Suicide Risk Detection and Management in **Clinical Settings**

Implementation challenges and lessons learned

Edwin D. Boudreaux, PhD Celine Larkin, PhD Dept. of Emergency Medicine, UMass Medical School May 15 2019



Learning Objectives

Participants will be able to:

• Identify tools for detecting suicide risk and prioritizing evaluations in acute care settings

• Give examples of best practices to intervene on suicide risk in acute care patients

• Describe implementation challenges and solutions

Outline

• Current state of suicide/suicide prevention

- Best practices in suicide prevention in acute care
 - Zero Suicide model
 - Screening tools
 - Brief interventions

• Implementation across a large health care system

Suicide: Facts and Figures

- 10th leading cause of death in the US
- 2nd leading cause of death in teens and young adults



In 2017, there were an estimated **1,400,000** suicide attempts

In 2015, suicide and selfinjury cost the US \$69 Billion



Suicide rates are increasing in the U.S.



Health care use is frequent in suicide decedents

• Study of 5,894 suicides in the Mental Health Research Network (11 health systems serving over 11 million individuals across 11 states)



(Ahmedani et al., 2014)^{Slide 7}

Many emergency department patients have hidden suicide risk



• Most of these patients are not identified and, even when identified not treated with best practices

Suicide Risk: A Continuum





Outline

• Current state of suicide/suicide prevention

- Best practices in suicide prevention in acute care
 - Zero Suicide model
 - Screening tools
 - Brief interventions
- Implementation across a large health care system

Zero Suicide



- A priority of the National Action Alliance for Suicide Prevention and a goal of the National Strategy for Suicide Prevention
 - Lead system-wide culture change committed to reducing suicides
 - **Train** a competent, confident, and caring workforce
 - Identify patients with suicide risk via comprehensive screenings

Zero Suicide



- A priority of the National Action Alliance for Suicide Prevention and a goal of the National Strategy for Suicide Prevention
 - Engage all individuals at-risk of suicide
 - Treat using evidence-based treatments
 - Transition individuals through care with warm hand-offs and supportive contacts
 - Improve policies and procedures through CQI

"It is critically important to design for zero even when it may not be theoretically possible...It's about purposefully aiming for a higher level of performance."

Thomas Priselac President and CEO of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center

EDC (2015)



WITHOUT IMPROVED SUICIDE CARE, PEOPLE SLIP THROUGH GAPS



Adapted from James Reason's "Swiss Cheese" Model Of Accidents EDC ©2016. All rights reserved.

A Systematic Approach to Health Care Quality Improvement: Henry Ford Health System



EDC ©2016. All rights reserved.



"Identify" Universal Screening to Detect and Stratify



"Identify" The Patient Safety Screener (PSS-3)

Introductory script: "Now I'm going to ask you some questions that we ask everyone treated here, no matter what problem they are here for. It is part of the hospital's policy and it helps us to make sure we are not missing anything important."



"Identify" The Patient Safety Screener (PSS-3)

- Validation study (Boudreaux et al., 2015)
- Administered the tool to general adult ED medical and psychiatric presentations
- Compared to a reference standard, Beck Scale for Suicide Ideation (BSSI; Beck & Steer, 1991)
- Concurrent validity with BSSI:
 - Overall positive screening (PSS: positive on ideation and/or attempt; BSSI: ideation 4 or 5 or attempt)
 - Kappa =0.95 (95% CI: 0.91-0.99)

"Identify"

Emergency Department Safety Assessment and Followup Evaluation (ED-SAFE) 1 : Implementing Universal Screening



Boudreaux et al. 2016

"Identify" ED-SAFE 1: Detecting Suicide Risk



Boudreaux et al. 2016

"Identify": Other tools

COLUMBIA-SUICIDE SEVERITY RATING SCALE

Ask questions that are in bold and underlined. Ask Questions 1 and 2 1) Wish to be Dead: Person endorses thoughts about a wish to be dead or not alive anymore, or wish to fall asleep and not wake	YES	Past month	
1) Wish to be Dead:		N	
up?			
Have you wished you were dead or wished you could go to sleep and not wake up?		L	
2) Suicidal Thoughts: General non-specific thoughts of wanting to end one's life/die by suicide, "The thought about killing myself" without general thoughts of ways to kill oneself/associated methods, intent, or plan." Have you had any actual thoughts of killing yourself?			
If YES to 2, ask questions 3, 4, 5, and 6. If NO to 2, go directly to question 6.		_	
3) Suicidal Thoughts with Method (without Specific Plan or Intent to Act):		Г	
Person endorses thoughts of suicide and has thought of a least one method during the assessment period. This is different than a specific plan with time, place or method details worked out. "I thought about taking an overdose but I never made a specific plan as to when where or how I would actually do itand I would never go through with it."			
Have you been thinking about how you might do this?		Ĺ	
4) Suicidal Intent (without Specific Plan): Active suicidal thoughts of killing onesell and patient reports having <u>some intent to act on such thoughts</u> , as oppose to '1 <i>have the thoughts but I definitely will not do anything about them.</i> " Have you had these thoughts and had some intention of acting on them?			
5) Suicide Intent with Specific Plan: Thoughts of killing oneself with details of plan fully or partially worked out and person has some intent to carry k out. Have you started to work out or worked out the details of how to kill yourself? Do you intend to carry out this plan?			
6) Suicide Behavior Question	Lifet	im	
Have you ever done anything, started to do anything, or prepared to do anything to end your life?		Г	
Examples: Collected pills, obtained a gun, gave away valuables, wrote a will or suicide note, took out pills		Ĺ	
but didn't swallow any, held a gun but changed your mind or it was grabbed from your hand, went to the	Pas Mon		
roof but didn't jump; or actually took pills, tried to shoot yourself, cut yourself, tried to hang yourself, etc.	PIOL	Ë	
If YES, ask: Was this within the past 3 months?			
Response Protocol to C-SSRS Screening Item 4 Immediate Notification of Physician and/or Behavioral Health and Patient Safety Precautions Item 5 Immediate Notification of Physician and/or Behavioral Health and Patient Safety Precautions	vietv		

Ask Suicide Screening Question (ASQ) For patients ages 10-24 Positive screen: "Yes" to any question

 \bullet

attempt only





"Engage" Safety Planning Intervention

- 1. Recognizing warning signs
- 2. Employing internal coping strategies
- 3. Socializing with others
- Contacting family members or friends in a crisis
- 5. Contacting mental health professionals or agencies
- Reducing the potential for use of lethal means

SAFETY PLAN					
Step 1: Warning signs:					
1.					
2.					
3.					
Step 2: Internal coping strategies - Things I can do to take my mind off my problems					
without contacting another person:					
1.					
2.					
3.					
Step 3: People and social settings that provide distraction:					
1.		Phone			
2.		Phone			
3.	Pace				
4.	Race				
Step 4: Peo	Step 4: People whom I can ask for help:				
1.	Name	Phone			
2.	Name	Phone			
3.	Name	Phone			
Step 5: Prof	Step 5: Professionals or agencies I can contact during a crisis:				
1.	Clinician Name	Phone			
		±#			
2.	Clinician Name	Phone			
	Clinician Pager or Emergency Contac	:t #			
3.	Suicide Prevention Lifeline: 1-800-273-TALK (8255)				
4.	Local Emergency Service				
	Emergency Services Phone				
Makingthe	Makingthe environment safe:				
1.					
2.					
Repladuced with permason (D. 2019 Manley & Brown), www.aucodeastelypton.com					
Stanley, B.Z. Brown, G. K. (2012). Salely planning misivanion. A bial intervanion to mitigate suicide itak. Expolore and Personal Pradice, 79, 256-264					

Safety Planning Intervention (SPI) is associated with a decrease in suicide behavior report (SBR)

Percentage of Veterans with SBR during 6-month

Follow-up



χ2(1, N = 1640) = 4.72, p = .029; OR = 0.56, 95% CI: 0.33, 0.95

SPI is associated with improved suicide-related coping



Mixed effect regression: Main effect z = 2.95, 95% CI: 1.67, 8.23, p = 0.003 Group by time interaction z = -2.16, 95% CI: -1.32, -0.66, p= .03

"Engage" Counseling on Access to Lethal Means

- Those dying by suicide were more likely to live in homes with guns (Brent et al., 1999)
- Higher risk of suicide in states with higher firearm prevalence (Miller et al., 2007)
- Removing access to lethal means can prevent a lethal suicide attempt or prevent the suicide attempt entirely (Sarchiapone et al., 2011)
- Counseling on access to lethal means (CALM)
 - Online training: https://www.sprc.org/resources-programs/calmcounseling-access-lethal-means



TRANSITION

"Treat"/"Transition" Cost-effectiveness of interventions in ED

FIGURE 1. Incremental costs and outcomes of the three interventions to reduce suicide risk among hospital emergency department patients, compared with usual care (UC)^a



- ^a Based on Monte Carlo simulation that accounted for uncertainty across the model inputs
- ^b Compared with usual care, postcards and cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) improved outcomes with incremental cost-effectiveness (ICE) below \$50,000 per life-year with certainty (100% likelihood).
- ^c Compared with usual care, telephone outreach improved outcomes with ICE below \$50,000 per life-year with 99.5% likelihood.
- ^d Saved life-years per emergency department visitor imes 10 $^{-3}$

- Modeled costs and outcomes based on existing studies
- Caring contact postcards improved outcomes *and* reduced costs, compared with usual care
- Telephone outreach and CBT improved outcomes at an incremental cost below a WTP of \$50,000 per life-year

Denchev et al., 2018

"Transition" ED-SAFE 1: Counseling calls (CLASP-ED)



Miller et al. 2017

Outline

• Current state of suicide/suicide prevention

- Best practices in suicide prevention in acute care
 - Zero Suicide model
 - Screening tools
 - Brief interventions
- Implementation across a large health care system: The System of Safety study

Title: A System of Safety (SOS): Preventing Suicide through Healthcare System Transformation

• PIs: Edwin D. Boudreaux, Catarina I. Kiefe, University of Massachusetts Medical School Worcester, MA

- Funded by: National Institute of Mental Health (1R01MH112138-01)
- Aim: To implement Zero Suicide's Seven Essential Elements of Care across settings through continuous performance improvement hub-and-spoke model and a stepped wedge design

System of Safety: Setting and Context

UMass Memorial Health Care System

- Phase 1: Six EDs at four sites
- Phase 2: Inpatient med/surg and BH at five hospitals
- Phase 3: Primary care and specialty outpatient



Main types of providers/stakeholders

- RNs, MDs, Patient care associates, Mental Health Clinicians

SOS: Lean Hub and Spoke

Central Lean Hub works with spokes to train, implement, monitor, and improve performance



Zero Suicide components in System of Safety



UMMHC workflow

- 1. Universal primary screening using PSS-3 by nurse
- 2. If +, stratification using the ED-SAFE Secondary Screener (ESS)
 - Mild, moderate, high
- 3. Safety precautions
- 4. Review by physician
- 5. Behavioral health evaluation
 - Safety planning where available
- 6. Referral resources



Implementation strategies had to be wide-ranging

- \checkmark Screening tools, safety plan and alerts built in EHR
- ✓ Online modules rolled out to RNs, MDs, and PCAs
- ✓ In-person training (to varying degrees)
- ✓ System-wide policy approved
- ✓ Reporting and auditing to identify shortfalls
- ✓ CQI approach and post go-live unit calls



Next steps: Extend to behavioral health and primary care

Lessons learned

- It takes time to find the right task for the right role
 RNs fit well with screening but not brief intervention
- Screening was difficult, but less difficult than implementing intervention and transition

• Carrot vs Stick – likely never would have had significant transformation without the stick (i.e., Joint Commission)



Lessons learned (contd.)

- Stepped wedge design impeded progress and ultimately fell pretty to the "real world" organization of healthcare
- Barriers varied by setting: Med/surg inpatient vs ED
- Fidelity to protocols required multimodal training, ongoing monitoring and buy-in from leadership and front-line
 - Big difference between adoption and true implementation!
 - Training of working professionals in a way that is effective for behavior change is nearly impossible
 - Especially physicians



High Yield Resources

- Consensus guide for ED-based suicide prevention

 <u>https://www.sprc.org/edguide</u>
- Implementing universal screening
 - <u>https://www.sprc.org/micro-learnings/patientsafetyscreener</u>
- One-hour webinar on Counseling on Access to Lethal Means:
 https://www.sprc.org/resources-programs/calm-counseling-access-lethal-means
- Suicide Assessment Five-step Evaluation and Triage (SAFE-T)
 - <u>https://store.samhsa.gov/product/Suicide-Assessment-Five-Step-Evaluation-and-Triage-SAFE-T-/SMA09-4432</u>



Edwin.Boudreaux@umassmed.edu