

Promising Strategies for Advancement in Knowledge of Suicide Risk Factors and Prevention

Jitender Sareen, MD, Corinne Isaak, MSc, Laurence Y. Katz, MD, James Bolton, MD, Murray W. Enns, MD, Murray B. Stein, MD, MPH

Suicide is an important public health problem. Although there have been advances in our knowledge of suicide, gaps remain in knowledge about suicide risk factors and prevention. Here, we discuss research pathways that have the potential to rapidly advance knowledge in suicide risk assessment and reduction of suicide deaths over the next decade. We provide a concise overview of the methodologic approaches that have the capacity to rapidly increase knowledge and change practice, which have been successful in past work in psychiatry and other areas of medicine. We suggest three specific pathways to advance knowledge of suicide risk factors and prevention. First, analysis of large-scale epidemiologic surveys and administrative data sets can advance the understanding of suicide. Second, given the low base rate of suicide, there is a need for networks/consortia of investigators in the field of suicide prevention. Such consortia have the capacity to analyze existing epidemiologic data sets, create multi-site cohort studies of high-risk groups to increase knowledge of biological and other risk factors, and create a platform for multi-site clinical trials. Third, partnerships with policymakers and researchers would facilitate careful scientific evaluation of policies and programs aimed at reducing suicide. Suicide intervention policies are often multi-faceted, expensive, and rarely evaluated. Using quasi-experimental methods or sophisticated analytic strategies such as propensity score-matching techniques, the impact of large-scale interventions on suicide can be evaluated. Furthermore, such partnerships between policymakers and researchers can lead to the design and support of prospective RCTs (e.g., cluster randomized trials, stepped wedge designs, waiting list designs) in high-risk groups (e.g., people with a history of suicide attempts, multi-axial comorbidity, and offspring of people who have died by suicide). These research pathways could lead to rapid knowledge uptake between communities and have the strong potential to reduce suicide.

(Am J Prev Med 2014;47(3S2):S257–S263) © 2014 American Journal of Preventive Medicine

Introduction

Suicide is an important cause of death throughout the world.¹ Suicide rates in the U.S. have increased rather than decreased in the last decade.² There is an urgent need for research that rapidly advances

knowledge and has rapid uptake by policymakers and clinicians to reduce suicide deaths.

One of the major challenges in advancing knowledge around suicide prevention is that deaths by suicide are relatively infrequent events. Although the gold standard test of an intervention is an RCT, conducting RCTs that are powered for detecting impact on suicides are expensive, difficult to coordinate, and require long periods of follow-up.³ Here, we discuss three key research pathways (analysis of existing data sets that include suicide variables, networks and consortia focused on suicide prevention, and researchers working with policymakers to address important questions related to suicide) that we believe can advance the field of suicide prevention in a manner that will reduce suicides over the next 10 years. To guide the current discussion, we list the well-established suicide risk factors⁴ and prevention strategies

From the Department of Psychiatry (Sareen, Isaak, Katz, Bolton, Enns), Department of Psychology (Sareen, Bolton), and Department of Community Health Sciences (Sareen, Bolton, Enns), University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; and the Departments of Psychiatry and Family and Preventive Medicine (Stein), University of California, and Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, California

Address correspondence to: Jitender Sareen, MD, Departments of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Community Health Sciences, University of Manitoba, PZ430-771 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3E 3N4. E-mail: sareen@cc.umanitoba.ca.

0749-3797/\$36.00

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2014.05.041>

Table 1. Selected suicide risk factors and interventions: individual, family, and community levels

Risk factors	Interventions
Individual level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sex/gender ● Occupation ● History of suicide attempts ● Mental disorder (anxiety, mood) ● Addictions ● Physical illness ● Financial stress ● Personality disorders/impulsivity/aggression ● Legal problems ● Lack of religious affiliation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Timely access to evidence-based interventions in various settings: college, workplace, justice, primary care, organized faith settings, specialty care (S/I) ● Postdischarge follow-up contact for patients hospitalized for suicidal behavior (I)
Family level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Childhood maltreatment ● Intimate partner violence ● Addictions, mental disorders, suicide in family members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Positive parenting programs (U/S) ● Family-based interventions (U/S) ● Peer support for young mothers (S) ● Support for the bereaved (S)
Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Suicide in peers ● Sensational media reporting of suicide ● Specific cultural factors (e.g., Native Americans, immigrants, refugees) ● Access to lethal means: guns, pesticides 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● School-based evidence based programs (U) ● Media education of safe reporting (U) ● Culturally grounded interventions (U/I/S) ● Means restriction (U) ● Crisis lines (U)

Note: IOM-defined prevention programs: I, indicated; S, selective; U, universal.

I programs target groups that have already developed the disease and aim to reduce severe problems.

S programs target groups at high risk for the outcome or disease.

U programs include all people in a certain community in the intervention.

at the individual, family, and community levels (Table 1) and describe the limitations of the current knowledge in these areas.

Limitations of the Current State of Knowledge on Suicide Risk Factors

Suicide is, fortunately, a relatively rare event. Unfortunately, this makes it hard to study for a variety of reasons.⁴ First, empirical data on optimal screening and prediction tools for suicide are lacking.⁵ Many suicide risk assessment tools (e.g., SAD PERSONS scale) have good sensitivity but poor positive predictive value in their ability to forecast future suicide attempts.^{5,6}

Second, there is a lack of understanding of suicide risk in vulnerable groups (e.g., military personnel, ethnic minorities, socially deprived individuals). For example, depending on the group studied, social markers such as income and marital status have been shown to be both suicide risk and protective factors.^{7,8}

Third, with the recent increase in use of social media, information is lacking on the impact of exposure to suicide in social media on suicide contagion. Fourth, although there has been an increase in prevalence of non-suicidal self-injury,⁹ the longitudinal course and risk for

death by suicide among people with non-suicidal self-injury remains unknown. Fifth, most epidemiologic studies of suicidal ideation and attempts have been cross-sectional, may be affected by recall bias, and are not generalizable to death by suicide.

Limitations of Evidence in Suicide Prevention

Although a wide range of suicide prevention strategies are suggested in guidelines worldwide (Table 1), it is important to underscore that most of the suicide prevention strategies, with the exception of means restriction policies,¹⁰ training of physicians in treating depression,¹¹ and postcards after hospitalization for suicide attempts,¹² lack strong empirical evidence for reducing suicidal behavior. There is, therefore, an urgent need to rigorously test promising suicide prevention strategies.

Owing to the low base rate phenomenon of suicide, extremely large sample sizes (thousands of people) often followed over relatively long periods of time are required to test whether interventions are effective. The most-cited studies in the field of suicide prevention to date are quasi-experimental designs in high-risk adult groups (e.g., Air Force personnel,¹³ regions of Hungary¹⁴) where

improving/increasing gatekeeper training for suicide and treatment of depression by primary care physicians reduced suicide rates.

Furthermore, large-scale clinical trials for mental disorders often exclude people with a high risk of suicidal behavior. Thus, there is little information available from RCTs regarding effective interventions in high-risk adults. Even less data are available for optimal methods of intervention in culturally diverse groups.¹⁵ Finally, given the complex multifactorial and heterogeneous etiology of suicide, large-scale public health interventions may be expensive and typically have small effect sizes.¹⁶ In the context of limited funding for research, investigators often face significant obstacles in designing fundable studies.

Suggested Research Pathways

In order to advance knowledge of suicide risk factors and evaluate suicide prevention strategies, the following three main research pathways are suggested (Table 2).

Pathway 1: Analyses of Existing Epidemiologic, Clinical, and Administrative Data

Although there has been a large increase in knowledge around risk factors for suicide, existing large, longitudinal mental health surveys and clinical trial databases are

publicly available and can be analyzed to further increase our understanding of risk factors for suicide and suicide attempts.¹⁷ There is also a need for developing predictive algorithms for suicide similar to those developed in the Framingham Heart study¹⁸ for development of a core set of predictors for cardiovascular disease. This would require identifying a select group of key, potentially modifiable risk factors that could be targeted among individuals at high suicide risk. However, such large-scale intervention studies are time consuming and costly.

In the medical field, there has been an increase in the use of propensity score-matching analysis to determine if certain interventions (e.g., pharmacotherapy) have impact on outcomes.^{19,20} Although these types of observational methodologies may not entirely remove residual confounding issues, they are economically feasible and overcome the ethical concerns about randomization of high-risk groups.²¹ Propensity score-matching analyses have been used, for example, to understand the impact of antidepressants during pregnancy on fetal and neonatal outcomes where randomization is clearly not acceptable because of ethical issues.²²

The analysis of large-scale epidemiologic surveys and administrative databases has been instrumental in increasing our understanding of suicide risk. Much of our understanding of risk factors for suicide attempts

Table 2. Strengths and limitations of proposed research pathways

Research pathways	Strengths	Limitations
1. Analysis of existing epidemiologic samples and clinical trial databases	Data already collected Inexpensive to conduct analysis Large sample size	Limited by what is already collected in data sets Observational studies, causal inferences cannot be made
2. Networks and consortia of researchers	Multi-site prospective cohorts (history of suicide attempts, family history of suicide) Sufficient sample sizes to examine biomarkers, genetics, and imaging work to understand biological factors related to suicide Understand the natural trajectory of suicidal behavior	Large infrastructure support required Observational studies Substantial effort to create the network and develop partnerships
3. Evaluation of current or new policies and programs	Creates partnerships between policymakers and researchers in suicide Bidirectional knowledge exchange leads to rapid uptake of new knowledge in suicide prevention Careful evaluation of large-scale policies leads to an understanding of which suicide policies have an impact on suicide Multi-site clinical trials with high-risk samples Sufficient sample size to detect impact of interventions on suicide attempts or deaths	Large-scale policies are heterogeneous and it may be difficult to discern which parts of the policies are associated with reductions in suicide Quasi-experimental designs preclude causal inferences Ethical issues of conducting RCTs in high-risk groups

comes from cross-sectional and longitudinal epidemiologic surveys, whereas understanding of suicide deaths comes from administrative database studies from the U.S., Europe, and Canada. Examples of secondary analysis of existing data sets includes the examination of controversial topics such as the relationship between anxiety disorders and risk of suicidal behavior among adults.²³ Based on a series of studies using several epidemiologic data sets, there has been an expansion of the understanding of the importance of anxiety,²⁴ specifically posttraumatic stress disorder and panic disorder, as triggers for suicide attempts.²³

Administrative data sets that link vital statistics databases with de-identified health information (e.g., physician contacts, prescription drug use) have rapidly advanced the understanding of suicide risk factors suicide.²⁵ They also provide the opportunity to objectively assess factors such as treatment seeking and overcoming the recall bias inherent in survey data. Using this method, Olfson et al.²⁶ have shown the gaps in follow-up care of patients after they present to emergency departments for suicide attempts.

This strategy is relatively inexpensive and can rapidly yield novel findings. However, observational studies (the use of techniques such as propensity matching notwithstanding) do not provide the same strength of evidence for cause and effect as data obtained in randomized trials.

Pathway 2: Need for Networks and Consortia

Given the low base rate phenomenon of suicide, a consortium of researchers across multiple sites is needed to generate findings backed by sufficient statistical power. These team endeavors also have the advantage of bringing together a diverse, highly expert group of researchers. This strategy enhances knowledge transfer opportunities both within the consortium and more broadly with the scientific community and public stakeholders, given the greater number of connections inherent in a larger team. Together, these factors enhance the potential for both rapid knowledge advancement and dissemination, increasing the likelihood of uptake in clinical and policy domains. Similar consortia have been necessary and successful in the field of genetics²⁷ where large sample sizes and diverse research expertise are also needed.

In suicide research, networks of researchers are needed to overcome the lack of understanding of the neurobiology and genetics of suicide. We suggest that networks could rapidly advance knowledge in suicide prevention by using longitudinal epidemiologic studies of high-risk samples. Prospective cohorts are required, where data on

family history of suicides or previous suicide attempts, as well as multiple mental and physical illnesses, can be “concentrated” for the highest likelihood of attempting suicide.

Weissman²⁸ discussed the concept of *translational epidemiology*, where population-based samples are recruited and their biological factors are examined (genetics and biomarkers) to increase knowledge of the biological underpinnings of suicidal behavior. Such efforts are essential in advancing the understanding of suicide biomarkers that have the potential to transform suicide risk assessment and personalized treatments.

Owing to the increase in suicide rates in the U.S. military in the mid to late part of the past decade, U.S. government agencies have funded consortia such as the Military Suicide Research Consortium (msrc.fsu.edu) and the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Service members (Army STARRS; armystarrs.org).²⁹ These consortia bring together a large group of investigators to conduct a series of studies to rapidly increase the knowledge of suicide risk factors among service members. In civilian samples, there are also examples of these networks on suicide prevention in Europe and Canada. Each network often has a particular focus. For example, some networks focus on genetics, whereas others, like our team in Manitoba, have focused on cultural factors related to suicide risk and culturally grounded universal suicide prevention strategies.¹⁵

We encourage the development and funding of more suicide prevention networks across civilian populations. Lessons learned include the fact that it can take months to years for a consortium to coalesce in terms of policies and procedures; hence, any investment in such an entity must have a long-term perspective. Once up and running, however, the ability to harness the brainpower and person-power of a large co-operative group of committed researchers focused on a problem can jump-start the generation of new knowledge. In addition, networks that engage policymakers can have important collaborative efforts in creating new knowledge on suicide prevention (see Pathway 3 below).

The strengths of this approach are that there can be a synergy in creating new knowledge, with the potential for multi-site intervention studies and collection of high-risk cohorts that are sufficiently powered to test the impact of interventions on suicide attempts and deaths. However, limitations of this approach include the need for substantial funding to create such a consortium, combined with the challenge of coordinating large research groups. Moreover, a large team of researchers can lead to synergistic efforts, but in some cases may inhibit the individuals within a team to innovate and create novel

strategies or approaches to suicide prevention that are not agreed upon by the leaders of the network.

Pathway 3: Researchers and Policymakers Working Together to Evaluate Policies of Suicide Prevention Programs

All too frequently, governments implement far-reaching and, at times, very expensive policy changes intended to have specific effects (e.g., reduction of suicide deaths) but fail to put in place in advance the means to evaluate such interventions. Collaboration between policymakers and researchers, prior to the implementation of the intervention, can facilitate the optimal evaluation of suicide prevention programs. We argue that there is a need for further work on examining policies using existing administrative data, quasi-experimental designs, or RCTs if possible.

There are several examples of high-quality evaluations of suicide policies using observational studies. Similar efforts are needed across different countries, health systems, and cultural contexts. A seminal paper¹³ in the field of suicide prevention demonstrated the impact of policy changes in suicide prevention for U.S. Air Force personnel. The authors used a quasi-experimental design to demonstrate a reduction in suicides associated with a multi-layered program implemented in a cohort of more than 5 million U.S. Air Force personnel.

Similarly, in a high-risk region in Hungary,¹⁴ education of primary care providers in the treatment of depression was associated with a reduction in suicides in the intervention area compared to surrounding regions that did not receive the intervention. Recently, While and colleagues³⁰ examined the impact of several suicide policies in the United Kingdom and found that certain policies were associated with reduction in suicides (e.g., 24-hour crisis lines, multi-disciplinary review of suicides) whereas other policies were not.

Finally, healthcare reform is currently an enormous public health concern in the U.S. Sommers et al.³¹ examined the impact of expansion of Medicaid in certain U.S. states using a quasi-experimental design and demonstrated that the states with expanded Medicaid coverage had an associated decrease in mortality. Similar methods could be used to examine the impact of Medicaid expansion (or other broad policy changes) on suicide rates.

In addition, with the recent gun violence in the U.S., there has been increasing concern about the need for stronger policies on firearm regulations. Analysis of U.S. state data showed an association between higher state-level regulations of firearms and a lower likelihood of suicides and homicides.³² Although these types of ecologic data preclude inferences about causality, this

recent paper suggests that means restriction policies may have the capacity to reduce suicides. Rapid analysis of policy-relevant questions could be conducted efficiently with these types of administrative data analyses.

To overcome the limitations of the quasi-experimental designs of the aforementioned studies, it would be ideal to conduct RCTs (e.g., cluster randomization, waiting list designs) when governments initiate new suicide prevention programs that have not been previously tested in RCTs. The Canadian government has, for example, partnered with researchers to implement a large-scale pragmatic RCT of Housing First consisting of case management for more than 2,000 homeless individuals with mental illness. This trial provided the opportunity to evaluate a promising intervention across five cities in Canada and engaged policymakers throughout the process.³³

Our team is also working with policymakers to facilitate the evaluation of promising suicide prevention programs that are being implemented (gatekeeper training) in Canada. Gatekeeper training involves coaching people (adults and youth) in the community who have primary contact with those at risk for suicide in identifying and assisting them in getting care.³⁴ Similar clinical trials are required for testing interventions among individuals at high risk for suicide (i.e., previous suicide attempters, those with multi-axial comorbidities, and offspring of people who have died by suicide).

Systematic evaluation of large-scale public health interventions has the potential to show an impact on relatively infrequent outcomes such as suicide and suicide attempts. Researchers benefit from this approach because they do not need to acquire funding for or deliver the expensive large-scale interventions (governments are already funding the roll-out of these untested programs).

Instead, researchers can focus on acquisition of funding to conduct thoughtful evaluation of the interventions. Policymakers can benefit from working with researchers who evaluate the interventions on suicide to ensure that programs and funding are doing what they are supposed to do (i.e., reducing suicides). However, strong partnerships between government and researchers are required to ensure clear roles and effective administration of both the intervention and evaluation of the program.

As many suicide prevention strategies are multi-layered, it may be difficult to discern the effective “ingredient” of the intervention. Also, evaluation of the process of policy implementation is essential in large-scale studies to ensure fidelity to the intervention. Although cluster randomization would be ideal, it may not be possible given that governments may be reluctant to “withhold” a potentially helpful intervention from a given community. Although this is politically

understandable, from a scientific perspective it is equally unjustified to subject a community to an unproven intervention that could do harm.

Thus, although quasi-experimental designs have been used to evaluate policies, these designs preclude strong causal inferences. Randomization may be more acceptable if a “proven” treatment is compared against a new, potentially better treatment. Finally, governments might not wish to evaluate the implemented programs because of fear of finding that the program is ineffective, which may lead to negative media attention and other political hazards.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we suggest three specific and complementary pathways to rapidly advance knowledge in suicide risk and reduce suicides: (1) increasing the analysis of existing databases to further our knowledge of risk and protective mechanisms in suicide; (2) creation of networks and consortia that have the platform for cross-site studies in suicide risk and suicide intervention; and (3) forging of partnerships between policymakers and researchers to rapidly test the impact of current and new policies in suicide prevention.

Publication of this article was supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences, and the National Institutes of Health Office of Disease Prevention. This support was provided as part of the National Institute of Mental Health-staffed Research Prioritization Task Force of the National Action Alliance for Suicide Prevention.

Preparation of this article was supported by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research grant (No. 273657) and a Manitoba Health Research Council Chair award to Dr. Sareen.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

References

- Nock MK, Borges G, Bromet EJ, Cha CB, Kessler RC, Lee S. Suicide and suicidal behavior. *Epidemiol Rev* 2008;30(1):133–54.
- Rockett IR, Regier MD, Kapusta ND, et al. Leading causes of unintentional and intentional injury mortality: U.S., 2000–2009. *Am J Public Health* 2012;102(11):e84–e92.
- Brown CH, Wyman PA, Guo J, Pena J. Dynamic wait-listed designs for randomized trials: new designs for prevention of youth suicide. *Clin Trials* 2006;3(3):259–71.
- Mann JJ, Apter A, Bertolote J, et al. Suicide prevention strategies: a systematic review. *JAMA* 2005;294(16):2064–74.
- Randall JR, Colman I, Rowe BH. A systematic review of psychometric assessment of self-harm risk in the emergency department. *J Affect Disord* 2011;134(1–3):348–55.
- Bolton JM, Spiwak R, Sareen J. Predicting suicide attempts with the SAD PERSONS scale: a longitudinal analysis. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2012;73(6):e735–e741.
- Sareen J, Afifi TO, McMillan KA, Asmundson GJ. Relationship between household income and mental disorders: findings from a population-based longitudinal study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2011;68(4):419–27.
- Agerbo E. High income, employment, postgraduate education, and marriage: a suicidal cocktail among psychiatric patients. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2007;64(12):1377–84.
- Hawton K, Bergen H, Mahadevan S, Casey D, Simkin S. Suicide and deliberate self-harm in Oxford University students over a 30-year period. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol* 2012;47(1):43–51.
- Yip PS, Caine E, Yousuf S, Chang SS, Wu KC, Chen YY. Means restriction for suicide prevention. *Lancet* 2012;379(9834):2393–9.
- Rutz W, von Knorring L, Walinder J. Frequency of suicide on Gotland after systematic postgraduate education of general practitioners. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1989;80(2):151–4.
- Carter GL, Clover K, Whyte IM, Dawson AH, D’Este C. Postcards from the EDge project: randomised controlled trial of an intervention using postcards to reduce repetition of hospital treated deliberate self poisoning. *BMJ* 2005;331(7520):805.
- Knox KL, Litts DA, Talcott GW, Feig JC, Caine ED. Risk of suicide and related adverse outcomes after exposure to a suicide prevention programme in the U.S. Air Force: cohort study. *BMJ* 2003;327:1376–8.
- Szanto K, Kalmar S, Hendin H, Rihmer Z, Mann JJ. A suicide prevention program in a region with a very high suicide rate. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2007;64(8):914–20.
- Katz LY, Elias B, O’Neil J, et al. Aboriginal suicidal behaviour research: from risk factors to culturally-sensitive interventions. *J Can Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2006;15(4):159–67.
- Streiner DL. The 2 “Es” of research: efficacy and effectiveness trials. *Can J Psychiatry* 2002;47(6):552–6.
- Kessler RC, Berglund P, Borges G, Nock M, Wang PS. Trends in suicide ideation, plans, gestures, and attempts in the U.S., 1990–1992 to 2001–2003. *JAMA* 2005;293(20):2487–95.
- Benjamin EJ, Levy D, Vaziri SM, D’Agostino RB, Belanger AJ, Wolf PA. Independent risk factors for atrial fibrillation in a population-based cohort: the Framingham Heart Study. *JAMA* 1994;271(11):840–4.
- Wang PS, Schneeweiss S, Avorn J, et al. Risk of death in elderly users of conventional vs. atypical antipsychotic medications. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353(22):2335–41.
- Paterno E, Bohn RL, Wahl PM, et al. Anticonvulsant medications and the risk of suicide, attempted suicide, or violent death. *JAMA* 2010;303(14):1401–9.
- Streiner DL, Norman GR. The pros and cons of propensity scores. *Chest* 2012;142(6):1380–2.
- Stephansson O, Kieler H, Haglund B, et al. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors during pregnancy and risk of stillbirth and infant mortality. *JAMA* 2013;309(1):48–54.
- Sareen J. Anxiety disorders and risk for suicide: why such controversy? *Depress Anxiety* 2011;28(11):941–5.
- Sareen J, Cox BJ, Afifi TO, et al. Anxiety disorders and risk for suicidal ideation and suicide attempts: a population-based longitudinal study of adults. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2005;62:1249–57.
- Bolton JM, Au W, Leslie WD, et al. Parents bereaved by offspring suicide: a population-based longitudinal case-control study. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2013;70(2):158–67.
- Olfson M, Marcus SC, Bridge JA. Emergency treatment of deliberate self-harm. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2012;69(1):80–8.

27. Pauls DL. The genetics of obsessive compulsive disorder: a review of the evidence. *Am J Med Genet C Semin Med Genet* 2008;148C(2):133–9.
28. Weissman MM, Brown AS, Talati A. Translational epidemiology in psychiatry: linking population to clinical and basic sciences. *Arch Gen Psychiatry* 2011;68(6):600–8.
29. Nock MK, Stein MB, Heeringa SG, et al. Prevalence and correlates of suicidal behavior among soldiers: results from the Army Study to Assess Risk and Resilience in Servicemembers (Army STARRS). *JAMA Psychiatry* 2014;71(5):514–22.
30. While D, Bickley H, Roscoe A, et al. Implementation of mental health service recommendations in England and Wales and suicide rates, 1997–2006: a cross-sectional and before-and-after observational study. *Lancet* 2012;379(9820):1005–12.
31. Sommers BD, Baicker K, Epstein AM. Mortality and access to care among adults after state Medicaid expansions. *N Engl J Med* 2012;367(11):1025–34.
32. Fleegler EW, Lee LK, Monuteaux MC, Hemenway D, Mannix R. Firearm legislation and firearm-related fatalities in the U.S. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173(9):732–40.
33. Goering PN, Streiner DL, Adair C, et al. The At Home/Chez Soi trial protocol: a pragmatic, multi-site, randomised controlled trial of a Housing First intervention for homeless individuals with mental illness in five Canadian cities. *BMJ Open* 2011;1(2):e000323.
34. Isaac M, Elias B, Katz LY, et al. Gatekeeper training as a preventative intervention for suicide: a systematic review. *Can J Psychiatry* 2009;54(4):260–8.