



## Synopsis

# Reducing self-harm in adolescents: the RISA-IPD comprehensive synopsis

David Cottrell,<sup>1\*</sup> Rebecca Walwyn,<sup>2</sup> Amanda Farrin,<sup>2</sup> Donna Irving,<sup>3</sup>  
Peter Fonagy,<sup>4</sup> Dennis Ougrin,<sup>5</sup> Daniel Stahl,<sup>6</sup> Judy Wright<sup>7</sup> and  
Alex Wright-Hughes<sup>2</sup> on behalf of the RISA-IPD Collaborative Group

<sup>1</sup>Division of Psychological & Social Medicine, Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

<sup>2</sup>Complex Interventions Division, Clinical Trial Research Unit, Leeds Institute of Clinical Trials Research, School of Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

<sup>3</sup>Medical Library, Leeds Trinity University, Leeds, UK

<sup>4</sup>Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology, University College, London, UK

<sup>5</sup>Youth Resilience Unit, WHO Collaborating Centre for Mental Health Services Development, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Psychiatry Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK

<sup>7</sup>Academic Unit of Health Economics, Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

\*Corresponding author [d.j.cottrell@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:d.j.cottrell@leeds.ac.uk)

Published January 2026  
DOI: 10.3310/KKBB1164  
Volume 30 • Issue 3

## Plain language summary

Reducing self-harm in adolescents: the RISA-IPD comprehensive synopsis

Health Technology Assessment 2026; Vol. 30: No. 3  
DOI: 10.3310/KKBB1164

NIHR Journals Library [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)

## Plain language summary

Self-harm is common in young people, and many of those who self-harm do so again. It leads to many unpleasant outcomes for the young person and their family. Research so far has found no clear evidence about how to prevent repetition when young people present to health services having self-harmed. One way to understand what might help is to combine the results from many different research studies to create an 'average' result. This is known as a meta-analysis. Doing this, using the data in published research articles has not led to clear conclusions, perhaps because the information available is patchy and inconsistent, which makes combining the information and analysing it difficult.

Another approach is to ask other researchers for their original 'raw' data, not just the data they have summarised in publications, and then combine and analyse all these data – this is known as an individual participant data meta-analysis. We did this, and were able to identify many more study participants, and obtain their data, than in earlier meta-analyses. This was because a number of studies included participants aged 14–65 years, and we were only interested in under 18s. In the published papers, it was not possible to tell who was under 18, but once we had the original data, we could separate out and add to our analysis all those under 18 in these 'wide age range' studies. The authors of some studies could not share their data, but we were able to include the results from their published research to add to our findings.

We found 39 relevant studies and were able to obtain data from 26 of them, involving 3448 study participants.

We grouped the interventions in these studies into nine broad groups: cognitive-behavioural therapy; dialectical behaviour therapy; family therapy; group therapy; mentalisation based, psychodynamic, cognitive analytic therapy; multisystemic therapy; problem-solving, psychoeducation, support; postcards, tokens and documents; and other single session, brief interventions.

Control interventions were all the treatment as usual offered in clinics participating in the study, sometimes with some specific additional elements included. There was often little detail about what 'treatment as usual' actually was. There were no 'no treatment' controls except in the studies of postcards, tokens and documents.

We found no evidence that intervention was more or less effective than control interventions at reducing repeat self-harm 12 months after the start of the studies. We found some hints that those who had self-harmed many times already responded better to treatment.

We discuss why we still have no clear recommendation about what therapeutic interventions to use and make recommendations about how future research could be done better.

# Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the [NIHR Journals Library website](#)

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 4 and is ranked 30th (out of 174 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb™ (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded™ (Clarivate™, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) ([www.publicationethics.org/](http://www.publicationethics.org/)).

Editorial contact: [journals.library@nihr.ac.uk](mailto:journals.library@nihr.ac.uk)

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at [www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta).

## Criteria for inclusion in the *Health Technology Assessment* journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

## HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

## This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as award number 17/117/11. The contractual start date was in June 2019. The draft manuscript began editorial review in February 2024 and was accepted for publication in November 2024. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care 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, the HTA 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, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2026 Cottrell *et al.* This work was produced by Cottrell *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library ([www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk](http://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk)), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India ([www.newgen.co](http://www.newgen.co)).