positive manner. Practitioner reports were mainly positive. Mean helpfulness score (out of 1-5 for very unhelpful to very helpful) was 4.04. No association between practitioner access to DAWBA and parent	With right supporting arrangement place, the DAWBA would be feasib assessment tool in community CAMHS.

				reported satisfaction on Experiences of Services Questionnaire.	
Leavey et al (2017)[100]	**	Qualitative study of 72 relatives or close friends bereaved by suicide and 19 GPs who have experienced the suicide of patients.	To examine systemic inadequacies in suicide prevention from the perspectives of bereaved family members and GPs.	Relatives highlight failures in detecting symptoms and behavioural changes and the inability of GPs to understand the needs of patients and their social contexts. A perceived overreliance on anti-depressants is a major source of criticism by family members. GPs lack confidence in recognition and management of suicidal patients, and report structural inadequacies in service provision.	Mental health and primary care services must find innovative and ethical ways to involve families in t decision-making process for patien at risk of suicide.
LoParo et al (2019)[90]	*	Zero Suicide Workforce Survey: measure to evaluate staff knowledge, practices, and	To examine whether (1) behavioral health providers were more likely to implement best practices when they were more confident in their abilities, (2)	Moderate association between provider's practice and confidence. The number of attended trainings had a significant correlation with both practice and confidence. Particular trainings demonstrated	Results suggest that behavioral health providers who are confident their skills in assessing and treatin suicide risk are more likely incorporate best practices into thei clinical work. Also, it appears there

		confidence in caring for patients at risk of suicide.	number of suicide prevention trainings was positively associated with perceived confidence in abilities and implementation of evidence-based practices, and (3) specific trainings were more impactful than others on increasing providers' level of confidence and/or practices.	differential effects on provider's practice and confidence.	a small but significant benefit to multiple trainings for increasing bo practice and confidence among providers.
Manuel & Crowe (2014)[123]	*	Descriptive, qualitative design	To examine how mental health nurses understood clinical responsibility and its impact on their practice	Three major themes: Being accountable involves weighing up patients' therapeutic needs against potential for blame in organizational culture of risk management. Fostering patient responsibility describes deciding when patients could take responsibility for their behaviour. Shifting responsibility describes culture of defensive	Highlights the challenges mental health nurses experience in relatio to clinical responsibility in practice, including the balancing required between the needs of patients, the needs of the organization, and the perceived need for self-protection.

				practice fostered by organizational risk aversion.	
Mathias et al (2012)[81]	*	Repeated testing of suicidal ideation at 6-month intervals for up to 2-years.	To examine if asking about suicidal thoughts can result in iatrogenic increases of such thoughts, especially among at-risk samples.	Change in suicidal ideation tested using several analytic techniques, each pointed to a significant decline in suicidal ideation in the context of repeated assessment.	Suggests that asking an at-risk population about suicidal ideation i not associated with subsequent increases in suicidal ideation.
McCallum et al (2014)[46]	*	Literature review	To explore why structured clinical judgement is not utilized more in front-line assessment of risk for violence in those with mental and personality disorders	Literature review on mental disorder and violence, risk assessment and risk management suggests that front-line mental health professionals can employ structured clinical judgement underpinned by principles of risk assessment tools.	Ongoing resource development, education and availability of exper should aid development of uniform approaches to violence risk management and therapeutic amelioration of the likelihood for violence.
Michail et al (2016)[87] UK	***	Qualitative focus group study using framework analysis.	To explore general practitioner (GP) views and experiences of assessing, communicating with and managing suicidal young people with the aim of co-	3 themes emerged from data in relation to GP's attitudes and beliefs towards suicide; the challenges GPs experience when it comes to the assessment and management of suicide risk in young people; and	Reveals wide variations in understanding and operationalisati of risk among GPs, with subseque implications to how GPs perceive r should be assessed. GP educatior on suicide risk assessment and

			producing an educational intervention on youth suicide prevention tailored to GPs' perceived needs.	optimal ways of addressing some of these challenges through the provision of specialist education and training targeting GPs' knowledge and clinical skills.	management in youth should prom holistic understanding and assessment of risk and its individu social and contextual influences.
Muir-Cochrane et al (2011)[121]	**	Qualitative study	To investigate the risk assessment practices of a multidisciplinary mental health service.	Mental health professionals draw on both managerial and therapeutic approaches to risk management, integrating these approaches into their clinical practice.	Rather than being dominated by managerial concerns regarding ris participants demonstrate professio autonomy and concern for needs o their clients.
Mulder et al (2016)[126]	*	Discussion paper	To explore the value of risk prediction in psychiatry	Significant efforts have been made to identify risk factors associated with suicide. Evidence suggests that risk categorisation may be of limited value, or worse, potentially harmful.	Argues for a shift in focus towards real engagement with the individua patient, their specific problems and circumstances.
Oordt et al (2009)[91]	*	Before-after 6 month study	To investigate whether training in an empirically-based assessment and treatment approach administered through a	At 6 month follow-up 44% of practitioners reported increased confidence in assessing suicide risk, 54% reported increased confidence in managing suicidal patients, 83%	Suggests that brief and carefully developed workshop training can potentially change provider perceptions and behaviours with a subsequent impact on clinical care

			continuing education workshop could meaningfully impact professional practices, clinic policy, clinician confidence, and beliefs post-training and 6 months later.	reported changing suicide care practices, and 66% reported changing clinic policy.	
Pearson et al (2009)[131]	**	Retrospective case-note study and semi-structured interviews.	To investigate the frequency and nature of general practice consultations in the year before suicide for patients in current, or recent, contact with secondary mental health services.	91% of individuals (n = 224) consulted their GP at least once in the year before death. The median number of consultations was 7. GPs reported patient safety concerns in 27% of cases. Only 16% of GPs thought suicide could have been prevented. Poor agreement between GPs and mental health teams on risk of suicide. Both sets of clinicians rated moderate to high levels of risk in only 3% of cases.	Consultation prior to suicide is common but suicide prevention in primary care is challenging. Possib strategies might include examining the potential benefits of risk assessment and collaborative working between primary and secondary care.
Reeves et al (2015)[43]	*	Systematic review	To review studies that assess the utility, feasibility and acceptability of SDAs in the	Overall, attitudes towards SDAs were positive, with lack of training in administration and interpretation of	Current evidence is not yet sufficie to recommend that SDAs should b universally adopted as an adjunct

			assessment of psychopathology among children and young people in routine clinical practice.	SDAs and concern for validity being key barriers. Two randomised control trials and case series suggest that SDAs might aid detection of emotional disorders.	clinical practice, but findings sugge that they can be used if applied cautiously and mindfully pending further evaluation.
Ross et al (2016)[80]	*	Qualitative survey	To describe opinions about suicide risk screening in a pediatric medical inpatient sample.	Majority (62.3%) of adolescents who participated had not been previously asked about suicide and were supportive of suicide risk screening (81.0%). Five salient themes emerged from qualitative analysis: prevention, elevated risk, emotional benefits, provider responsibility, and lack of harm in asking.	Majority of youth screened for suic risk on medical inpatient units were supportive of suicide risk screenin Opinion data can assure clinicians that suicide risk screening is acceptable to paediatric patients a parents. Medical setting is unique opportunity to capture youth at risk suicide.
Saab et al (2021)[108]	***	Systematic Review	To examine the effect of RA strategies on predicting suicide and self-harm outcomes among adult healthcare service users.	Insufficient evidence exists to support any one tool, inclusive of clinician assessment of risk, for self-harm and suicidality. Discourse on risk assessment needs to move toward broader discussion on safety	

				of patients at risk for self-harm/suicide.	
Saini et al (2016)[102]	**	Semi-structured interviews	To explore GPs' interpretations of patient communication and treatment in primary care leading up to suicide and to investigate relationship between GPs and mental health services prior to a patient's suicide.	Three themes emerged from GP interviews: (i) GP interpretations of suicide attempts or self-harm; (ii) professional isolation; and (iii) GP responsibilities versus patient autonomy. GPs in this study may have different views from GPs who have never experienced patient suicide or who have experienced the death of a patient by suicide who was not under specialist services. Findings may not be representative of rest of UK, although many issues are likely to apply across services.	Highlights recommendations for suicide prevention in general pract increasing GP awareness of suicid related issues and improving traini and RA skills; removing barriers to accessing therapies/ treatments in primary care; improving liaison and collaboration between services; ar increasing awareness in primary c about why patients may not want treatments offered by focusing on each individual's situational contex
Saini et al (2010)[101]	**	Questionnaire and interview study in the North West of England	To describe services available in general practices for the management of suicidal patients and to	Responses suggested greater availability of services and training for general mental health issues than for suicide prevention. Three key themes from GP interviews	Health professionals have importa role to play in preventing suicide. However, GPs expressed concern about the quality of primary care mental health service provision an

			examine GPs views on these services.	were: barriers accessing primary or secondary mental health services; obstacles faced when referring a patient to mental health services; managing change within mental health care services.	difficulties with access to secondar mental health services. Addressing these issues could facilitate future suicide prevention in primary care.
Stickley & Felton (2006)[55]	*	Discussion paper	To explore whether nurses can manage to promote a service user's liberty, while simultaneously endeavouring to protect the individual and society from danger	Mental health nurses have a responsibility to promote individual's right to freedom while at the same time promote society's right to be protected from danger.	Considers tension in mental health policy and practice that promotes freedom and choice and yet appea to endorse control, and how this affects nurses
Turecki & Brent (2016)[127]	*	Discussion paper	-	With no effective algorithm to predict suicide in clinical practice, improved recognition and understanding of clinical, psychological, sociological, and biological factors might help to detect high-risk individuals and assist in treatment selection.	Regular follow-up of people who attempt suicide by mental health services is key to prevent future suicidal behaviour.

Vandewalle et al (2019)[53]	*	Qualitative study	To uncover and understand core elements of how nurses in psychiatric hospitals make contact with patients experiencing suicidal ideation.	Nurses seek to "create conditions for open and genuine communication" while maintaining focus on "developing an accurate and meaningful picture of patients". These represent nurses' attention to relational processes like building trust as well as focus on assessing suicide risk. Nurse contacts depend on whether they are guided more by checking and controlling suicide risk or by acknowledging and connecting (with) the person.	Relevance limited – nurses in psychiatric hospitals in Belgium.
Vassilev & Pilgrim (2007)[67]	*	Discussion paper	To problematize the taken for granted notion of "mental health services" by drawing upon general sociological work on "risk" and "trust".	Outlines the risks to and from patients in routine mental health work, and the betrayal of trust as both a normal part of care and its corruption in mental health work.	Concludes that "mental health services" are a myth being mostly concerned with mental disorder an control (at least to most patients w form the focus of activity).
Wand (2012)[48]	**	Conventional Literature Review	To establish research evidence for effectiveness of	Search found limited research on effectiveness of risk assessment.	

			a risk assessment approach in mental health. Searched professional literature on RA in mental health, specifically for research on the effectiveness of risk assessment in reducing risk of harm to self or others.	"Structured professional judgment" possibly reduces aggression risk but no evidence that risk assessment is effective in relation to self-harm or suicide reduction.	
Wand (2012)[44]	*	Discussion paper	To outline the emerging field of positive health, which eschews a psychiatric disorder and illness focus, being oriented towards identification of strengths, abilities, hopes, and the individual's preferred future.	The shift in positive health, from illness towards wellness, aims to build health literacy and decision-making capacity and thereby make more effective use of health-care services. Promotes a positioning of mental health nursing practice within a positive health paradigm.	Tables solution-focused assessme questions to contrast to current format for mental health assessme which rather than being 'comprehensive', is predominantly concerned with problem and risk identification, and the search for pathology in the individual.
White et al (2019)[56]	*	Qualitative exploratory descriptive study	To explore early career Registered nurses' understanding of providing care to mental health consumers who hear voices,		Relevance limited by experience o nurses from Australia

			a qualitative exploratory descriptive study with nine nurses regarding their experiences of caring for people who hear voices.		
Wilson et al (2016)[109]	*	Critical discourse analysis	To examine mental health policies and guidelines, and to interview service users, families, nurses and the police about experiences of accessing services.	For those who attempt to access services early in crisis, as suggested to lead to a better outcome, provision of services and rights appear to be reversed by an attempt to exclude them through practices that screen them out, rather than prioritising a choice in access.	The discursive practice of being labelled “risky” results in divergenc between law and policy, which creates for nurses the obligation to manage a tension between medicalisation and normalisation.
Woods (2013)[122] [Canada]	*	Exploratory and descriptive study	To: (1) identify and describe current risk assessment and management approaches used in the adult inpatient mental health and forensic units; and (2) identify good	Participants reported that they had not considered risk assessment and management as a proactive structured process. Education and training was limited and skills were developed over time through practice.	Five key issues: reliance on clinica judgement alone is not the best choice; need to consider risk as a whole concept; risk management being more reactive than proactive education and training; and client involvement in risk assessment.

			practice and shortfalls in current approaches.		
Xanthopoulou et al (2021)[105] [UK]	**	Interviews and inductive thematic analysis.	To explore patient experiences of psychosocial assessment after presenting with self-harm/suicidality.	People described two different experiences; a therapeutic interaction that made people feel their life mattered and instilled hope for the future and a formulaic assessment about the “risk” which made people feel their life did not matter and hopeless about the future.	Psychosocial assessment impacts hope for people in crisis. A focus o therapeutic communication that is about the person, as well as the ris improves patient experience, decreases distress, and instils hop that life is worth living.

*** - Directly relevant – evidence derived from a child and adolescent risk management context; ** - Partially relevant – evidence derived from a wider mental health risk management context which may or may not include child and adolescent populations; * - Indirectly relevant - evidence on risk assessment more generally (e.g. risk assessment for violence)