

Preventing suicide in community and custodial settings: changing or reducing access to means

[Evidence review for changing or reducing
access to means]

NICE guideline <number>

Evidence reviews

[February 2018]

Draft for Consultation

*These evidence reviews were developed
by Public Health – Internal Guideline
Development team*

Disclaimer

The recommendations in this guideline represent the view of NICE, arrived at after careful consideration of the evidence available. When exercising their judgement, professionals are expected to take this guideline fully into account, alongside the individual needs, preferences and values of their patients or service users. The recommendations in this guideline are not mandatory and the guideline does not override the responsibility of healthcare professionals to make decisions appropriate to the circumstances of the individual patient, in consultation with the patient and/or their carer or guardian.

Local commissioners and/or providers have a responsibility to enable the guideline to be applied when individual health professionals and their patients or service users wish to use it. They should do so in the context of local and national priorities for funding and developing services, and in light of their duties to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and to reduce health inequalities. Nothing in this guideline should be interpreted in a way that would be inconsistent with compliance with those duties.

NICE guidelines cover health and care in England. Decisions on how they apply in other UK countries are made by ministers in the [Welsh Government](#), [Scottish Government](#), and [Northern Ireland Executive](#). All NICE guidance is subject to regular review and may be updated or withdrawn.

Copyright

© National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2017. All rights reserved. NICE copyright material can be downloaded for private research and study, and may be reproduced for educational and not-for-profit purposes. No reproduction by or for commercial organisations, or for commercial purposes, is allowed without the written permission of NICE.

ISBN:

Contents

Interventions to change or reduce access to means of suicide	6
Introduction	6
Review question	6
PICO table.....	6
Public Health evidence	7
Evidence review	7
Findings7	
Summary of included studies in the review	7
Economic evidence	9
Evidence statements	9
Recommendations.....	11
The committee’s discussion of the evidence.....	12
Appendices	16
Appendix A: Review protocol	16
Appendix B: References	18
Appendix C: Excluded studies.....	21
Appendix D: Evidence tables	25
D.1.1 Anestis et al 2017	25
D.1.2 Beautrais 2001 and Beautrais et al 2009	27
D.1.3 Bennewith 2007 and Bennewith et al 2011	29
D.1.4 Chung et al 2016.....	33
D.1.5 Hemmer et al 2017	35
D.1.6 Ichikawai et al 2013	38
D.1.7 Isaac and Bennett 2005	40
D.1.8 King and Frost 2005.....	41
D.1.9 Law et al 2014	43
D.1.10 Lester 2005.....	46
D.1.11 Lockley et al 2014	47
D.1.12 Matsubayashi 2013	49
D.1.13 Pelletier 2007	52
D.1.14 Perrron et al 2013	54
D.1.15 Reisch and Michel (2005).....	56
D.1.16 Sinyor et al 2017/Sinyor and Levitt 2010	57
D.1.17 Skegg and Herbison (2009).....	62
D.1.18 Stack (2015).....	63
D.1.19 Ueda (2015).....	65
Appendix E: GRADE tables	68
E.1 Physical barriers.....	68

E.2 Restriction on road access (due to road maintenance or outbreak of foot & mouth disease)	69
E.3 Blue lighting at train stations	70
E.4 Encouraging help-seeking: crisis telephones or signpost at sites.....	71
E.5 Surveillance.....	72
Appendix F: Forest plot.....	73
F.1 Physical barrier.....	73
F.2 Restriction on road access	73
F.3 Encouraging help-seeking	74
F.4 Surveillance.....	74

2 Interventions to change or reduce access 3 to means of suicide.

4 Introduction

5 Restricting access to suicide means is an important component of suicide prevention and
6 provides a basis for prevention strategies. The effectiveness of restricting access to means
7 on suicide rates has been demonstrated within a number of studies examining the impact of
8 regulations on the availability of pharmaceuticals, firearms and pesticides (Nordentoft et al
9 2007; Johnson and Coyne-Beasley 2009). In some countries, restriction of access to
10 common methods of suicide has led to lower overall suicide rates. For instance, in Canada,
11 national restrictions on access to firearms were implemented in 1977, with a resulting
12 decrease of suicide by firearm and the total number of suicide rates. Legal restrictions to
13 firearms also resulted in a reduction of firearm suicide in Australia in 1980 and in several US
14 states (Mann et al 2005; Miller et al 2006).

15 In the UK, national legislation limiting the size of pack of medications was introduced in 1998
16 and suicide rates by poisoning with paracetamol have decreased significantly since (Hawton
17 et al 2001). In Ireland, legislation was introduced in 2001 to control the sale of paracetamol,
18 resulting in a significant fall in the rate of intentional paracetamol overdoses (Corcoran et al
19 2010; Donohoe E et al; 2006). To reduce the incidence of suicide within prisons, Safer Cells
20 have been introduced to provide useful accommodation for some at-risk prisoners and to
21 make the act of suicide or self-harm by ligaturing as difficult as possible (Minister of Justice,
22 2010).

23 Therefore, there is evidence supporting restrictions on access to means as an effective
24 preventive strategy at a national level. This review focuses on local interventions to restrict or
25 change access to the means of suicide and the aim is to determine whether these
26 interventions are effective and cost effective at preventing suicide.

27 Review question

28 Are interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide (such as restricting
29 access to medicines, providing safety fences, more lighting, and CCTV or suicide patrols)
30 effective and cost effective at preventing suicide?

31 PICO table

32 The review focused on identifying studies that fulfilled the conditions specified in PICO table
33 (Table 1). For full details of the review protocol, see Appendix A:

34 Table 1: PICO inclusion criteria for the review question of changing or reducing 35 access to means.

Population	Whole population or subgroups. Interventions directed at individuals may be identified and the protocol will be adapted accordingly.
-------------------	---

Interventions	Local interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• providing safety fences, more lighting, CCTV or suicide patrols• Access to medicines (prescribed medication would be covered by existing guidelines and can be cross-referred to) Exclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Assisted suicide• National strategies or national interventions.
Comparator	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Other intervention• Status quo/control• Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Suicide rates• Suicide attempts• Number of people hospitalised after suicide attempts• Reporting of suicide ideation The outcomes that will be considered when assessing help-seeking behaviour: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Service uptake (such as mental health services, helplines).

36

37 Public Health evidence

38 Evidence review

39 In total, 19,228 references were identified through the systematic searches. References were
40 screened on their titles and abstracts and full text and 50 references that were potentially
41 relevant to this question were requested. 19 quantitative studies were included (see
42 Appendix D: for the evidence tables) and 31 studies were excluded. For the list of excluded
43 studies with reasons for exclusion, see Appendix D:

44 Findings

45 Summary of included studies in the review

46 12 studies provided evidence on local approaches to the restrictions of access to means of
47 suicide. Included studies were categorised by types of interventions as following:

48 Interventions delivered in isolation

49 *Physical barriers at high frequency jump sites*

50 A total of 6 studies examined the effectiveness of physical barriers for preventing suicides
51 from jump sites. 5 individual experimental studies reported barriers such as glass barriers or
52 fences installed on 5 separate bridges or viaducts including the Memorial Bridge, USA

53 (Pelletier 2007), the Grafton Bridge, New Zealand (Beautrais 2009), the Bloor Street Viaduct,
54 Canada (Sinyor and Levitt 2010/2017), Jacques-Cartier Bridge, Canada (Perron et al 2013)
55 and the Gateway Bridge, Austria (Law et al 2014). 1 individual study examined the
56 effectiveness of barriers such as fences on bridges and other high structures in Switzerland
57 (Hemmer et al 2017).

58 **Safety nets**

59 2 studies (Reisch and Michel 2005; Hemmer et al 2017) reported a safety net installed on the
60 terrace or bridge, to deter people from jumping from these sites.

61 **Railway/subway platform screen door**

62 2 studies (Ueda et al 2015 and Chung et al 2016) reported platform screen doors (PSDs)
63 installed on subway or train platforms. PSDs open only when trains stop at stations, therefore
64 limiting access to the platform by individuals who enter the train tracks in order to take their
65 own lives.

66 **Restrictions on road access to high frequency sites**

67 2 naturalistic studies (Issa and Bennett 2005, Skegg and Herbison 2009) reported off road
68 fencing for access to cliffs. Issa and Bennett (2005) compared the number of suicide events
69 before and after restricting road access to high frequent suicide sites following outbreak of
70 foot and mouth disease, and Skegg and Herbison (2015) examined the change in suicide
71 rates before and after the road closure due to maintenance.

72 **Blue light-emitting-diode lights**

73 2 studies (Matsubayashi and Ueda 2013; Ichikawa and Inada 2014) reported the installation
74 of blue lights on railway platforms. The blue lights were originally introduced to reduce crime,
75 due to their possible calming effect on people.

76 **Telephone hotline (Crisis telephones)**

77 1 study (Stack 2015) examined suicide rates before and after telephone hotlines were
78 installed on the Skyway Bridge in St. Petersburg, Florida. Phones were placed along the
79 area of the bridge where it rises to 193 feet (59 m) and where there was a parking spot for
80 emergency vehicles where people had been committing suicide. Suicide victims usually drive
81 to the top of the rise in the bridge, park their car in the emergency lane and jump.

82 **Signposts**

83 1 study (King and Frost 2005) examined suicide rates after the installation of signposting of
84 the Samaritans' national telephone number in 26 car parks in the New Forest in England. A
85 simple white A4 sign displaying the national help-line number of Samaritans in black and the
86 caption "The Samaritans: we'll go through it with you" which was positioned on an existing
87 notice board at the entrance to each of the 26 car parks.

88 **Firearm legislation**

89 1 study (Anestis et al 2017) examined the impact of firearm legislation on suicide rates
90 across USA states from 1999 to 2015, by comparing overall suicide rates and firearm suicide

91 rates between states with and without specific legislation regulating handgun ownership
92 including universal background checks and mandatory waiting periods.

93 **Combinations of interventions**

94 ***Physical barriers and surveillance***

95 1 study (Bennewith et al 2007 and Bennewith et al 2011) examined suicide rates before and
96 after the installation of a barrier (wire fencing) on a bridge (the Clifton Suspension Bridge)
97 with an expansion of role of bridge staff to ensure individuals' safety and the installation of
98 CCTV cameras to monitor incidents on the bridge.

99 ***Physical barriers, encouraging help-seeking and surveillance***

100 1 study (Lockley et al 2014) examined suicide rates after the installation of a fence installed
101 along a cliff-top, crisis telephones and CCTV cameras in the Gap Park (Sydney, Australia).
102 The local council introduced 4 approaches to manage suicide high-frequency locations:
103 restricting access to means by constructing fencing, encouraging help-seeking by installing
104 crisis telephone and signs, installing CCTV cameras and improving site amenities.

105 ***Encouraging help-seeking and surveillance***

106 1 study (Lester 2005,) examined suicide rates after the installation of telephone helpline and
107 the presence of police patrols for preventing suicides.

108 Outcomes covered included suicide rates at the intervention site, displacement to other
109 nearby sites and suicide attempts and other sites; however there was no data on other
110 outcomes of interest as stated in the review protocol.

111 **Economic evidence**

112 No economic study met inclusion criteria of the review.

113 **Evidence statements**

114 ***Evidence statement 7.1 - physical barriers***

115 **Suicides**

116 A meta-analysis of 11 studies found a statistically significant reduction in the number of
117 suicides at sites where physical barriers were installed over a total of 161 years post-
118 intervention follow-up (risk ratio = 0.24 [95% confidence interval, 0.14 to 0.39]). The average
119 number of suicides per year decreased from 3.2 suicides to 0.7 suicides after the installation
120 of physical barriers. There were no significant subgroup differences when analyses by type
121 of barrier such as, fences, safety nets or platform screen doors. The level of certainty in the
122 evidence was moderate to high.

123 **Displacement to nearby sites**

124 A meta-analysis of 7 studies found an increase in suicides at other sites but this was not
125 statistically significant over a total of 45 years post-intervention follow-up (rate ratio = 1.46)

126 (95% confidence interval, 0.84 to 2.54). The average number of suicides increased at other
127 sites from 3.7 per year to 6.3 suicides per year after the installation of physical barriers at
128 nearby high frequency suicide sites. The level of certainty in the evidence was moderate.

129 ***Evidence statement 7.2 - restriction on road access to prevent suicide***

130 **Suicides**

131 A meta-analysis of two studies found a statistically significant reduction in the number of
132 suicides where restriction on road access was in place over a total of 2.4 years post-
133 intervention follow-up (risk ratio at 0.12 [95% confidence interval 0.02 to 0.87]). The number
134 of suicides decreased from 9.8 per year to 0 per year following the road access restriction.
135 The level of certainty in the evidence was moderate.

136 ***Evidence statement 7.3 - the effectiveness of blue lights to prevent suicides at railway
137 stations***

138 **Suicides**

139 A single study over a 11 years post-intervention follow-up found a statistically significant
140 reduction in the number of suicides following the installation of blue lights at railway stations
141 (risk ratio at 0.14 [95% confidence interval, 0.08 to 0.24]). The number of suicides on
142 average decreased from 10.2 per year to 1.5 per year following the installation of blue lights.
143 The level of certainty in the evidence was moderate.

144 **Suicide attempts**

145 Evidence from one study over a 10 year study period (7 years pre-intervention and 3 years
146 post intervention) found a statistically significant increase in the number of people who
147 attempted to suicide following the installation of blue lights at railway stations, (risk ratio at
148 1.55 [95% confidence interval, 1.11 to 2.22]). The number of attempted suicides on average
149 increased from 11.3 per year to 17.7 per year following the installation of blue lights. The
150 level of certainty in the evidence was moderate.

151 ***Evidence statement 7.4 - the effectiveness of interventions encouraging help-seeking to
152 prevent suicides***

153 **Suicides**

154 A meta-analysis of 4 studies found no statistically significant difference in the number of
155 suicides following interventions to encourage help-seeking over a total of 21 years post-
156 intervention follow-up (risk ratio at 0.91 [95% confidence interval, 0.43 to 1.93]). The number
157 of suicides increased slightly from 5.4 per year to 6.8 per year following the implementation
158 of the intervention. The level of certainty in the evidence was very low.

159 ***Evidence statement 7.5 - the effectiveness of surveillance to prevent suicides***

160 **Suicides**

161 A meta-analysis of 3 studies found a statistically significant reduction in the number of
162 suicides following surveillance interventions over a total of 10 years post-intervention follow-

163 up (risk ratio at 0.568 [95% confidence interval, 0.50 to 0.94]). The average number of
164 suicides per year decreased from 7.8 to 5.3 following the implementation of the intervention.
165 The level of certainty in the evidence was low.

166 **Displacement to nearby sites**

167 Evidence from one study found no statistically significant difference in the number of suicides
168 at nearby sites over a total of 5.0 years post-intervention follow-up (risk ratio 1.36 [95%
169 confidence interval, 0.85 to 2.16]). The average number of suicides per year increased at
170 nearby sites from 6.2 to 8.4 suicides per year. The level of certainty in the evidence was low.

171 **Evidence statement 7.6 - the effectiveness of firearm legislation to prevent suicide**

172 **Suicides**

173 Evidence from one study over a 15-years observation found states with laws requiring
174 background check and/or mandatory waiting periods had lower overall suicide rates and
175 firearm suicide rates than states without such laws (mean difference, background check=4.8
176 fewer suicide per 100,000 in states with background check; mean difference, mandatory
177 waiting period=-4,5 per 100,000 in states with mandatory waiting periods) The reductions in
178 firearm suicide rates were statistically significant. The level of certainty in the evidence was
179 very low.

180 **Recommendations**

181 1.6.1 Use local data including audit, Office for National Statistics and NHS data, as
182 well as rapid intelligence gathering, to:

- 183 • identify emerging trends in suicide methods and locations
- 184 • understand local characteristics that may influence the methods used
- 185 • determine when to take action to reduce access to means.

186 See recommendations 1.4.1 to 1.4.3.

187 1.6.2 Comply with national guidance about reducing access to methods of suicide
188 (for example, by implementing the safe cell initiative in custodial settings and
189 restricting access to painkillers in community settings).

190 1.6.3 Reduce the opportunity to attempt suicide in places where suicide is more
191 likely. (See Public Health England's Local suicide prevention planning: a practice
192 resource).

193 1.6.4 Consider other measures to deter people from suicide in places where suicide
194 is more likely. For example, consider:

- 195 • providing information about where and how people can get help when
196 they feel unable to cope
- 197 • using CCTV to allow staff to monitor when someone may need help
- 198 • increasing the number of staff or times when staff are at sites.

199

200 **Why the committee made the recommendations**

201

202 **Impact of the recommendations on practice**

203

204 **The committee's discussion of the evidence**

205 **Interpreting the evidence**

206 ***The outcomes that matter most***

207 The committee agreed that the number of people who died from suicides or the number of
208 people who had attempted suicides were the most important outcomes for this review
209 question.

210 Some of included studies used “displacement to nearby site” as an outcome and this was
211 included in the review as a post-hoc decision. This was considered important for decision
212 making as there is a concern that if access to means of suicide are restricted in one site, for
213 example, a train station, then the person may go to another site where the access to means
214 are not restricted.

215 Other outcomes specified in the review protocol such as the number of people hospitalised
216 after suicide attempts, the number of people reporting of suicidal ideation, and service uptake
217 were not reported in the included studies.

218 ***The quality of the evidence***

219 19 studies met the inclusion criteria for this review. All studies used a before-after study
220 design to examine the effectiveness of the interventions. The committee noted that the
221 overall certainty in the evidence on physical barriers or blue lights in this review was
222 moderate to high, and evidence on encouraging help-seeking combined with surveillance
223 was very low to low. There was also a paucity of evidence on restrictions to access to means
224 in custodial settings such as removal of ligature points or timed surveillance.

225 Amongst the included studies, evidence was provided on the effectiveness of the following
226 interventions:

- 227 • Physical barriers at jump sites
- 228 • Restrictions on road access to high frequency sites
- 229 • Safety nets
- 230 • Guard rails on windows
- 231 • Platform screen doors in railway or subway stations
- 232 • Crisis telephone (or telephone hotline)
- 233 • Signpost
- 234 • Blue light-emitting-diode lights
- 235 • Surveillance (CCTV camera or police patrol)

236 Most of these interventions were delivered in isolation, and 4 studies reported a combination
237 of interventions for preventing suicide. Overall pooled results of the effectiveness of
238 restriction on accessing to suicide means including physical barriers, road blockage, and
239 platform screen doors were consistent across studies, reporting a statically significant
240 reduction in suicide events after intervention. The certainty in results was moderate to high
241 as the number of suicides observed/reported and the length of follow-up time before and
242 after study interventions varied widely amongst included studies. There was also a possibility
243 of in-complete suicide cases being reported but this had little impact on the estimated effect
244 on preventing suicide.

245 2 included studies accessed the impact of restriction on road access to high frequency
246 suicide sites. The committee agreed that such studies were natural experiments and present
247 issues with repeatability.

248 **Benefits and harms**

249 **Physical barriers**

250 The committee noted that the evidence was primarily focused on the prevention of suicides
251 by jumping from high-frequency locations such as bridges, cliffs and subway or railway
252 platforms. Of interventions included, the committee agreed that an overall positive effect on
253 suicide prevention after the introduction of physical barriers at sites where suicide frequently
254 occurred was substantial, with a statistically significant reduction in the number of suicides at
255 these sites. However further research may be needed to warrant the use of platform screen
256 doors at railway or subway stations for preventing suicides, as evidence on the effectiveness
257 of platform screen doors were largely based on data reported or collected from one railway
258 or subway company. The committee noted there have been pilot schemes within the UK
259 (network rail) to assess these interventions, but currently no published data is available to
260 evaluate the effectiveness of such interventions. In addition, there is a lack of evidence on
261 interventions to restrict access to means in prison settings.

262 **Encouraging help-seeking**

263 The committee noted 4 studies¹ that examined the effectiveness of interventions related to
264 help-seeking, however pooled results did not show any benefit effect of this type of
265 intervention in preventing suicide. The committee suggested that the encouragement of help
266 seeking at high frequency sites such as the use of signposts and crisis telephones may be

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT
1 (King and Forst (2005) was delivered alone; Lester (2005), Lockley et al (2014) and Wong et al (2009) were delivered in combination with other interventions such surveillance and gatekeeper training.

267 an area where further research is needed, given heterogeneity across included studies
268 regarding types of help-seeking interventions and their delivery methods.

269 **Blue lights**

270 The committee found it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of blue lights on preventing
271 suicide as the evidence base was very uncertain due to only one study being included. The
272 committee noted that blue lights are being introduced in the UK but only as a combined
273 intervention of signposting, crisis telephones and gate-keeping training. Committee members
274 also raised concerns over how blue lights would work as a calming measure and further
275 noted that these lights would only be useful at night time.

276 **Surveillance (CCTV camera or police patrol)**

277 It was agreed that interventions involving surveillance such as the installation of CCTV and
278 the presence of staff at high frequency suicide sites, led to a reduction in the number of
279 suicides. The committee suggested that such benefit was likely to be associated with
280 increased vigilance at high-frequency locations and highlighted that an improvement in
281 vigilance of particular suicidal methods and locations would be crucial when preventing
282 suicides.

283 The committee noted that we should be mindful about unintended consequences when
284 restricting access to means and that the impact of suicide prevention by restriction on access
285 to means in different settings may vary. The committee highlighted that the most common
286 means of suicide is hanging and that up to 90% of suicides by hanging occur in a private
287 residences, which makes the restriction of access to means in these cases difficult. Thus,
288 the committee were keen to focus on suicidal prevention in public places where interventions
289 to reduce access to means have been shown to be both cost-effective and effective.

290 **Cost effectiveness and resource use**

291 No health economic evidence was found and this review question was prioritised for health
292 economic modelling. Possible resource use impacts were:

293 • Costs of setting up physical barrier (tie in with different barriers such as fence, safety
294 net, railway platform screen doors)

295 To support implementation of the recommendation, an implementation tool has been
296 developed for local authorities to determine the cost-effectiveness of prevention access to
297 means based on their own local data.

298 **Other factors the committee took into account**

299 The committee noted that when interpreting the evidence from the included studies, it is
300 essential to identify whether interventions were targeted at the population or individual level
301 depending on the nature of an intervention. For example, medication management could
302 prevent self-poisoning by reduced package size of paracetamol at a population level and/or
303 monitoring repeat prescriptions at an individual level. The committee also discussed the
304 importance of real-time surveillance to identify local high frequency sites, and agreed that
305 information about such high-frequency locations should be accessible and shared between
306 agencies involved in suicide prevention.

307 The committee noted that Public Health England had produced a report (PHE 2015) on
308 preventing suicides in public places. The committee considered the difference between
309 suicide as an impulsive act and suicide as a planned act. The committee agreed that the
310 evidence base on preventing access to the means of other suicide methods were limited in
311 the review. There was a gap in the evidence on restriction of access to means in custodial
312 settings and settings where specific occupational groups have access to means for suicide
313 such as doctors, nurses, veterinary workers, and farmers. The committee based on their
314 experience in practice, described several other common forms of suicide methods such as
315 hanging, self-poisoning by prescription medications (in particular, medications prescribed to
316 individuals with terminal conditions that are unused if the individual dies), fire-arms and GP
317 access to information on fire-arm ownership and burning.

318

319 **Appendices**

320 **Appendix A: Review protocol**

Topic 1	Interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide
Component of protocol	Description
Review question	Are interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide (such as medicines, providing safety fences, more lighting, and CCTV or suicide patrols) effective and cost effective at preventing suicide?
Context and objectives	To determine whether interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide effective and cost effective at preventing suicide.
Participants/population	Whole population or subgroups.
Intervention(s)	<p>Local interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide, for example: providing safety fences, more lighting, CCTV or suicide patrols Access to medicines</p> <p>Exclusions: Assisted suicide National strategies or national interventions.</p> <p>Prescribed medication would be covered by existing guidelines (for example, NG5 and NG46) and can be cross-referred to.</p>
Comparator(s)/control	<p>Comparators that will be considered are: Other intervention Status quo Time (before and after) or area (i.e. matched city a vs b) comparisons</p>
Outcome(s)	<p>The outcomes that will be considered when assessing the impact on health are: Suicide rates (including at hot-spots) Suicide attempts Number of people hospitalised after suicide attempts Reporting of suicide ideation</p> <p>The outcomes that will be considered when assessing help-seeking behaviour: Service uptake (such as mental health services, helplines).</p>

Topic 1	Interventions to change or reduce access to the means of suicide
Component of protocol	Description
Types of studies to be included	<p>Comparative studies including: Randomised or non-randomised controlled trials Before and after studies Cohort studies Economic studies: Economic evaluations Cost-utility (cost per QALY) Cost benefit (i.e. Net benefit) Cost-effectiveness (Cost per unit of effect) Cost minimization Cost-consequence</p> <p>Systematic reviews will only be included if they have a high level of external validity to our research questions. They will also be used as a source for primary evidence. Only full economic analyses will be included – papers reporting costs only will be excluded. Qualitative studies will be excluded</p>

321 For the full protocol see the attached version on the guideline consultation page

Appendix B: Literature search strategies

See separate document attached on the guideline consultation page.

Appendix C: References

- Anestis Michael D, Selby Edward A, and Butterworth Sarah E (2017) Rising longitudinal trajectories in suicide rates: The role of firearm suicide rates and firearm legislation. *Preventive medicine* 100, 159-166
- Beautrais A L. (2001). Effectiveness of barriers at suicide jumping sites: a case study. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 35(5), pp.557-62.
- Beautrais A L, Gibb SJ, Fergusson DM, et al. (2009). Removing bridge barriers stimulates suicides: an unfortunate natural experiment. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 43(6), pp.495-7.
- Bennewith O, Nowers M, and Gunnell D. (2007). Effect of barriers on the Clifton suspension bridge, England, on local patterns of suicide: implications for prevention. *The British journal of psychiatry: the journal of mental science*, 190, pp.266-7. Included in Pirkis's review
- Bennewith O, Nowers M, and Gunnell D (2011). Suicidal behaviour and suicide from the Clifton Suspension Bridge, Bristol and surrounding area in the UK: 1994-2003. *European journal of public health*, 21(2), pp.204-8. Included in Pirkis' review
- Chung YW, Kang SJ, Matsubayashi T et al. (2016) The effectiveness of platform screen doors for the prevention of subway suicides in South Korea *Journal of affective disorders* 194 80-83
- Corcoran P, Reulbach U, Keeley HS et al. (2010) Use of analgesics in intentional drug overdose presentations to hospital before and after the withdrawal of distalgesic from the Irish market *BMC clinical pharmacology* 10 (1) 1-8
- Donohoe E, Walsh N, Tracey JA (2006) Pack-size legislation reduces severity of paracetamol overdoses in Ireland *Irish journal of medical science* 175 (3) 40-42
- Hawton K, Townsend E, Deeks J et al. (2001) Effects of legislation restricting pack sizes of paracetamol and salicylate on self poisoning in the United Kingdom: before and after study *Bmj* 322 (7296) 1203
- Hemmer Alexander, Meier Philipp, and Reisch Thomas (2017) Comparing Different Suicide Prevention Measures at Bridges and Buildings: Lessons We Have Learned from a National Survey in Switzerland. *PloS one* 12(1), e0169625
- Higgins JP, Green S (2011) *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 4 edition. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ichikawa M, Inada H, Kumeji M (2014) Reconsidering the effects of blue-light installation for prevention of railway suicides *Journal of affective disorders* 152 183-185

Isaac M, Bennett J (2005) Prevention of suicide by jumping: the impact of restriction of access at Beachy Head, Sussex during the foot and mouth crisis 2001. *Public Health* 109: 19-22.

Johnson RM, Coyne-Beasley T (2009) Lethal means reduction: what have we learned? *Current opinion in pediatrics* 21 (5) 635-640

King E and Frost N. (2005). The New Forest Suicide Prevention Initiative (NFSPI). *Crisis*, 26(1), pp.25-33.

Law CK, Svetcic J, De Leo, and Diego. (2014). Restricting access to a suicide hotspot does not shift the problem to another location. An experiment of two river bridges in Brisbane, Australia. *Australian and New Zealand journal of public health*, 38(2), pp.134-8.

Lester D (2005) Suicide by jumping from bridges. *Percept Mot Skills* 100: 628.

Lockley A, Cheung Y, Cox G, Robinson J, Williamson M, Harris M, Machlin A, Moffat C, and Pirkis J. (2014). Preventing suicide at suicide hotspots: a case study from Australia. *Suicide & life-threatening behavior*, 44(4), pp.392-407.

Mann JJ, Apter A, Bertolote J et al. (2005) Suicide prevention strategies: a systematic review *Jama* 294 (16) 2064-2074

Matsubayashi T, Sawada Y, Ueda M (2013) Does the installation of blue lights on train platforms prevent suicide? A before-and-after observational study from Japan *Journal of affective disorders* 147 (1) 385-388

Matsubayashi T, Sawada Y, Ueda M (2014) Does the installation of blue Lights on train platforms shift suicide to another station? Evidence from Japan *Journal of affective disorders* 169 57-60

Miller M, Azrael D, Hepburn L et al. (2006) The association between changes in household firearm ownership and rates of suicide in the United States, 1981-2002 *Injury Prevention* 12 (3) 178-182

Ministry of Justice. National offender management service. 2010. Quick-time learning Bulletin. Safer Cells.

Nordentoft M, Qin P, Helweg-Larsen K et al. (2007) Restrictions in means for suicide: an effective tool in preventing suicide: the Danish experience *Suicide and life-threatening behavior* 37 (6) 688-697

Pelletier A R. (2007). Preventing suicide by jumping: the effect of a bridge safety fence. *Injury prevention: journal of the International Society for Child and Adolescent Injury Prevention*, 13(1), pp.57-9.

Perron S, Burrows S, Fournier M, Perron PA, and Ouellet F. (2013). Installation of a bridge barrier as a suicide prevention strategy in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. *American journal of public health*, 103(7), pp.1235-9.

Public Health England (2015) Preventing suicide in public places : a practice resource. Public Health England.

Reisch T and Michel K. (2005). Securing a suicide hot spot: effects of a safety net at the Bern Muenster Terrace. *Suicide & life-threatening behavior*, 35(4), pp.460-7.

Sinyor Mark, Schaffer Ayal, Redelmeier Donald A, Kiss Alex, Nishikawa Yasunori, Cheung Amy H, Levitt Anthony J, and Pirkis Jane (2017) Did the suicide barrier work after all? Revisiting the Bloor Viaduct natural experiment and its impact on suicide rates in Toronto. *BMJ open* 7(5), e015299

Sinyor M, and Levitt A J. (2010). Effect of a barrier at Bloor Street Viaduct on suicide rates in Toronto: Natural experiment. *BMJ (Online)*, 341(7765), pp.185. Skegg K and Herbison P. (2009). Effect of restricting access to a suicide jumping site. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 43(6), pp.498-502.

Stack S. (2015). Crisis phones-Suicide prevention versus suggestion/contagion effects: Skyway Bridge, 1954-2012. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 36(3), pp.220-224.

Ueda M, Sawada Y, Matsubayashi T (2015) The effectiveness of installing physical barriers for preventing railway suicides and accidents: Evidence from Japan *Journal of affective disorders* 178 1-4

Appendix D: Excluded studies

No.	Study	Reason for exclusion
1.	Atkins Whitmer, D, and Woods DL (2013). Analysis of the cost effectiveness of a suicide barrier on the Golden Gate Bridge. <i>Crisis</i> , 34(2), pp.98-106.	No economic data reported in the result
2.	Barker E, Kolves Ki, De Leo D. (2016). Rail-suicide prevention: Systematic literature review of evidence-based activities. <i>Asia-Pacific psychiatry: official journal of the Pacific Rim College of Psychiatrists</i> .	The review was not in line with inclusion criteria for a systematic review defined in the protocol.
3.	Biddle L, Donovan J, Owen-Smith A et al. (2010). Factors influencing the decision to use hanging as a method of suicide: qualitative study. <i>The British journal of psychiatry: the journal of mental science</i> , 197(4), pp.320-5.	Qualitative study
4.	Cox GR, Owens C, Robinson J, et al. (2013). Interventions to reduce suicides at suicide hotspots: a systematic review. <i>BMC public health</i> , 13, pp.214.	No new evidence added to Pirkis' reviews
5.	Gunnell David, Knipe Duleeka, Chang Shu-Sen, Pearson Melissa, Konradsen Flemming, Lee Won Jin, and Eddleston Michael (2017) Prevention of suicide with regulations aimed at restricting access to highly hazardous pesticides: a systematic review of the international evidence. <i>The Lancet. Global health</i> 5(10), e1026-e1037	Interventions were implemented at a national level
6.	Hagihara A, and Abe T. (2012). Effects of media reports and the subsequent voluntary withdrawal from sale of suicide-related products on the suicide rate in Japan. <i>European archives of psychiatry and clinical neuroscience</i> , 262(3), pp.245-51.	Intervention (media reporting)
7.	Harris FM, Maxwell M, O'Connor R, et al. (2016). Exploring synergistic interactions and catalysts in complex interventions: longitudinal, mixed methods case studies of an optimised multi-level suicide prevention intervention in four European countries (Ospi-Europe). <i>BMC public health</i> , 16, pp.268.	Intervention (multi-component prevention)
8.	Havarneanu GM, Burkhardt J-M, and Paran F. (2015). A systematic review of the literature on safety measures to prevent railway suicides and trespassing accidents. <i>Accident, and analysis and prevention</i> , 81, pp.30-50.	The review was not in line with inclusion criteria for a systematic review defined in the protocol

No.	Study	Reason for exclusion
9.	Havarneau Grigore M, Burkhardt Jean-Marie, and Silla Anne (2016) Optimizing suicide and trespass prevention on railways: a problem-solving model from the RESTRAIL project. <i>International journal of injury control and safety promotion</i> , 1-18	Outcome of interest were not included
10.	Johnson RM, Frank EM, Ciocca M, et al. (2011). Training mental healthcare providers to reduce at-risk patients' access to lethal means of suicide: evaluation of the CALM Project. <i>Archives of suicide research: official journal of the International Academy for Suicide Research</i> , 15(3), pp.259-64.	Intervention (gatekeeper training)
11.	Knapp M, McDaid D, Parsonage M (2011) Mental Health Promotion and Prevention: The economic case. <i>Economic analyses of barriers on Clifton Suspension Bridge</i> .	No detailed on economic data in the report
12.	Knipe Duleeka W, Chang Shu-Sen, Dawson Andrew, Eddleston Michael, Konradsen Flemming, Metcalfe Chris, and Gunnell David (2017) Suicide prevention through means restriction: Impact of the 2008-2011 pesticide restrictions on suicide in Sri Lanka. <i>PLoS one</i> 12(3), e0172893	Study was conducted in non-OECD country
13.	Larsen ME, Cummins N, Boonstra TW, O'Dea B, Tighe J, Nicholas J, Shand F, Epps J, and Christensen H. (2015). The use of technology in Suicide Prevention. <i>Conference proceedings: ... Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society. Annual Conference, 2015</i> , pp.7316-9.	Study type (overview)
14.	Law C, Yip P S, Chan W S, Fu K-W, Wong P W Lw Y. (2009) Evaluating the effectiveness of barrier installation for preventing railway suicides in Hong King. <i>J Affect Disord</i> , 114 : 254-62.	Study was conducted in non-OECD country
15.	Law C, Yip P S. (2011) An evaluation of setting up physical barriers in railway stations for preventing railway injury : evidence from Hong Kong. <i>J Epidemiol Community Health</i> , 65 : 915-20.	Study was conducted in non-OECD country
16.	Mann J J, Apter A, Bertolote J, Beautrais A, Currier D, Haas A, Hegerl U, Lonnqvist J, Malone K, Marusic A, Mehlum L, Patton G, Phillips M, Rutz W, Rihmer Z, Schmidtke A, Shaffer D, Silverman M, Takahashi Y, Varnik A, Wasserman D, Yip P, and Hendin H. (2005). Suicide prevention strategies - A systematic review. <i>Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association</i> , 294(16), pp.2064-2074.	Intervention (not targeting access to means)
17.	Mohl A, Stulz N, Martin A, Eigenmann F, Hepp U et al (2012) The "Suicide Guard Rail": a minimal structural intervention in hospital reduces suicide jumps. <i>BMC Res Notes</i> 5: 408	Not in the community setting.

No.	Study	Reason for exclusion
18.	Owens C, Lloyd-Tomlins S, Emmens T, and Aitken P. (2009). Suicides in public places: findings from one English county. <i>European journal of public health</i> , 19(6), pp.580-2.	No intervention
19.	Pearson Melissa, Metcalfe Chris, Jayamanne Shaluka, Gunnell David, Weerasinghe Manjula, Pieris Ravi, Priyadarshana Chamil, Knipe Duleeka W, Hawton Keith, Dawson Andrew H, Bandara Palitha, deSilva Dhammika, Gawarammana Indika, Eddleston Michael, and Konradsen Flemming (2017) Effectiveness of household lockable pesticide storage to reduce pesticide self-poisoning in rural Asia: a community-based, cluster-randomised controlled trial. <i>Lancet</i> (London, and England) ,	Study was conducted in non-OECD country
20.	Pirkis J, Spittal MJ, Cox G et al. (2013) The effectiveness of structural interventions at suicide hotspots: a meta-analysis <i>International journal of epidemiology</i>	Individual studies identified and included if met inclusion criteria for the review
21.	Pirkis J, San Too L, Spittal MJ et al. (2015) Interventions to reduce suicides at suicide hotspots: a systematic review and meta-analysis <i>The Lancet Psychiatry</i> 2 (11) 994-1001	Individual studies identified and included if met inclusion criteria for the review
22.	Pope N D, Slovak K L, and Giger J T. (2016). Evaluating a training intervention to prepare geriatric case managers to assess for suicide and firearm safety. <i>Educational Gerontology</i> , 42(10), pp.706-716.	Intervention (gatekeeper training)
23.	Shelef L, Tatsa-Laur L, Derazne E, Mann J J, and Fruchter E. (2016). An effective suicide prevention program in the Israeli Defence Forces: A cohort study. <i>European psychiatry: the journal of the Association of European Psychiatrists</i> , 31, pp.37-43.	Intervention (national intervention)
24.	Skilling G D, Sclare P D, Watt S J, and Fielding S. (2008). The effect of catalytic converter legislation on suicide rates in Grampian and Scotland 1980-2003. <i>Scottish medical journal</i> , 53(4), pp.3-6.	Intervention (national legislation)
25.	Slaven J and Kisely S. (2002). The Esperance primary prevention of suicide project. <i>The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry</i> , 36(5), pp.617-21.	Intervention (national prevention)
26.	Walrath C, Garraza L G, Reid Hailey, Goldston D B, and McKeon R. (2015). Impact of the Garrett Lee Smith youth suicide prevention program on suicide mortality. <i>American journal of public health</i> , 105(5), pp.986-93.	Intervention (multi-component intervention)
27.	Wong P W, Liu P M Chan W S et al (2009) In integrative suicide prevention program for visitor charcoal burning suicide and suicide pact. <i>Suicide life threat Behav</i> 39(1): 82-90.	Study was conducted in non-OECD country

No.	Study	Reason for exclusion
28.	Yip P S. F, Caine E, Yousuf S, Chang S S, Wu K C. C, and Chen Y Y. (2012). Means restriction for suicide prevention. <i>The Lancet</i> , 379(9834), pp.2393-2399.	Study type (overview)
29.	Yip Paul S. F, Cheng Qijin, Chang Shu-Sen, Lee Esther Sze Tsai, Lai Chui-Shan Carmen, Chen Feng, Law Yik-Wa Frances, Cheng T M. Eric, Chiu Sau Mee, Tse Y L. Jeff, Cheung Ka-Wai Raymond, Tse Man-Li, Morgan Peter R, and Beh Philip (2017) A Public Health Approach in Responding to the Spread of Helium Suicide in Hong Kong. <i>Crisis</i> 38(4), 269-277	Study was conducted in non-OECD country
30.	Yurtseven Ayse, Uzun Ibrahim, and Arslan Murat Nihat (2017) Suicides by Jumping Off Istanbul Bridges Linking Asia and Europe. <i>The American journal of forensic medicine and pathology</i> 38(2), 139-144	Non-intervention study
31.	Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, van Heeringen K, Arensman E, Sarchiapone M, Carli V, Hoschl C, Barzilay R, Balazs J, Purebl G, Kahn J Pierre A S, Cendrine B L, Bobes J, Cozman D, Hegerl U, and Zohar J. (2016). Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year systematic review. <i>The lancet. Psychiatry</i> , 3(7), pp.646-59.	Intervention (national intervention)

Appendix E: Evidence tables

E.1.1 Anestis et al 2017

Anestis Michael D, Selby Edward A, and Butterworth Sarah E (2017) Rising longitudinal trajectories in suicide rates: The role of firearm suicide rates and firearm legislation. Preventive medicine 100, 159-166			
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results
<p>Author/year</p> <p>Anestis et al 2017</p> <p>Quality score</p> <p>-</p> <p>Study type</p> <p>Observation</p> <p>Aim of the study</p> <p>To examine whether the rates of change in overall suicide rates and firearm suicide rates differed between states with and without specific legislation regulating handgun ownership demonstrated in prior studies to be associated cross-sectional with overall suicide rates (universal background checks and mandatory waiting periods; to examine</p>	<p>Inclusion criteria</p> <p>Firearm-related suicide and non-firearm related suicide between 1999 and 2015</p> <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Method of analysis</p> <p>The study examined the changes in annual overall and non-firearm suicide rates from one year to the next to determine if decreases in firearm suicide rates during one year predicted increases in non-firearm suicide rates during that same year. To examine this we used linear mixed models, which allowed us to examine suicide rates for each year during the data period</p>	<p>Participant numbers</p> <p>Firearm-related suicide and non-firearm related suicide between 1999 and 2015</p> <p>Participant characteristics</p> <p>Not reported</p> <p>Intervention</p> <p>Gun-based prevention efforts in preventing death by suicide. Such research has presented evidence for the utility of legislation regulating access and exposure to handguns (e.g., universal background checks, mandatory waiting periods) in lowering overall – not simply firearm – suicide rates</p> <p>Universal background checks refer to a requirement that individuals selling a gun use a local, state, or federal system(variable by state) to search for records indicating that the individual attempting to buy the gun is barred from doing so (e.g. prior conviction for violent crime).</p> <p>Mandatory waiting periods refer to an amount of time required to pass between the purchase of a gun and</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Firearm related suicide</p> <p>The result shows that states with background checks demonstrated lower overall suicide rates over the data period than did states without such laws</p> <p>(Universal Background Check Required M=10.25; SD=2.87; Universal Background Check Not Required M=14.82; SD=3.37; b=4.57, SE = 0.84, t (49) = 4.33, p b 0.001, d = 1.22). Further examination of the model with covariates included indicated that background checks maintained significance for lower firearm suicide rates (p b 0.01), but not overall suicide rates (p b 0.001).</p> <p>States with mandatory waiting periods demonstrated significantly lower overall suicide rates (Wait Period Required M = 10.19; SD =2.60; No Wait Period M = 14.715; SD = 3.72; b = 3.16, SE = 1.10, t (49) = 2.89, p b 0.001, d =0.89). With the inclusion of covariates, mandatory waiting period remained a significant predictor of lower firearm suicide rates (p b0.05), but not overall suicide rates (p N 0.05).</p> <p>Further investigation indicated that states with universal background checks (including private sales of handguns or all firearms) and/or mandatory waiting periods demonstrated no significant differences in non-firearm suicide rates than states without those laws. Furthermore, although there were individual main effects for background check and waiting period laws and reduced overall suicide rates, there were no synergistic effects, as states with both laws (M = 9.27, SD =2.23) were not significantly different than states with one law (M =11.50, SD = 2.89; b = 0.28, 1.24, t (49) = 0.22, p = 0.83), however there may be low power to detect such effects.</p>

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>whether firearm legislation is associated with sustained changes in the trajectory of state-wide suicide rates across time.</p>	<p>(1999–2015) while simultaneously accounting for variability across states (and the District of Columbia) by specifying a random intercept for the model.</p>	<p>the physical transfer of the weapon from the seller to the purchaser. The number of days involved in the waiting period varies by state.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Region, N (states)</th> <th>N w/background und</th> <th>% w/background und</th> <th>N w/wait</th> <th>% w/wait</th> <th>Annual suicide rate (SD)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>New England, 6</td> <td>3</td> <td>50%</td> <td>1</td> <td>17%</td> <td>11.42 (3.37)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mid Atlantic, 3</td> <td>3</td> <td>100%</td> <td>1</td> <td>33%</td> <td>8.88 (2.56)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>East North Central, 5</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> <td>11.55 (1.77)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West North Central, 7</td> <td>2</td> <td>29%</td> <td>3</td> <td>43%</td> <td>13.42 (2.45)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>South Atlantic, 9</td> <td>4</td> <td>44%</td> <td>3</td> <td>33%</td> <td>11.65 (2.90)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West South Central, 4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>13.58 (1.52)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>West South Central, 4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>13.41 (2.57)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mountain, 8</td> <td>1</td> <td>13%</td> <td>0</td> <td>0%</td> <td>18.83 (2.97)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pacific, 5</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> <td>2</td> <td>40%</td> <td>14.58 (4.45)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Region, N (states)	N w/background und	% w/background und	N w/wait	% w/wait	Annual suicide rate (SD)	New England, 6	3	50%	1	17%	11.42 (3.37)	Mid Atlantic, 3	3	100%	1	33%	8.88 (2.56)	East North Central, 5	2	40%	2	40%	11.55 (1.77)	West North Central, 7	2	29%	3	43%	13.42 (2.45)	South Atlantic, 9	4	44%	3	33%	11.65 (2.90)	West South Central, 4	0	0%	0	0%	13.58 (1.52)	West South Central, 4	0	0%	0	0%	13.41 (2.57)	Mountain, 8	1	13%	0	0%	18.83 (2.97)	Pacific, 5	2	40%	2	40%	14.58 (4.45)
Region, N (states)	N w/background und	% w/background und	N w/wait	% w/wait	Annual suicide rate (SD)																																																															
New England, 6	3	50%	1	17%	11.42 (3.37)																																																															
Mid Atlantic, 3	3	100%	1	33%	8.88 (2.56)																																																															
East North Central, 5	2	40%	2	40%	11.55 (1.77)																																																															
West North Central, 7	2	29%	3	43%	13.42 (2.45)																																																															
South Atlantic, 9	4	44%	3	33%	11.65 (2.90)																																																															
West South Central, 4	0	0%	0	0%	13.58 (1.52)																																																															
West South Central, 4	0	0%	0	0%	13.41 (2.57)																																																															
Mountain, 8	1	13%	0	0%	18.83 (2.97)																																																															
Pacific, 5	2	40%	2	40%	14.58 (4.45)																																																															
<p>Location and setting States, USA</p>	<p>Next the study investigated state laws (universal background check and mandatory waiting period) in predicting annual overall suicide rates across states.</p>	<p>Comparison States with and without laws related gun ownership</p>	<p>Author’s conclusions</p> <p>Our findings also highlight the potential impact of means safety efforts on the overall suicide rate. Specifically, our results indicated that the presence of specific laws was associated with a fundamentally different longitudinal trajectory of the overall suicide rate. In states without such laws, both the firearm-specific and overall suicide rates showed a sharp increase across years, whereas states with such laws exhibited a much more modest slope. Our results speak to the potential benefits of public health efforts aimed at reducing the national overall suicide rate through a concentrated effort to reduce the likelihood that a suicidal individual can readily access a gun.</p>																																																																	
<p>Length of study 1999-2015</p>	<p>For these analyses we used linear mixed effects models to examine each law as a fixed effect, investigating each law in a separate model and including a random intercept to allow for variance between and within states.</p>																																																																			
<p>Source of funding Not reported</p>																																																																				

Limitations identified by author

Study data did not allow for an examination of the extent to which suicidal individuals were directly impacted by firearm legislation on the individual level.

Limitations identified by review team

Variation in the gun legislation in different states, and the effect could be confounded by any other suicide prevention programmes or initiatives during study period.

E.1.2 Beautrais 2001 and Beautrais et al 2009

Beautrais A L. (2001). Effectiveness of barriers at suicide jumping sites: a case study. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 35(5), pp.557-62.

Beautrais A L, Gibb SJ, Fergusson DM, et al. (2009). Removing bridge barriers stimulates suicides: an unfortunate natural experiment. *The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry*, 43(6), pp.495-7.

Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																		
<p>Author/year Beautrais 2001 Beautrais 2009 (linked studies)</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type After- before- after reversal study</p> <p>Aim of the study</p> <p>Study 1: examined the impact of the removal of barriers from a central city bridge in 1996 on suicide rates</p> <p>Study 2: compared the number of suicides due to jumping from the bridge after the reinstatement of safety barriers on the same bridge in 2003</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Mean Age</th> <th>Sex: male (n)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Grafton bridge (n=9)</td> <td>26.3</td> <td>8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other bridges (n=19)</td> <td>33.9</td> <td>14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Inclusion criteria Suicide events</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Study 1 Since the safety barriers were removed during 1996 data for 1996 were removed from all analyses.</p> <p>Data Collection: Study 1: Data for suicide deaths by jumping from Grafton Bridge, from 1992 to 2000, were obtained from the regional City Police Inquest Office. It was not possible to obtain parallel data on all suicides by jumping from other sites in Auckland during the period</p>	Location	Mean Age	Sex: male (n)	Grafton bridge (n=9)	26.3	8	Other bridges (n=19)	33.9	14	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Study 1: Metal screens fixed above concrete parapets for purposes of suicide prevention, removed in 1996.</p> <p>Intervention group: The number of deaths by suicide from jumping from the bridge in prior to the removal of the safety barriers (1992–1995) and the number of deaths from suicide by jumping in following the removal of the barriers (1997–2000).</p> <p>Comparison group: The number of deaths by suicide from jumping from all other sites in Auckland , before (1993–1995) and after (1997–1998) removal of safety barriers from the bridge</p> <p>Study 2: Reinstallation of a barrier in 2003 with an improved curved glass design</p> <p>Intervention (no comparison/control group):</p> <p>Number of deaths by suicide from jumping from the bridge from after reinstatement of the barriers (2002-2006)</p>	<p>Primary outcomes Number of suicides</p> <p>Study 1: Suicide by jumping from Grafton bridge before and after removal of safety barriers</p> <p>Prior to the removal of barriers only three suicides occurred during the preceding 4 years, compared with 15 deaths in the 4 years following the removal of barriers. Chi-squared, one sample tests showed these differences to be highly significant (numbers, 3 vs 15: $\chi^2 = 8$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.01$; rates, 0.29 vs 1.29 per 100 000: $\chi^2 = 6.6$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.01$).</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Safety barriers in place (1992-1995)</th> <th>Safety barriers removed (1997-2000)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Number</td> <td>3</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rate per 100 000 of population at risk</td> <td>0.29</td> <td>1.29</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Suicides (n) by jumping from GB, and all other sites in Auckland , before (1993–1995) and after (1997–1998) removal of safety barriers from the bridge</p>		Safety barriers in place (1992-1995)	Safety barriers removed (1997-2000)	Number	3	15	Rate per 100 000 of population at risk	0.29	1.29
Location	Mean Age	Sex: male (n)																			
Grafton bridge (n=9)	26.3	8																			
Other bridges (n=19)	33.9	14																			
	Safety barriers in place (1992-1995)	Safety barriers removed (1997-2000)																			
Number	3	15																			
Rate per 100 000 of population at risk	0.29	1.29																			

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Location and setting Grafton Bridge in Auckland, New Zealand</p> <p>Length of study Study 1: Number of deaths by suicide by jumping from in the 4-year period (1992–1995) prior to the removal of the safety barriers and the number of deaths in the 4-year period (1997–2000) following the removal of the barriers. Number of deaths by suicide from jumping for all other sites in the Auckland region was obtained from 1994-1998.</p> <p>Study 2: Study assessed number and rates of suicides in three periods: _ 1991–1995 (5-year period in which original barriers were in place) _ 1997–2002 (6-year period in which no barriers were in place) _ 2002–2006 (5-year period in which new barriers were in place)</p> <p>Source of funding The Health Research Council of New Zealand.</p>	<p>1992–2000.</p> <p>However data from 1994 to 1998 from suicides by jumping in the whole region were obtained from the national health statistics database. Case history data about each suicide death were abstracted from coronial files held by this database</p> <p><i>Study 2:</i> National mortality data for suicide deaths due to jumping were compared for three time periods: 1991-1995 (old barrier in place); 1997-2002 (no barriers in place); 2003-2006 (after barriers were reinstated). Data obtained from the Department of Court’s coronial records, and the mortality database of the New Zealand Health Information Service.</p>	<p>Number of deaths by suicide from jumping before the first barriers were removed at the site (1991-1995) and after the first barriers were removed (1997-2002)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time</th> <th>Grafton bridge (n)</th> <th>All other sites (n)</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1994-1995</td> <td>2</td> <td>12</td> <td>14</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997-1998</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>14</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Time	Grafton bridge (n)	All other sites (n)	Total	1994-1995	2	12	14	1997-1998	7	7	14	<p><i>Note: missing data from other sites between 1992-1994, 1998-2000, so data for Grafton Bridge was merged to match</i></p> <p>Overall numbers of suicides by jumping remained unchanged (14), prior to, and following, the removal of barriers from the Bridge. However, the distribution of deaths by jumping varied markedly: prior to the removal of barriers from the Bridge the majority (12/14) of suicides by jumping in Auckland occurred at sites other than the Bridge; following the removal of the barriers half (7/14) of all suicides by jumping in Auckland occurred at Grafton Bridge. A χ^2 test showed a significant association between time period and site ($\chi^2 = 4.12$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.05$).</p> <p><i>Study 2:</i> Rates of suicide due to jumping from Grafton Bridge 1991-2006</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Period</th> <th>Number of suicides</th> <th>Suicides per year</th> <th>Rate per 100,000</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1991-1995 (before barriers)</td> <td>5</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1997-2002 (barriers removed)</td> <td>19</td> <td>3.17</td> <td>0.28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003-2006 (barriers reinstalled)</td> <td>0</td> <td>0.00</td> <td>0.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Numbers and rates of suicide increased in the period when the barriers were removed, compared when the original and new barriers were in place. An χ^2 test of the rate of change in the rate of suicide over the</p>	Period	Number of suicides	Suicides per year	Rate per 100,000	1991-1995 (before barriers)	5	1.0	0.10	1997-2002 (barriers removed)	19	3.17	0.28	2003-2006 (barriers reinstalled)	0	0.00	0.00
Time	Grafton bridge (n)	All other sites (n)	Total																													
1994-1995	2	12	14																													
1997-1998	7	7	14																													
Period	Number of suicides	Suicides per year	Rate per 100,000																													
1991-1995 (before barriers)	5	1.0	0.10																													
1997-2002 (barriers removed)	19	3.17	0.28																													
2003-2006 (barriers reinstalled)	0	0.00	0.00																													

			<p>three periods showed a highly significant difference between time periods ($\chi^2(2) = 16.9, p < 0.0001$). Pairwise comparisons showed that rates of suicide over the period when the barriers were removed were significantly higher than for the original barriers ($\chi^2(1) = 4.8, p < 0.05$) and the new barriers ($\chi^2(1) = 4.0, p < 0.0001$).</p> <p>Authors conclusions</p> <p>The present studies add to evidence that the most effective form of prevention at bridge jumping sites is installation of safety barriers. In a naturalistic study, the Grafton Bridge 'experiment' has used, in effect, a powerful a-b-a (reversal) design: barriers were in place, removed, and then reinstated. The original barriers were old, did not extend across the full length of the Bridge and failed to prevent all suicides. The well-designed replacements extend the entire length of the Bridge and have eliminated suicides.</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author</p> <p>Cannot be concluded unequivocally that the removal of barriers from Grafton Bridge led to an overall increase in the rates of suicide by jumping in the Auckland region – could be that the removal of barriers had made the bridge more accessible and preferred site for suicide by jumping than was the case when barriers were in place.</p> <p>Study 1: Not possible to obtain full coronial data for suicides by jumping in the Auckland region after 1998, although data for suicides from Grafton bridge were available up to 2000. These restrictions on data availability reduce the statistical precision of the before and after comparisons reported in this paper.</p> <p>All data are based upon official records and are subject to the liabilities and potential imprecisions of official record data</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team</p> <p>Study 1: Missing suicide rate data from other sites in the Auckland region between 1992- 1994 (pre barrier removal) and between 1998- 2000 (post barrier removal) – therefore this is compared with data from Grafton bridge from the same time. However it is a relatively short duration for comparison - only data from 2 years pre/post removal of the barrier. Longer follow-up period may be needed to measure the true effect of the barrier on suicide rates after re- installation.</p> <p>Only explores 'other sites' for suicide by jumping in the Auckland region as a whole group comparison – data for suicide numbers before and after not specific to a particular site. Motives and epidemiological profiles of those who jump from locations that have acquired notoriety, may not be comparable with those who jump from other locations (e.g. residential buildings).</p>			

E.1.3 Bennewith 2007 and Bennewith et al 2011

<p>Bennewith O, Nowers M, and Gunnell D. (2007). Effect of barriers on the Clifton suspension bridge, England, on local patterns of suicide: implications for prevention. The British journal of psychiatry: the journal of mental science, 190, pp.266-7.</p>			
<p>Bennewith O, Nowers M, and Gunnell D (2011). Suicidal behaviour and suicide from the Clifton Suspension Bridge, Bristol and surrounding area in the UK: 1994-2003. European journal of public health, 21(2), pp.204-8.</p>			
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results

<p>Author/year Bennewith et al 2007 Bennewith et al 2011 (linked studies)</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Before and after</p> <p>Aim of the study <i>Study 1)</i> To assess the effect of the installation of barriers on the Clifton suspension bridge, Bristol, England on local patterns of suicide</p> <p><i>Study 2)</i> The study additionally compared the characteristics of people jumping from different sites in Bristol, UK and its surrounding area, described the characteristics of those who jumped from the bridge before and after the installation of the preventive barriers, the non-fatal and fatal suicidal incidents on the bridge and Bridge staffs' views of the role the barriers have played in the prevention of suicides from the bridge</p> <p>Location and setting</p>	<p>Number of participants</p> <p>987 suicides in the Bristol area over the 10-year study period. Of these deaths, 134 (13.6%) were suicides by jumping and 61 from the Clifton suspension bridge. The other main sites for jumping were car parks (n = 12), other bridges (n = 10), cliffs (n = 20) and places of residence (n = 20)</p> <p>Bridge staff: Interviews were conducted with 10 of the 13 staff employed as attendants on the Clifton Suspension Bridge.</p> <p>Participant characteristics</p> <p><i>Characteristics of individuals who died by jumping from the CB and other sites within Bristol 1994–2003:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Mean Age (SD)</th> <th>Sex: male (%)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Clifton bridge (n=61)</td> <td>31.5 (9.0)</td> <td>5 (90.2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other bridges (n=10)</td> <td>33.9 (11.8)</td> <td>7 (70.0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Car parks (n=10)</td> <td>32.7 (8.6)</td> <td>10 (83.3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Place of residence (n=20)</td> <td>59.2 (20.2)</td> <td>14 (70.0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cliffs (n=20)</td> <td>40.3 (12.4)</td> <td>12 (60.0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other sites</td> <td>37.4 (17.6)</td> <td>7 (77.8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>P value</td> <td>P<0.001</td> <td>P = 0.09</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Characteristics of bridge staff interviewed:</i></p>	Location	Mean Age (SD)	Sex: male (%)	Clifton bridge (n=61)	31.5 (9.0)	5 (90.2)	Other bridges (n=10)	33.9 (11.8)	7 (70.0)	Car parks (n=10)	32.7 (8.6)	10 (83.3)	Place of residence (n=20)	59.2 (20.2)	14 (70.0)	Cliffs (n=20)	40.3 (12.4)	12 (60.0)	Other sites	37.4 (17.6)	7 (77.8)	P value	P<0.001	P = 0.09	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>The effectiveness of restricting access to lethal means by installing a two metre high wire fencing on the main span of the bridge in 1998 was assessed. The fencing was accompanied by an expansion of the role of bridge staff to include monitoring of incidents, and the installation of CCTV cameras.</p> <p>Two staff work on the Clifton Suspension Bridge at night and three during the day. Part of their role is to ensure the safety of people on the bridge and to deal with any incidents. They are based in the Bridge-master's offices at either end of the bridge and their observation of incidents on the bridge is enhanced by CCTV cameras, installed at several points on the bridge, and by their regular patrols.</p> <p>Interviews with 10 of 13 bridge staff were also conducted</p> <p>Intervention group: data examined on changes in the number or rate of suicides before and after barrier installation at the high-frequency location</p> <p>Comparison group: data examined on changes in the number or rate of suicides before and after barrier installation at other sites in Bristol, UK</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p><i>Suicide rates (Study 1&2):</i></p> <p>Substantial decreases in the number of suicides by jumping (though not a complete elimination of them) following the installation of fencing on the Clifton Suspension Bridge.</p> <p>Deaths from the bridge halved from 8.2 per year (1994^1998) to 4.0 per year (1999^2003; P=0.008). Although 90% of the suicides from the bridge were by males, there was no evidence of an increase in male suicide by jumping from other sites in the Bristol area after the erection of the barriers</p> <p>In the 5 years after the construction of the barriers there was a non-significant increase compared with the previous 5 years in the number of deaths by jumping from sites other than the suspension bridge: from 6.2 deaths per year to 8.4 deaths per year (P=0.2).</p> <p>No significant change in the <i>overall rate</i> of suicide among those resident in the area during the periods before and after the placement of the barriers on the bridge: mean annual rate 11.2 per 100 000 v. 10.5 per 100 000, difference 70.7 (95% CI 71.9 to 0.9), P=0.39. This was the case for both men (difference 71.8 per 100 000, 95% CI 71.7 to 0.9) and women (difference 0.4 per 100 000, 95% CI 70.9 to 2.1).</p> <p>Suicide by jumping</p> <p><i>Clifton suspension bridge:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1994-1998 (before)</th> <th>1999-2003 (after)</th> <th>Diff in means (95% CI)</th> <th>P value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean deaths/year</td> <td>8.2</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>-4.2 (-5.9 to -1.4)</td> <td>0.008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total deaths</td> <td>41</td> <td>20</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male mean deaths/year</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>-5.0 (-2.6 to -6.3)</td> <td>0.001</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male total deaths</td> <td>40</td> <td>15</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1994-1998 (before)	1999-2003 (after)	Diff in means (95% CI)	P value	Mean deaths/year	8.2	4.0	-4.2 (-5.9 to -1.4)	0.008	Total deaths	41	20			Male mean deaths/year	8.0	3.0	-5.0 (-2.6 to -6.3)	0.001	Male total deaths	40	15		
Location	Mean Age (SD)	Sex: male (%)																																																		
Clifton bridge (n=61)	31.5 (9.0)	5 (90.2)																																																		
Other bridges (n=10)	33.9 (11.8)	7 (70.0)																																																		
Car parks (n=10)	32.7 (8.6)	10 (83.3)																																																		
Place of residence (n=20)	59.2 (20.2)	14 (70.0)																																																		
Cliffs (n=20)	40.3 (12.4)	12 (60.0)																																																		
Other sites	37.4 (17.6)	7 (77.8)																																																		
P value	P<0.001	P = 0.09																																																		
	1994-1998 (before)	1999-2003 (after)	Diff in means (95% CI)	P value																																																
Mean deaths/year	8.2	4.0	-4.2 (-5.9 to -1.4)	0.008																																																
Total deaths	41	20																																																		
Male mean deaths/year	8.0	3.0	-5.0 (-2.6 to -6.3)	0.001																																																
Male total deaths	40	15																																																		

<p>Clifton suspension bridge, Bristol, England. The bridge is located at the centre of the geographic area served by the Bristol coroner. 75m above the river and has a fatality of over 95%.</p> <p>Information gained on all suicided occurring in the Bristol area</p> <p>Length of study Barriers installed in 2008</p> <p><i>Study 1</i> 1994–1998 (5-year pre intervention period); 1999–2003 (5-year post intervention period).</p> <p><i>Study 2</i> Same study period used above for suicide rates before and after the installation of barriers</p> <p>1996–2005 (2-year pre intervention period and 7 year post) - interviews with bridge staff and further records of fatal and non-fatal incidents on the bridge</p> <p>Source of funding The American Foundation for Suicide Prevention</p>	<p>All male who had worked on the bridge for a range of 6 months to 24 years. They had witnessed a range of 0 to '≥15' cases of jumping from the bridge, dependant in part on their period of employment</p> <p>Inclusion criteria</p> <p>All deaths with an inquest verdict of suicide were included in the study. Records of deaths given an open, accidental or misadventure verdict by the coroner were also examined</p> <p>The likelihood (high, medium, low or unclear) that these deaths were suicide was rated independently by D.G. and M.N., masked to the year of death. Only cases rated as medium or high likelihood were included.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <p>Did not examine the coroner's files for accidental acute alcohol poisonings or deaths from illegal drug use or methadone poisoning, as determining the possibility of suicide in such deaths is particularly problematic</p> <p>Data collection</p> <p><i>Study 1</i> Coroners' inquest files were examined</p> <p>to obtain information on all suicides occurring in the Bristol area, 5 years before (1994–1998) and 5 years after (1999–2003) the installation of the barriers</p>		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Female mean/deaths per year</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.8 (-0.8 to 8.4)</td> <td>0.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female total deaths</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Female mean/deaths per year	0.2	1.0	0.8 (-0.8 to 8.4)	0.1	Female total deaths	1	5			<p><i>Sites in Bristol other than the suspension bridge:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1994-1998 (before)</th> <th>1999-2003 (after)</th> <th>Diff in means (95% CI)</th> <th>P value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Mean deaths/year</td> <td>6.2</td> <td>8.4</td> <td>2.2 (-0.9 to 7.2)</td> <td>0.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total deaths</td> <td>31</td> <td>42</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male mean deaths/year</td> <td>5.2</td> <td>5.2</td> <td>0 (2.2 to -3.8)</td> <td>1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Male total deaths</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female mean/deaths per year</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>2.2 (0.2 to 7.7)</td> <td>0.023</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female total deaths</td> <td>1</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Characteristics of suicides by jumping in the Bristol area (study 2):</i></p> <p>Statistical evidence ($P < 0.01$) that age was associated with the choice of site from which to jump. Those who died by jumping from their place of residence were older (mean age of 59.2 years) than those jumping from other sites. 80% of all the jumping suicides were male. The number of male suicides from the Suspension Bridge (90.2%) was higher than for all other sites, however only a weak statistical difference between sites ($P = 0.09$)</p> <p><i>Characteristics of those who died by jumping from the Clifton Suspension Bridge before and after the installation of the barriers (study 2):</i></p>		1994-1998 (before)	1999-2003 (after)	Diff in means (95% CI)	P value	Mean deaths/year	6.2	8.4	2.2 (-0.9 to 7.2)	0.2	Total deaths	31	42			Male mean deaths/year	5.2	5.2	0 (2.2 to -3.8)	1.0	Male total deaths	26	26			Female mean/deaths per year	1.0	3.2	2.2 (0.2 to 7.7)	0.023	Female total deaths	1	5		
Female mean/deaths per year	0.2	1.0	0.8 (-0.8 to 8.4)	0.1																																													
Female total deaths	1	5																																															
	1994-1998 (before)	1999-2003 (after)	Diff in means (95% CI)	P value																																													
Mean deaths/year	6.2	8.4	2.2 (-0.9 to 7.2)	0.2																																													
Total deaths	31	42																																															
Male mean deaths/year	5.2	5.2	0 (2.2 to -3.8)	1.0																																													
Male total deaths	26	26																																															
Female mean/deaths per year	1.0	3.2	2.2 (0.2 to 7.7)	0.023																																													
Female total deaths	1	5																																															

	<p><i>Study 2</i></p> <p>Same data from coroner's inquest files above used</p> <p>The following information, for the years 1996–2005 was also gained from incident forms completed by bridge staff: (i) approximate age (data based on Bridge staff's subjective impression) and sex of the individual; (ii) any previous history of incidents on the bridge for that individual; (iii) how the incident was noticed; (iv) a brief description of the incident; (v) action taken; (vi) whether local health or police services were informed and (vii) outcome of the incident</p>		<p>Mean age of suicides from the bridge was similar before (1994–1998) compared with after (1999–2003) the installation of the barriers (30.3 years vs. 34.1 years, difference 3.8 years, 95% CI 1.10–8.57).</p> <p><i>Incidents on the bridge gained from staff incident forms (study 2):</i></p> <p>421 fatal and non-fatal incidents where someone jumped or appeared to be at risk of jumping from the bridge were recorded. 113 (39 per year) recorded 3 years (1996–1998) before the installation of the barriers and 304 (43 per year) in the 7 years (1999–2005) afterwards. 368 of these incidents were not fatal - potential suicides can more easily be reached by Bridge staff because of the time taken to scale the barrier and cameras on the bridge assist by alerting them to such incidents.</p> <p>Data on sex were recorded for 406 (406/421) incidents. 71.4% involved men. The number of incidents each year for males was similar before and after the installation of the barriers (29 vs. 29). Though there was an increase in the number of incidents involving females (8 vs. 13), statistical evidence for a sex-difference across the two time points was weak ($\chi^2 = 2.74$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.10$).</p> <p>Information on age group was available for 330 (78.4%) incidents. 72.7% involved were people aged 25–49 years, 20.6% were aged <25 years and only 6.7% were aged ≥50 years. The proportion of individuals in each age group was similar before and after the installation of the barriers ($\chi^2 = 0.62$, $df = 2$, $P = 0.73$).</p> <p><i>Staff involvement</i></p> <p>Whether Bridge staffs were involved in incidents or not was recorded for 379 episodes. Of these, they were involved in 71.3% (67/94) before the installation of the barriers and 83.5% (238/285) after ($\chi^2 = 6.73$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.01$).</p> <p><i>Interviews with Bridge staff (study 2):</i></p> <p>8 interviewees believed that the barriers had been effective in preventing deaths by jumping from the bridge. 3 stated that the barriers meant that there was more opportunity for staff to intercede, and members of the public had also been able to 'get involved with the person or call for help.'</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>One interviewee mentioned that the distance from the toll house to the centre of the bridge had meant that previously it was more difficult for staff to get to people before they had the opportunity to jump. Another stated that 'the cameras [on the Bridge] are very important in combination with the barrier.' They mean that 'you can see them . . . testing the wires and get onto the Bridge.'</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author Possible that some incidents on the bridge involving a potential suicide were not recorded on an incident form. While complete data on age, sex, site of suicide and the place of residence of the deceased were available from the coroner's records, other data were incomplete.</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Studies identified only small decreases in the <i>overall</i> suicide rate in the given city – other methods of suicide may be more common Did not explore whether individuals who were prevented from jumping by barriers adopted other methods of suicide Only explores 'other sites' for suicide by jumping in the Bristol region as a whole group comparison – data for suicide numbers before and after not specific to a particular site. Longer follow-up period may be needed to measure the true effect of a barrier at the high-frequency location</p>		

E.1.4 Chung et al 2016

<p>Chung YW, Kang SJ, Matsubayashi T et al. (2016) The effectiveness of platform screen doors for the prevention of subway suicides in South Korea <i>Journal of affective disorders</i> 194 80-83</p>																								
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																					
<p>Author/year Chung et al 2016</p> <p>Quality score +</p> <p>Study type before and after study</p> <p>Aim of the study To assess the effectiveness of installing half- and full-height platform screen doors (PSD's) in reducing subway suicides</p> <p>Location and setting</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable</p> <p>Characteristics of PSD's at stations In 2005, Seoul Metro commenced installation of PSDs across all its subway stations and completed the installation in 2009. Thus, none of the 121 stations had PSDs at the beginning of the study period in 2003, and subsequently, the stations were retro fitted with PSDs at various time intervals. Among these, two stations that are located above the ground had half-height PSDs, measured at</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>No control group</p> <p>Intervention: The number of suicides before the installation of half and full height PSD's across the single subway system and the number of suicides after the installation of half and full heights PDS's across the single subway system</p> <p>The dependent variable is the total number of suicides at each station per month, and independent variables are indicator variables of having all PSDs, full-height PSDs, or Half-height PSDs.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>The average number of suicides per station-month was 0.01 (SD= 0.10).The minimum number was 0, while the maximum was 2.The total number of suicides during the 10 year study period was 135</p> <p>The table below shows the total number of suicides per year at stations with and without PSDs that include both the full –and half-height doors. The number of suicides is significantly higher when the stations were not equipped with PSDs. However, the table also shows cases of suicides after the PSD installation. In total, 3 suicides were observed at two stations with PSDs (Gangbyeon and Konkuk University stations) both of which were equipped with half-height PSDs.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Before PSD's</th> <th colspan="2">After PSD's</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>N (station-months)</th> <th>Suicides</th> <th>N (station-months)</th> <th>Suicides</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>1452</td> <td>21</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>1452</td> <td>20</td> <td>0</td> <td>-</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Before PSD's		After PSD's		Year	N (station-months)	Suicides	N (station-months)	Suicides	2003	1452	21	0	-	2004	1452	20	0	-
	Before PSD's		After PSD's																					
Year	N (station-months)	Suicides	N (station-months)	Suicides																				
2003	1452	21	0	-																				
2004	1452	20	0	-																				

<p>Ten-year monthly panel data for 121 subway stations between 2003 and 2012 in the Seoul metropolitan, South Korea</p> <p>Length of study 10 years (2003-2012)</p> <p>Source of funding</p> <p>Financially supported by the Health Science Research Grants of Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour, Welfare, JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, the National Research Foundation of Korea, and the Korean government</p>	<p>1.65m (65in.), and the remaining 119 stations had full-height PSDs that completely or almost extend to the ceiling of the platforms.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Data on individual suicide cases that occurred between 2003 and 2012 at subway stations operated by Seoul Metro, which operates 50% of the subway stations in Seoul.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Did not account for suicide attempts (only fatal cases)</p> <p>Data collection Seoul Metro runs 121 subway stations: 10 on Line 1 (from Cheongnyangni to Seoul Station), 51 on Line 2 (entire section), 34 on Line 3 (from Jichuk to Ogeum), and 26 on Line 4 (from Danggogae to Namtaeryeong). Monthly data of suicide counts at all 121 stations was used for analysis. Thus, the unit of observation was station-month: the total number of station-month observations was 14,520 (121 stations*120 months).</p>		<table border="1"> <tr><td>2005</td><td>1450</td><td>18</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>1300</td><td>18</td><td>152</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>1216</td><td>24</td><td>236</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>1053</td><td>18</td><td>399</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>846</td><td>13</td><td>606</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>1452</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>1452</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2012</td><td>0</td><td>-</td><td>1452</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>-</td><td>132</td><td>-</td><td>3</td></tr> </table>	2005	1450	18	2	0	2006	1300	18	152	0	2007	1216	24	236	0	2008	1053	18	399	1	2009	846	13	606	1	2010	0	-	1452	0	2011	0	-	1452	1	2012	0	-	1452	0	Total	-	132	-	3	<p>Regression analysis</p> <p>The table provides estimates for the Poisson regression with 95% confidence intervals. The dependent variable is the total number of suicides at each station per month, and independent variables are indicator variables of having all PSDs, full-height PSDs, or Half-height PSDs. The station, year and month fixed effects were included in the estimation.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Model 1</th> <th>Model 2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>All PSDs</td> <td>-2.181 [-3.521, -0.842]</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Full height PSDs</td> <td></td> <td>-17.146 [-18.334, -15.960]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Half height PSDs</td> <td></td> <td>0.746 [-1.129, 2.622]</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>14,520</td> <td>14,250</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Model 1</p> <p>The regression coefficient was negative indicating that the number of suicides was lower post PSD installation. To interpret the magnitude of the PSDs' overall effect, the incident relative ratio (IRR) was computed at 0.113 with a 95% confidence interval of 0.030 -0.431, suggesting that the introduction of PSDs decreased the number of suicides by 89% (CI: 57–97%).</p> <p>Model 2</p> <p>Results suggest that the stations equipped with full-height PSDs experienced a drop in the suicide rate since the installation. The corresponding IRR was approximately zero, suggesting that the full-height PSDs were effective in completely preventing suicides. By contrast, half-height PSDs did not seem to reduce the number of suicides, as the estimated coefficient was statistically indistinguishable from zero.</p>		Model 1	Model 2	All PSDs	-2.181 [-3.521, -0.842]		Full height PSDs		-17.146 [-18.334, -15.960]	Half height PSDs		0.746 [-1.129, 2.622]	N	14,520	14,250
2005	1450	18	2	0																																																												
2006	1300	18	152	0																																																												
2007	1216	24	236	0																																																												
2008	1053	18	399	1																																																												
2009	846	13	606	1																																																												
2010	0	-	1452	0																																																												
2011	0	-	1452	1																																																												
2012	0	-	1452	0																																																												
Total	-	132	-	3																																																												
	Model 1	Model 2																																																														
All PSDs	-2.181 [-3.521, -0.842]																																																															
Full height PSDs		-17.146 [-18.334, -15.960]																																																														
Half height PSDs		0.746 [-1.129, 2.622]																																																														
N	14,520	14,250																																																														

			<p>Author Conclusions</p> <p>The present study provided further evidence that installing physical barriers at subway stations can be an effective strategy to reduce the number of suicides at stations. However, it also found that half-height PSDs are not as effective as full-height ones, even when these doors are as high as the height of an adult. In fact, it has been reported that those attempting suicide climbed over the PSDs at the Gangbyeon and Konkuk University stations, where half-height PSDs are of the same height as adults</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author The findings were based on the data from a single subway operator for a limited period of time. Accordingly, they did not consider the possibility that some passengers choose to die at a station run by other operators. The study did not examine the potential substitution effects of other suicide methods</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team No indication of numbers of overall suicide rates in the area before and after PSD's – this would have given more information about shifts in suicides locations after the installation of PSD's or the possible substitution of other methods All stations had PSD's fitted after 2003- described that 2 of these had half height PSD's fitted and the rest had full height PSD's fitted. However it is not clear in which years these PSD's were fitted. As there were only 2 suicides with half-height PSD's the estimation result may not be fully accurate.</p>			

E.1.5 Hemmer et al 2017

<p>Hemmer Alexander, Meier Philipp, and Reisch Thomas (2017) Comparing Different Suicide Prevention Measures at Bridges and Buildings: Lessons We Have Learned from a National Survey in Switzerland. PloS one 12(1), e0169625</p>			
<p>Study details</p>	<p>Research Parameters</p>	<p>Population / Intervention</p>	<p>Results</p>

Author/year	Inclusion criteria	Participant numbers	Primary outcomes
<p>Hemmer et al 2017</p> <p>Quality score</p> <p>-</p> <p>Study type</p> <p>Before and after</p> <p>Aim of the study</p> <p>The study aims to assess:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) how high a barrier should be and how deep a safety net should be installed below the pedestrian level to prevent a significant number of all suicides by jumping? 2) 2) What more information t can be derived from this Swiss national survey on bridges and buildings? <p>Location and setting</p> <p>Bridges and other high structures in Switzerland.</p> <p>Length of study</p> <p>The final analyses were carried out including data of the years 1990 - 2013.</p> <p>Source of funding</p>	<p>Exclusion criteria</p> <p>high-frequency locations not secured by structural interventions.</p> <p>Method of analysis</p> <p>Pre-post analyses comparing data before and after the installation of the measure for all structures and each individual structure were conducted.</p> <p>To test the overall effect of the prevention measures across jump sites, both the Mantel-Haenszel Test and maximum-likelihood methods (negative binominal regression) were calculated.</p> <p>To review the effects of suicide prevention measures at individual bridges, rate ratios with confidence intervals based on the standard error and p-values, were conducted.</p> <p>Comparison of suicide reduction rates of safety nets and barriers</p>	<p>Data on ADD suicides from 15 jump sites that met the inclusion criteria were analysed</p> <p>Participant characteristics</p> <p>The jump sites included 13 bridges, 1 terrace, and 1 multi-story car park.</p> <p>The jump sites were on average 62.94 m high (range 33.80 m to 150.00 m; SD = 23.00 m).</p> <p>The average barrier height before the suicide prevention intervention measures were installed was 1.13 m (SD = 0.14 m); the highest barrier was 1.30 m high, and the lowest was 0.80 m. On three bridges, the original barrier height could not be determined. On average, the jump sites were 2.75 km (SD = 3.71 km) away from a town centre.</p> <p>Intervention</p> <p>Of the 15 jump sites:</p> <p>N=11 (73.3%) were secured by barriers (fences).</p> <p>Five of these (45.5%) had complete fences, and 6 (54.5%) incomplete fences. On average, the security barriers had height of 2.30 m (SD = 0.61 m). After the construction of the security barrier, the minimum railing height was 1.50 m, and the maximum height 3.30 m. With one exception vertical barriers were raised to at least 1.70 m. Two of the fences had additional inward angles (bridges D, M). One bridge was additionally secured with side barriers on the bridgeheads in order to prevent climbing around the fences (bridge A). Six of the areas secured by fences were equipped with aid signs displaying emergency helpline numbers.</p> <p>N=4 (26.7%) jump sites were secured by safety nets.</p>	<p>Suicide rates before and after structural interventions.</p> <p>Author's conclusions</p> <p>Aggregated data from all 15 sites (barriers and safety nets) showed structural interventions had a preventive effect on suicide incidence. Pre- intervention the suicide Rate Ratio (RR) was 0.32 (CI 95% = 0.23, 0.44). Post-intervention RR = 0.3 (CI 95% = 0.17, 0.44). This corresponds to a reduction of the occurrence of suicides by 71.7%. In the pre-intervention phase, 327 suicides were carried out during 2679 months (a rate of 0.12 suicides per month or 1.47 per year). In the post- intervention phase, 38 suicides occurred during 1101 months (a rate of 0.035 suicides per month or 0.41 per year).</p> <p>Safety nets (n=4 sites). Safety nets led to a 77.1% reduction of suicides. The rate ratio from before to after the installation of safety nets is 0.21, (CI 95% = 0.07, 0.62). During 656 months, 55 suicides occurred in the pre-intervention phase (0.084 suicides per month, or 1.00 per year). In the post-intervention phase, during 364 months, 7 suicides occurred (0.019 suicides per month or 0.23 per year).</p> <p>Barriers – fences (n=11 sites). This intervention led to reduction of suicides by 68.7%. The rate ratio from before to after installing the barriers was 0.34, (95% CI = 0.18, 0.64). In the pre-intervention phase, 272 suicides occurred during 2023 months (a rate of 0.13 suicides per month or 1.61 per year). In the post-intervention phase 31 suicides occurred during 737 months (0.042 suicides per month or 0.51 per year).</p> <p>Extent of structural interventions.</p> <p>Complete safety measures (n=5 sites with barriers, n=2 sites with nets) led to reduction of suicide by 82.0%. The rate ratio from before and after installing was 0.18, (CI 95% = 0.10, 0.44). In the pre-intervention phase, 184 suicides occurred during 1360 months (a rate of 0.14 suicides per month or 1.62 per year). In the post-</p>

<p>The SWISS FEDERAL ROADS OFFICE. Additional logistic support (workplace, PC, print copies computer hardware etc) was given by the PsychiatricHospital of Muensingen, Switzerland. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.</p>	<p>as well as complete and incomplete interventions were conducted by using Mann Whitney-U tests.</p>	<p>At 2 (50.0%) sites, the nets secure the complete jump area. 2 nets (50.0%) were incomplete.</p> <p>On average, the safety nets had a depth of 3.88 m (SD = 2.66 m) below street level. The minimum depth was a bridge net with 0.50 m, and the maximum depth was 7.00 m on terrace. Three of the areas were equipped with signs displaying emergency helpline numbers.</p>	<p>intervention phase, 23 suicides occurred during 488 months (0.047 suicides per month or 0.57 per year).</p> <p>Incomplete safety measures (n=6 sites with barriers, n=2 sites with nest) led to a reduction of suicide by 44.8%. The rate ratio from before and after installing was 0.55, (CI 95% = 0.45, 0.86st). In the pre-intervention phase, 143 suicides occurred during 1319 months (a rate of 0.11 suicides per month or 1.30 suicides per year. In the post-interventions phase, 15 suicides occurred during 613 months (0.02 suicides per month or 0.29 per year).</p> <p>Complete interventions were significantly more effective than incomplete safety measures (Mann-Whitney U test; p = .029). No significant difference was found between safety nets and barriers.</p> <p>The suicide rate ratios of the individual structures showed that the efficacy of the safety measures ranged from 2.1% to 100%.</p> <p>Author's conclusions</p> <p>Structural interventions such as barriers or safety nets show a preventive effect. Altogether, the reduction in suicides across all jump sites represents 71.7%. The suicide rate could be reduced from 1.47 suicides per year to 0.41 suicides per year.</p> <p>Safety nets were not statistically significant more preventive than safety barriers.</p> <p>Incomplete structural interventions led to an insufficient prevention of suicides. It seems to be more important that a structural measure secures all parts of a bridge that allow lethal jumps, and it seems less important which kind of structural measure (safety net versus barrier) is chosen. More data is needed to determine whether there is in fact a difference between safety nets and barriers.</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author</p> <p>Along with physical availability, psychological availability by media reports is a decisive factor in the development and maintenance of a high-frequency location. Effects by media were not included in the present study. The study has not reviewed whether there has been a shift to nearby jump sites as a result of safeguarding a specific jump site. A further limitation of this study is that in part, calculations had to be carried out with a very small number of cases. Due to the small power of the analyses, the likelihood of finding significant effects is rather small. It is possible that some rare cases of suicide by jumping were missed (e.g., the body of a person floated away in the river below the bridge). The date of intervention was not controllable. We had to compare different pre-post periods. Bias cannot be excluded completely. Moreover, the current study does not mention attempted suicides. It is important that additional studies confirm our findings and provide a more complete picture by including suicide attempts.</p>			

Limitations identified by review team

Agree with the limitations identified by the authors. No indication of numbers of overall suicide rates in the areas before and after the installation of structural interventions– this would have given more information about shifts in suicides locations or the possible substitution of other methods.

E.1.6 Ichikawai et al 2013

Ichikawa M, Inada H, Kumeji M (2014) Reconsidering the effects of blue-light installation for prevention of railway suicides Journal of affective disorders 152 183-185

Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																																																																		
<p>Author/year Ichikawa et al 2013</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Prospective Cohort study</p> <p>Aim of the study To reconsider the proportion of suicide attempts within station premises, where blue lights are potentially installed, and at night, when they would be lit. The proportion of suicide attempts that occurred at the end of the platforms (location for blue lights) at night was also estimated.</p> <p>Location and setting Japan</p> <p>Length of study Data obtained over a 10 year period (2002-2011)</p>	<p>Population</p> <p>Number of participants N/A</p> <p>Participant characteristics Unknown</p> <p>Inclusion criteria All railway cases categorised as “suicide attempt”</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Suicide attempts within the train or by jumping out of the train were excluded from the analysis</p> <p>Data collection Data on railway suicide attempts was compiled by the Japanese Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism (MLIT), which were made public pursuant to the Information Disclosure Act. Railway companies</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: Railway suicide attempts at stations by time and location. Blue lights were installed in 2008 across stations in the Tokyo metropolitan area – Matsubayashi 2015.</p> <p>Comparison: Data on no of suicide attempts by time and location after 2008.</p> <p>However does not state in the paper what percentage of stations reported here had blue lights and if the blue lights were still in place.</p>	<p>Primary outcome</p> <p>Descriptive analysis</p> <p>Table 1 shows the 5841 reported suicide attempts from April 2002 to March 2012 by time and location. Of these, 43% occurred within station premises (platforms), 43% were at night, and 14% fell into both categories. The proportion of night time suicide attempts was higher between stations (52%) than within station premises (platforms) (32%).</p> <p>Railway suicide attempts within station premises by time and location</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time</th> <th>All locations</th> <th>Middle platform</th> <th>End platform</th> <th>Unidentified</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0600-1159</td> <td>755</td> <td>158</td> <td>96</td> <td>501</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1200-1759</td> <td>957</td> <td>182</td> <td>151</td> <td>624</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1800-2359</td> <td>673</td> <td>103</td> <td>107</td> <td>463</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0000-0559</td> <td>150</td> <td>22</td> <td>25</td> <td>103</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2535</td> <td>465</td> <td>379</td> <td>1691</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Railway suicide attempts within station premises (platforms) at night (n=823) by year and location.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Total day/night</th> <th>Middle platform</th> <th>End Platform</th> <th>Unidentified</th> <th>Unidentified + end*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2002</td> <td>181</td> <td>4</td> <td>8</td> <td>61</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2003</td> <td>246</td> <td>5</td> <td>8</td> <td>83</td> <td>91</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2004</td> <td>204</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>55</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2005</td> <td>247</td> <td>15</td> <td>9</td> <td>57</td> <td>66</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2006</td> <td>226</td> <td>9</td> <td>12</td> <td>45</td> <td>57</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Time	All locations	Middle platform	End platform	Unidentified	0600-1159	755	158	96	501	1200-1759	957	182	151	624	1800-2359	673	103	107	463	0000-0559	150	22	25	103	Total	2535	465	379	1691	Year	Total day/night	Middle platform	End Platform	Unidentified	Unidentified + end*	2002	181	4	8	61	69	2003	246	5	8	83	91	2004	204	4	5	55	60	2005	247	15	9	57	66	2006	226	9	12	45	57
Time	All locations	Middle platform	End platform	Unidentified																																																																	
0600-1159	755	158	96	501																																																																	
1200-1759	957	182	151	624																																																																	
1800-2359	673	103	107	463																																																																	
0000-0559	150	22	25	103																																																																	
Total	2535	465	379	1691																																																																	
Year	Total day/night	Middle platform	End Platform	Unidentified	Unidentified + end*																																																																
2002	181	4	8	61	69																																																																
2003	246	5	8	83	91																																																																
2004	204	4	5	55	60																																																																
2005	247	15	9	57	66																																																																
2006	226	9	12	45	57																																																																

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Source of funding</p> <p>No funding</p>	<p>are obligated to report all accidents to the MLIT, including suicide attempts. All cases classified as 'suicide attempt' were extracted. Entries included the data and time of each attempt.</p> <p>The location of as suicide attempt was recorded under two broad classifications: "station premises" and "between stations." Platforms and adjacent areas are classified as being within the station premises. Because blue lights are typically installed at the ends of platforms and would have an effect only when lit, the proportion of suicide attempts stratified by time (06:00–11:59, 12:00–17:59, 18:00–23:59, or 00:00–05:59) and place ("station premises" or "between stations") was first calculated. From the descriptions of the events, it was estimated whether each one occurred at the end of the platform, where blue lights would potentially be installed. This region was defined as being within 20 m of either end of the platform, assuming the illumination from the blue lights would reach that distance at most.</p>		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>2007</td> <td>293</td> <td>13</td> <td>18</td> <td>47</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>310</td> <td>14</td> <td>19</td> <td>63</td> <td>82</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>284</td> <td>22</td> <td>17</td> <td>54</td> <td>71</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>254</td> <td>16</td> <td>19</td> <td>50</td> <td>69</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2011</td> <td>294</td> <td>23</td> <td>17</td> <td>51</td> <td>68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>2535</td> <td>125 (5%)</td> <td>132 (5%)</td> <td>566 (22%)</td> <td>698 (28%)</td> </tr> </table>	2007	293	13	18	47	65	2008	310	14	19	63	82	2009	284	22	17	54	71	2010	254	16	19	50	69	2011	294	23	17	51	68	Total	2535	125 (5%)	132 (5%)	566 (22%)	698 (28%)	<p>* for the most conservative estimate, it is assumed that all the "unidentified" attempts occurred at end sections</p> <p>Unidentified – those which could not be identified as occurring at the middle of end of a platform.</p> <p>Author Conclusions</p> <p>More than half of railway suicide attempts occurred during the day, with many occurring away from station premises. Night time suicide attempts within station premises accounts for only 14% of all railway suicide attempts. Those who entered the track from the platform did not necessarily do so from one of the ends, where the blue lights would potentially have been installed. According to our most conservative estimate, only 28% of suicide attempts within station premises occurred at the end of a platform at night. Therefore, the installation of blue lights on platforms, to the extent they have some effect in preventing night time suicides, would have a small effect on the overall prevention of railway suicides.</p>
2007	293	13	18	47	65																																			
2008	310	14	19	63	82																																			
2009	284	22	17	54	71																																			
2010	254	16	19	50	69																																			
2011	294	23	17	51	68																																			
Total	2535	125 (5%)	132 (5%)	566 (22%)	698 (28%)																																			

Limitations identified by author

Study is limited by the fact that the exact proportion of railway suicide attempts that occurred at the ends of platforms was not calculable because of the sometimes incomplete descriptions of location in the free-form portion of the event data. We therefore instead calculated the maximum number of suicide attempts that could have occurred at the end sections of platforms, using a pre-determined classification of place. This is a conservative estimate, and the proportion of suicide attempts that are potentially preventable by the blue lights should be less than that we obtained

Limitations identified by review team

This paper refers to the Matsubayashi 2013 paper and attempts to reconsider the proportion of suicide attempts by further providing information on location and time of the attempts, however data retrieved here is from the whole of Japan as opposed to the one railway company in Tokyo used in the Matsubayashi study. Therefore we do not know what percentage or number of the stations reported here had blue lights installed.

Blue lights installed by other railway companies may also be less effective due to differences in numbers, locations, and types of blue lights

For this reason we cannot accurately determine pre and post intervention suicide attempt numbers.

A large number of suicide attempts had unidentified locations. It was assumed that

Although this study reports suicide attempts not decreasing from the ends of the platforms at night since the installations began, and only a small percentage occurring at the ends of platforms at night, results should be treated with caution for the above reasons

E.1.7 Isaac and Bennett 2005

Isaac M, Bennett J (2005) Prevention of suicide by jumping: the impact of restriction of access at Beachy Head, Sussex during the foot and mouth crisis 2001. *Public Health Medic* 6: 19-22.

Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																												
<p>Author/year Isaac and Bennett (2005)</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Retrospective observational study of coroners reports</p> <p>Aim of the study To explore the impact of restriction of accessibility of the site during the Foot and Mouth crisis in England.</p> <p>Location and setting</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable</p> <p>Characteristics of Beachy Head Beachy Head is one of locations which gained notoriety as a popular site where people had died from suicide. Between 1965 and 1979, 124 deaths occurred at Beachy Head cliffs. More than 50% of those who jumped from Beachy Head came from outside East Sussex. Although Beachy Head still has its reputation as a well-known location for suicide by jumping, there have</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>No control group</p> <p>Intervention: In the year 2001 (foot and mouth crisis), Beachy Head was not accessible by car, and it was reopened in June 2001.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Suicide and accidental death by calendar month at Beachy Head 1987 -2001. 124 deaths occurred at Beachy Head (1965-1979) compared with 230 deaths during the period of 1987-2001 which was increase in 85%. This increase does not correlate with the national trends in suicide in England and Wales which showed a decrease in suicide rate between 1960 and 1997.</p> <p>The table below shows the total number of suicides and accidental deaths by gender and calendar month at Beachy Head 2001.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Suicide and accidental deaths</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Month</th> <th>Male</th> <th>Female</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Jan</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Feb</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marc</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>April</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>May</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Suicide and accidental deaths		Total	Month	Male	Female		Jan	0	0	0	Feb	0	0	0	Marc	0	0	0	April	0	0	0	May	0	0	0
	Suicide and accidental deaths		Total																												
Month	Male	Female																													
Jan	0	0	0																												
Feb	0	0	0																												
Marc	0	0	0																												
April	0	0	0																												
May	0	0	0																												

<p>Suicide by jumping and accidental death at Beachy Head, east Sussex.</p> <p>Length of study The data was abstracted from the coroners' reported of all people who died at Beachy Head during 1987-2001.</p> <p>Source of funding Not reported</p>	<p>been no review of the rates of suicide at Beachy Head since that published in 1982.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria All deaths at Beachy Head were reviewed during 1987-2001.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Data collection Coroners' reports of deaths at Beachy Head during 1987-2001.</p>		<table border="1"> <tr><td>June</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>July</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Aug</td><td>2</td><td>0</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>Sep</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Oct</td><td>0</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Nov</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>Dec</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr> </table>	June	1	0	1	July	1	0	1	Aug	2	0	2	Sep	0	1	1	Oct	0	0		Nov	2	1	3	Dec	0	1	1	Total	6	3	9					<p>Author Conclusions</p> <p>The present study provided evidence that changes in accessibility had a profound effect on suicide by jumping than other method of suicide. Restricting access to Beachy Head is not feasible as it is a tourist attraction. However, there might a possibility of working with local agencies as well as suicide prevention groups to make it more difficult to access for suicide while still being freely accessible for tourism.</p>
June	1	0	1																																					
July	1	0	1																																					
Aug	2	0	2																																					
Sep	0	1	1																																					
Oct	0	0																																						
Nov	2	1	3																																					
Dec	0	1	1																																					
Total	6	3	9																																					
<p>Limitations identified by author</p> <p>The rates of suicide in the area were available but it was difficult to clarify if availability of Beachy Head increases suicide in East Sussex residents. Although there was past history of psychiatric difficulties in more than 60%, and it might be logical to assume that better management psychiatric illness could reduce the suicides but this cannot be concluded from this study.</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team</p> <p>The study reported the number of suicide and accidental death at Beachy Head but no separate figures on the number of death due to suicide. The study is retrospective design reviewing suicide and accidental death based on coroner's reported during 1987-2001. The intervention of interest in the review (restriction on road) was in place for 5 months in 2001, and the comparison only made based on short follow-up time.</p>																																								

E.1.8 King and Frost 2005

<p>King E and Frost N. (2005). The New Forest Suicide Prevention Initiative (NFSPi). <i>Crisis</i>, 26(1), pp.25-33.</p>			
<p>Study details</p>	<p>Research Parameters</p>	<p>Population / Intervention</p>	<p>Results</p>
<p>Author/year King and Frost 2005</p> <p>Quality score -</p>	<p>Number of participants/ participant characteristics Not applicable</p> <p>Number of car parks receiving intervention:</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: A simple white A4 sign displaying the national help-line number of the Samaritans in Black and the caption "The Samaritans: We'll go through this with you", was positioned on an existing notice board at</p>	<p>Primary outcomes <i>Number of suicides</i></p> <p>N of signed car parks- 26 N of unsigned car parks- 114</p>

<p>Study type Retrospective cohort study</p> <p>Aim of the study A multiagency initiative aimed to reduce the number of suicides by car exhaust (carbon monoxide) poisoning in the 140 New Forest car parks, UK, by displaying signs with telephone numbers of the Samaritans.</p> <p>Location and setting The New Forest includes 145 square miles of woodland, open heath land and pasture in Hampshire on the south coast of England.</p> <p>Length of study Numbers, location and residence of all car park deaths were monitored for 3 years during the implementation of signs in 1998 at the high-frequency locations.</p> <p>Source of funding The New Forest District Council, Forestry Commission, and the Southampton & SW Hants Health Authority</p>	<p>26</p> <p>Characteristics of suicides at the New Forest During the years 1993-1997 (before intervention), 102 suicides occurred in the New Forest Registration District, of whom 47 were visitors. The proportion of suicides dying from car exhaust as in the whole region was 63%. 41 (40%) of these suicides were found in the Forestry Commission car parks of whom 39 (81%) were visitors. Coroners records showed that visitors from as far away as Nottinghamshire, Kent and Cornwall had driven to the New Forest to die.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria The intervention was targeted at car parks in the New Forest associated with the highest suicide risk. Each of which was either the site of more than one suicide, or in close proximity to other car parks in which multiple suicides had occurred.</p> <p>All persons who initiated a suicidal act in the New Forest Registration District, and on whom a verdict of suicide, or an open verdict, was recorded</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Data collection Details on suicides: Inquest files of suicides in the New Forest</p>	<p>the entrance to each of the 26 car parks in 1998. Each sign also described the location of the nearest public telephone box.</p> <p>The Samaritans offered suicide awareness training to all Local Authority and Forest Commission workers who might be expected to find a body in a parked car, and the Hampshire ambulance Service provided practical advice.</p> <p>Comparison group: The significance of changes in the patterns of suicides occurring in the National Forest Registration District was evaluated in the light of a national observed decrease in the proportion of car exhaust suicides in England & Wales since 1992.</p> <p>The numbers, location, residence, and cause of suicide in the NFRD for the preceding 10 year period (1988-1998) and during the 3 year period (1998-2001) of signage were compared. Comparisons were also made between the average annual numbers of suicides who had parked in one of the 140 NFRD car parks, and suicides occurring elsewhere in the NFRD. This included District Council and parish council car parks, homes, open ground and lay-bys.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Method</th> <th>NFRD</th> <th>Signed car parks</th> <th>Unsigned car parks</th> <th>Any car park</th> <th>Elsewhere in District</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="6"><i>1988-1998 (10 years before intervention)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exhaust</td> <td>139</td> <td>45</td> <td>51</td> <td>96</td> <td>43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hanging</td> <td>29</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>27</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>67</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>65</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="6"><i>1998-2001 (3 year intervention period)</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exhaust</td> <td>14</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hanging</td> <td>19</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>17</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>23</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Method	NFRD	Signed car parks	Unsigned car parks	Any car park	Elsewhere in District	<i>1988-1998 (10 years before intervention)</i>						Exhaust	139	45	51	96	43	Hanging	29	1	1	2	27	Other	67	1	1	2	65	<i>1998-2001 (3 year intervention period)</i>						Exhaust	14	3	2	5	9	Hanging	19	1	2	2	17	Other	23	1	1	3	20						
Method	NFRD	Signed car parks	Unsigned car parks	Any car park	Elsewhere in District																																																										
<i>1988-1998 (10 years before intervention)</i>																																																															
Exhaust	139	45	51	96	43																																																										
Hanging	29	1	1	2	27																																																										
Other	67	1	1	2	65																																																										
<i>1998-2001 (3 year intervention period)</i>																																																															
Exhaust	14	3	2	5	9																																																										
Hanging	19	1	2	2	17																																																										
Other	23	1	1	3	20																																																										

	<p>Registration District obtained from the years 1984-1997.</p> <p>Official statistics on all suicides and corresponding open verdict deaths, registered in Hampshire, and in four counties (East Sussex, Essex, Gloucestershire and Nottinghamshire) in which well-known forests (Ashdown Forest, Epping Forest, Forest of Dean, and Sherwood Forest) are situated were obtained from the Office of national Statistics for the years 1993-2001. The exact location of death was ascertained by inspecting the inquest files.</p> <p>Car park sites for intervention: The 140 Forest Commission car parks were mapped and those in which at least 1 suicide had been found in the years 1984-1997 identified from detailed information contained in the inquest files from all the suicides.</p>		
<p>Limitations identified by author Not possible to ascertain the number of telephone calls to the Samaritans helpline during the intervention period</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Causal association between caller and the intervention.</p>			

E.1.9 Law et al 2014

<p>Law CK, Sveticic J, De Leo, and Diego. (2014). Restricting access to a suicide hotspot does not shift the problem to another location. An experiment of two river bridges in Brisbane, Australia. <i>Australian and New Zealand journal of public health</i>, 38(2), pp.134-8.</p>			
<p>Study details</p>	<p>Research Parameters</p>	<p>Population / Intervention</p>	<p>Results</p>

<p>Author/year Law et al 2014</p> <p>Quality score +</p> <p>Study type Before and after</p> <p>Aim of the study To evaluate the short- and long-term effect of safety barriers on Brisbane's Gateway Bridge and to examine whether there was substitution of suicide location.</p> <p>Location and setting Data on suicide by jumping in Brisbane, Australia were obtained from the Queensland Suicide Register. The effects of barrier installation at the Gateway Bridge were assessed through a natural experiment setting</p> <p>Length of study Data obtained between 1990 and 2012 – 23 years</p> <p>Source of funding Australian Commonwealth Government, Department of Health</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable Participant characteristics Not applicable</p> <p>Inclusion criteria The location of suicide (Greater Brisbane Region or Statistical Area Level 4: 301-305, as specified by the 2011 Australian Statistical Geography Standard) and cause of death being either jumping from a high place or drowning.</p> <p>Since Queensland is the second-largest state in Australia, with an area of 1.85 million km², it is unlikely that the installation of barriers on a bridge in Brisbane would influence the epidemiology of jumping suicides across the whole state</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Suicide cases by other methods (e.g. hanging) that occurred at the bridges in Brisbane were excluded from the study.</p> <p>Data collection Suicide data were retrieved from the Queensland Suicide Register (QSR), an independent and comprehensive mortality database that includes information on all identified suicides by Queensland</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison Two bridges and their surroundings were investigated.</p> <p>Intervention group: The Gateway Bridge is a pair of 65-metre-high bridges over the Brisbane River. A pair of fencing barriers about 3.3 metres high was retrofitted along the sidewalk of the bridge in 1993. After the new duplication bridge was built in May 2010, the barrier was replaced with a similar one with a height of 3.6 metres on the original bridge at the end of November 2010.</p> <p>Comparison group: The Story Bridge, opened in 1935, is a 74-metre-high cantilever bridge that crosses the Brisbane River from Fortitude Valley on the north to Kangaroo Point on the south. To date no physical barriers have been installed on the Story Bridge and it could therefore be used as the control comparison site in the present analysis.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes <i>Number of suicides</i></p> <p>A total of 277 suicides by jumping from a high place were identified for the period 1990 to 2012 in Brisbane. The method of jumping from a height accounted for 5.2% of all suicides by residents of Brisbane (n=5,232). Of those, 146 (45.5%) occurred from bridges in Brisbane, most commonly from the Gateway Bridge (n=38) and the Story Bridge (n=88)</p> <p>Table 1 and 2: Number of suicides (rate per 100,000 of population). 1990-1993 before barriers, 1994-2012 after barriers. % change in rate refers to the average relative change of suicide risk between the pre installation and post-installation period estimated by from the Poisson regression model</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Gateway Bridge</th> <th>Story Bridge</th> <th>Other Bridges in Brisbane</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1990-1993</td> <td>22 (0.673)</td> <td>15 (0.459)</td> <td>6 (0.183)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1994-2012</td> <td>16 (0.084)</td> <td>73 (0.382)</td> <td>14 (0.073)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 1990-2012</td> <td>38 (0.170)</td> <td>88 (0.392)</td> <td>20 (0.089)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% Change in rate</td> <td>-87.5 (p=<0.001)</td> <td>-16.73 (p=0.520)</td> <td>-60.0 (p=0.060)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Other jumping sites in Brisbane (not bridges)</th> <th>All suicides by jumping in Brisbane</th> <th>All suicides by residents of Brisbane</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1990-1993</td> <td>13 (0.398)</td> <td>56 (1.713)</td> <td>757</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1994-2012</td> <td>27 (0.618)</td> <td>221 (1.157)</td> <td>4475</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total 1990-2012</td> <td>118 (0.586)</td> <td>277 (1.238)</td> <td>5232</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Gateway Bridge	Story Bridge	Other Bridges in Brisbane	1990-1993	22 (0.673)	15 (0.459)	6 (0.183)	1994-2012	16 (0.084)	73 (0.382)	14 (0.073)	Total 1990-2012	38 (0.170)	88 (0.392)	20 (0.089)	% Change in rate	-87.5 (p=<0.001)	-16.73 (p=0.520)	-60.0 (p=0.060)		Other jumping sites in Brisbane (not bridges)	All suicides by jumping in Brisbane	All suicides by residents of Brisbane	1990-1993	13 (0.398)	56 (1.713)	757	1994-2012	27 (0.618)	221 (1.157)	4475	Total 1990-2012	118 (0.586)	277 (1.238)	5232
	Gateway Bridge	Story Bridge	Other Bridges in Brisbane																																				
1990-1993	22 (0.673)	15 (0.459)	6 (0.183)																																				
1994-2012	16 (0.084)	73 (0.382)	14 (0.073)																																				
Total 1990-2012	38 (0.170)	88 (0.392)	20 (0.089)																																				
% Change in rate	-87.5 (p=<0.001)	-16.73 (p=0.520)	-60.0 (p=0.060)																																				
	Other jumping sites in Brisbane (not bridges)	All suicides by jumping in Brisbane	All suicides by residents of Brisbane																																				
1990-1993	13 (0.398)	56 (1.713)	757																																				
1994-2012	27 (0.618)	221 (1.157)	4475																																				
Total 1990-2012	118 (0.586)	277 (1.238)	5232																																				

	<p>residents from 1990 onwards.</p> <p>Suicide rates at each jumping location were calculated using the population of Brisbane, which was retrieved from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. To examine the effect of barrier installation for preventing suicide by jumping at the Gateway Bridge, descriptive analyses and Poisson regression analyses were applied. The latter examined the statistical significance of any change in numbers of suicides by jumping stratified from each jumping location (i.e. the Gateway Bridge, the Story Bridge, other bridges and other jumping sites in the Brisbane area) before (1990–1993) and after (1994–2012) the installation of the barriers on the Gateway Bridge</p>		<p>% Change in rate</p>	<p>55.4 (p=0.131)</p>	<p>-32.4 (p=0.009)</p>	<p>1.2 (p=0.758)</p>
<p>The overall incidence of suicide reduced by 87.5% ($p < 0.001$) following the fencing and the change did not appear to cause displacement to other locations of suicide by jumping across Brisbane during the same period at the Story Bridge (percentage change=-16.7%, $p=0.520$), other bridges (percentage change=-60.0%, $p=0.060$), or other jumping sites (percentage change=+55.4%, $p=0.131$).</p> <p>Overall, a 32.4% reduction of suicides by jumping was detected in Brisbane ($p=0.009$). However, this did not pose a significant impact on all suicides for residents in Brisbane (percentage change=+1.2%, $p=0.758$).</p> <p>Author conclusions</p> <p>This study provides empirical support that the barriers constructed at the Gateway Bridge were effective in preventing suicides by jumping with no immediate signs of displacement to another neighbouring suicide high-frequency location (e.g. the Story Bridge) or other locations. This indicated that suicidal individuals generally did not seek alternative sites during the follow-up period of 19 years (from 1994 to 2012). Furthermore, the installation of higher barriers after renovation of the bridge in 2010 may have completely dissuaded people from considering suicide at that location.</p> <p>This study also demonstrated the importance of examining the long-term effects of barrier installation at the high-frequency location. As referred to the findings, the suicide rate at the Gateway Bridge only reduced by 53.0% during the first four-year period after the barrier installation (refer to study – not reported in table), which was considerably lower than the overall reduction of 87.5%. This indicated that the immediate effect of barrier installation is not sufficient to reflect its true impact at a high-frequency location and a longer follow-up period is needed for reporting in future.</p>						
<p>Limitations identified by author</p> <p>As suicide by jumping only constituted a small proportion of cases in Brisbane, it is difficult (if not impossible) to estimate how the physical barriers at the Gateway Bridge have affected the total number of suicides in the area, i.e., whether being prevented from jumping from the chosen bridge would lead not only to a substitution of location, but also of suicide method.</p> <p>Reliable data for non-fatal suicidal acts incidence were not available, which could underestimate the actual effect of barriers on preventing suicide</p> <p>Data did not contain any information about the structural weak points of the original Gateway Bridge in 1986 for people to commit suicide.</p> <p>It would have been ideal to have an analysis that starts from the establishment of the bridge in 1986.</p> <p>Not considered whether the installation of suicide barriers would bring a net gain to society from an economic perspective</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team</p> <p>Information on subject characteristics not reported (other studies report higher suicide by jumping rates in males)</p>						

Motives and epidemiological profiles of those who jump from locations that have acquired notoriety, may not be comparable with those who jump from other locations (e.g. residential buildings).

E.1.10 Lester 2005

Lester D (2005) Suicide by jumping from bridges. Percept Mot Skills 100: 628.									
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results						
<p>Author/year Lester 2005</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type before and after</p> <p>Aim of the study A descriptive study to describe the number of suicides jumping from Skyway Bridge Location and setting Sunshine Skyway Bridge, St. Petersburg, Florida</p> <p>Length of study 1996-1998, 2000-2002</p> <p>Source of funding Not reported</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable</p> <p>Characteristics of Skyway Bridge The Skyway Bridge opened in 1954, and the first suicide occurred in November 1957. To date, 127 people have died. In 2000, the Florida state police began staffing the bridge full-time and 6 emergency call boxes stationed in the bridge since July 1999.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Observed suicide cases on Skyway Bridge</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Data collection Suicide cases reported jumping from Skyway Bridge.</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>No control group</p> <p>Intervention: the police patrol on the bridge and emergency call boxes stationed on the bridge.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes The table below shows the total number of suicides jumping from the bridge</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>number</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1996-1998</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2000-2002</td> <td>19</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Author Conclusions The present study indicated the number of suicides from the bridge has declined, following installed crisis emergency telephones with the presence of a full-time police.</p>	Year	number	1996-1998	25	2000-2002	19
Year	number								
1996-1998	25								
2000-2002	19								
<p>Limitations identified by author Not reported</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Sources of data collection were not reported, and the implementation and follow-up time only 3 years.</p>									

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

E.1.11 Lockley et al 2014

Lockley A, Cheung Y, Cox G, Robinson J, Williamson M, Harris M, Machlin A, Moffat C, and Pirkis J. (2014). Preventing suicide at suicide hotspots: a case study from Australia. <i>Suicide & life-threatening behaviour</i> , 44(4), pp.392-407.																																										
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																																							
<p>Author/year Lockley et al 2014</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Before and after analysis comparing number of suicides in two periods.</p> <p>Aim of the study To study the effects of The Gap Park Self-Harm Minimisation Masterplan project (a collaborative attempt to address jumping suicides at Sydney's Gap Park through means restriction, encouraging help-seeking, and increasing the likelihood of third-party intervention)</p> <p>Location and setting Gap Park is a coastal escarpment area of approximately 4.7 hectares, located on Sydney Harbour's South Head. It is one of Sydney's most popular tourist destinations.</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable for main interventions.</p> <p>Discussions with Stakeholders were held: 18 stakeholders including representatives from the collaborating organisations, technical contractors, and the local community. These discussions focused on the process of developing and implementing the Masterplan project and on lessons learned.</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics The gender and age profiles of the confirmed suicides were as follows: Males 56%, females 44%; < 20 years 4%, 20–29 years 30%, 30–39 years 16%, 40–49 years 27%, 50–59 years 12%, ≥60 years 11%. No equivalent break downs were available for the police call-out data.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Potential cases were identified by examining</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison The Masterplan project involved: 1) restricting access to means by constructing fencing 2) encouraging help seeking by installing crisis telephones and signs, and increasing the likelihood of intervention by a third party by putting in place closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras and improving the amenity of the site.</p> <p>Intervention Access to means at the site was restricted by the construction of a 130-cm-high fence along the cliff-tops. It consists of inward curved wire mesh and a wooden handrail. It does not offer foot-holds and can be more easily scaled from the cliff-side, so if a person manages to get over it, it is easier for them to get back to the safe side. The fencing component of the Masterplan project was completed in July 2011.</p> <p>Help-Seeking was encouraged by telephones and signs in 2010. These telephones link by push button activation to either the emergency services number or to specially trained Life line staff. Signs were installed at the same time and display the location of the phones.</p> <p>The likelihood of intervention by a third party was increased by the installation of CCTV cameras in 2010 and a new main entrance which includes seating, lighting, and tourist information displays. These works were designed to increase the probability that others would be present in the event that an individual was showing signs of distress</p> <p>Control group: Not applicable</p> <p>Statistical analysis</p>	<p>Primary outcomes <i>Number of suicides and number of attempted suicides (jumping incidents):</i></p> <p>Information on the number of reported jumping incidents from 2006 to 2012 (n = 76) and confirmed suicides from 2001 to 2011 (n = 82) in the Gap Park area obtained from the police call-out dataset and the NCIS, respectively</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Jumping incidents</th> <th>Confirmed suicides</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2001</td><td>N/A</td><td>7</td></tr> <tr><td>2002</td><td>N/A</td><td>8</td></tr> <tr><td>2003</td><td>N/A</td><td>4</td></tr> <tr><td>2004</td><td>N/A</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>N/A</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>15</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>11</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>6</td><td>5</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>7</td><td>7</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>18</td><td>13</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>12</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>2012</td><td>7</td><td>N/A</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Jumping incidents - Rose Bay Police call-out data. Confirmed suicides - National Coroners Information System</p> <p>Discrepancies between the two sets of figures arise for various reasons. In particular, the figures for jumping incidents may be higher than those for confirmed suicides in a given year because, in a small number of cases, the incident was reported and no body was discovered or the jump did not result in death.</p> <p><i>Join point regression on suicide numbers and police call outs:</i></p>	Year	Jumping incidents	Confirmed suicides	2001	N/A	7	2002	N/A	8	2003	N/A	4	2004	N/A	2	2005	N/A	3	2006	15	11	2007	11	11	2008	6	5	2009	7	7	2010	18	13	2011	12	11	2012	7	N/A
Year	Jumping incidents	Confirmed suicides																																								
2001	N/A	7																																								
2002	N/A	8																																								
2003	N/A	4																																								
2004	N/A	2																																								
2005	N/A	3																																								
2006	15	11																																								
2007	11	11																																								
2008	6	5																																								
2009	7	7																																								
2010	18	13																																								
2011	12	11																																								
2012	7	N/A																																								

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Length of study The study period included data on the number of suicides from 2001-2011.</p> <p>Source of funding The Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing.</p>	<p>Death Data from the National Coroners Information System.</p> <p>Data Collection: Data were extracted on suicides at Gap Park from 2001 to 2011 from the National Coroners Information System (NCIS). Deaths recorded on the NCIS with an ICD-10 diagnosis of "X60-X84" (deliberate self-harm) and/or with the "intent" column registered as intentional self-harm were interpreted as suicides. Suicides were included in the analysis if the primary mechanism was recorded as "blunt force"; the secondary mechanism was recorded as "falling, stumbling, jumping, pushed"</p> <p>Qualitative data from the stakeholder discussions and from the project documentation and related material were analysed thematically.</p>	<p>Quantitative data on suicides, police call-outs, and requests for live viewings of CCTV footage are reported as frequencies and percentages. Time trends in these data series were examined by join point regression, using Join point software, version 4.0.1. Join point regression was used to detect whether there were any significant changes in the direction or the rate of increase or decrease ("join points") and to calculate the estimated annual percentage change.</p>	<p>There was a downward trend in jumping incidents from 2006 to 2012, but join point regression analyse showed that this trend was not significant (EAPC = -2.61%, 95% confidence interval [CI] -21.1 to 20.2; p = .760). The same was true for the trend in confirmed suicides between 2001 and 2011 (EAPC = 6.71%, 95% CI -2.5 to 16.8; p = .137). There were no statistically significant changes in trend in either jumps or confirmed suicides. The join- point regression analyses also showed a significant increase in total police call-outs, on average, of almost 13% per year (EAPC = 12.89%, 95% CI 0.3 to 27.1; p = .047) and, on average, of 16% per year in call-outs related to individuals located at or approaching Gap Park (EAPC = 16.04%, 95% CI 7.1 to 25.7; p = .005).</p> <p><i>Telephones and signs:</i> The evaluation of the crisis tele- phones suggests that they have experienced a number of issues which was confirmed in the stakeholder discussions. These include a large volume of silent calls, false alarms, and hoaxes. In a small number of cases, the telephones have helped either by enabling bystanders to directly summon help or through use by the suicidal person them- selves. For example, the police call-out data refer to one case where the suicidal person specifically mentioned the direct link to Lifeline having saved his life Signs were difficult to assess directly. One positive observation, taken from the evaluation of the crisis telephones was that there was an increase in calls to Lifeline that were made on mobile phones and originated in the Gap Park area. – reported in Walsh 2011 linked evaluation report?</p> <p><i>CCTV cameras and New main entrance</i> Not directly assessed. Police call-outs did increase which may be related.</p> <p><i>Qualitative data from stakeholder discussions:</i> Uniformly, stakeholders noted that the strength of their relationships and ongoing collaboration were key to the project's success. The police continue to be the primary interveners in potential self-harm incidents. Woollahra Council has been able to provide leadership, coordination, com- munity consultation, landscape design expertise, and funding. The Masterplan project experience has also resulted in the Council, in partnership with the Black Dog Institute and Lifeline, planning and implementing a number of community mental health and self-harm minimization education activities.</p> <p>Author's conclusions: Despite the lack of significant trends in the overall time series, the figures may nonetheless provide early suggestive evidence that suicides may have decreased at Gap Park during and following the establishment phase of the Masterplan project. Both data sets show a peak in the number of incidents in</p>
---	--	--	--

			2010, the year that the crisis phones, signage, and CCTV system became operational. Both data sets also show there was a decrease in incidents in 2011, when these elements had been refined and when the fencing was installed and the site's amenity was improved.
<p>Limitations identified by author</p> <p>The Gap Park Masterplan project spanned a 5-year period, from 2007 to 2011. Different components of the project took varying amounts of time to complete and took effect at different times. This makes simple before and after examinations of police call-out data and confirmed suicide data difficult</p> <p>In addition, several of the major components (barriers) were only completed fairly recently, so it may be too early for their true effects on suicidal activity to be judged.</p> <p>The NCIS data may provide an under-count of suicides. Coroners are not required by law to find on intent unless the person died in custody or care, or the coroner believes that the public interest will be served by addressing the circumstances.</p> <p>The police call-out data were limited to cases where the police became involved. They relied on coding that may sometimes have been subjective, particularly when it related to the classification of "intent."</p> <p>Last, there are some limitations with the qualitative data. We relied on documentary evidence and evidence from a relatively small number of stakeholders. This means that some perspectives may not have been included, and those that were often subjective</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team</p> <p>No assessment of the effectiveness of the fencing barrier on the number of suicides <i>after</i> its installation in 2011 as data reported is only up to this point. The number of jumping incidents is however reported up to 1 year after its installation</p> <p>Short duration for assessment of the effectiveness of help seeking and third party interventions (signs and telephones-CCTV and tourist attractions) on the number of suicides <i>after</i> their installation in 2010. (1 year comparison)</p> <p>The effectiveness of the telephones, signs, CCTV cameras and the increase in tourist attractions were not directly assessed. Some information on police call outs to the site was reported which may be related. – Author reports an increase in calls to the lifeline according to a 'Walsh 2011' linked evaluation – but no data of this in the current study</p> <p>No raw qualitative data (e.g. quotations) reported from stakeholder discussions</p>			

E.1.12 Matsubayashi 2013

<p>Matsubayashi T, Sawada Y, Ueda M (2013) Does the installation of blue lights on train platforms prevent suicide? A before-and-after observational study from Japan Journal of affective disorders 147 (1) 385-388</p> <p>Matsubayashi T, Sawada Y, Ueda M (2014) Does the installation of blue Lights on train platforms shift suicide to another station? Evidence from Japan Journal of affective disorders 169 57-60</p>			
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results
<p>Author/year Matsubayashi et al 2013 Matsubayashi et al 2014 (linked studies)</p> <p>Quality score +</p>	<p>Data</p> <p>Number of station-year observations for study ½ 781 (calculated from 71 stations x 11 years) 994 (calculated from 71 stations x 14 years)</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Study 1 Treatment group: The number of suicides at 11 stations with installation of blue lights</p> <p>Comparison group: Other group of 60 stations without the installation of blue lights</p>	<p>Study 1</p> <p>Descriptive analysis Total number of suicides and the average number of suicides per station in the years pre (200-2007) and post (2008-2010) blue light installation</p>

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Study type Prospective Cohort study</p> <p>Aim of the study To evaluate the effect of blue lights on the number of suicides by using panel data from 71 train stations between 2000 and 2010 collected by one railway company. The number of suicides were compared before and after the intervention of blue lights at 11 stations in 2008. Further study analysed whether these lights shifted suicide from 14 stations with lights installed to other nearby stations. Updated data set from 2000-2013</p> <p>Location and setting Tokyo Metropolitan area</p> <p>Length of study Data obtained over a 10 year period (2000-2010) Data obtained over a 13 year period (2000-2013)</p> <p>Source of funding</p>	<p>Study 1: <i>Station-year suicide observations at all 71 stations (2000-2010)</i> 108 observations associated with at least one suicide 673 observations associated with 0 suicides Average number of suicides per station-year 0.164 (SD=0.443) Maximum number of suicides at a station per year = 3 Station with the highest number of total suicides = 10</p> <p><i>Installation of blue lights at 11 stations</i> 1 station in 2008 4 in 2009 6 in 2010 Blue lights stay on from sunset to sunrise</p> <p>Study 2: <i>Station-year suicide observations at all 71 stations (2000-2013)</i> 853 observations associated with 0 suicides Maximum number of suicides at a station per year – 3 Average number of suicides per station-year 0.16 (SD=0.44) Station with the highest number of suicides = 10</p>	<p>Study 2 Treatment group: The number of suicides at the 14 stations before and after the installation of blue lights and the neighbouring 5 stations on the same railway line</p> <p>Comparison group: The number of suicides at all other stations without the installation of blue lights</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Group 1 (comparison) (N=60) Number of suicides (mean per station)</th> <th>Group 2 (intervention) (N=1) Number of suicides (mean per station)</th> <th>Group 3 (intervention) (N=4) Number of suicides (mean per station)</th> <th>Group 4 (intervention) (N=6) Number of suicides (mean per station)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2000-2007</td> <td>67 (1.117)</td> <td>5 (5)</td> <td>13 (3.25)</td> <td>17 (2.83)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2008</td> <td>5 (0.082)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> <td>3 (0.750)</td> <td>3 (0.500)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2009</td> <td>5 (0.082)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> <td>4 (0.667)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2010</td> <td>5 (0.082)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> <td>1* (0.250)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Group 1 (comparison) (N=60) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 2 (intervention) (N=1) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 3 (intervention) (N=4) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 4 (intervention) (N=6) Number of suicides (mean per station)	2000-2007	67 (1.117)	5 (5)	13 (3.25)	17 (2.83)	2008	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	3 (0.750)	3 (0.500)	2009	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0.667)	2010	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	1* (0.250)	0 (0)	<p>Group 1: Stations that had no blue lights installed by 2010 (N=60) Group 2: Stations that had blue lights installed by 2008 (N=1) Group 3: Stations that had blue lights installed by 2009 (N=4) Group 4: Stations that had blue lights installed by 2010 (N=6)</p> <p>*One case of suicide, but occurred during the day when the blue lights were off. *The average no of suicides (prior to blue light installation) was higher in groups where blue lights were eventually installed – this could be because the railway company chose to install blue lights at stations where suicide numbers were higher.</p> <p>Regression analysis Incident rate ratio (IRR) = 0.167; 95% CI (0.032-0.867) Introduction of blue lights resulted in a decrease in the number of suicides by 84% (CI: 14-97%) Estimated effect of blue lights on the number of suicides</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Effect</th> <th>95% CI</th> <th>P-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Blue lights</td> <td>-1.788</td> <td>-3.431,-0.143</td> <td>0.003</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Constant</td> <td>-18.373</td> <td>-20.477-16.269</td> <td><0.000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table entries are Poisson regression estimates. The dependant variable is the total number of suicides at each station in a single year.</p> <p>Study 2 <i>Descriptive analysis</i></p>		Effect	95% CI	P-value	Blue lights	-1.788	-3.431,-0.143	0.003	Constant	-18.373	-20.477-16.269	<0.000
Year	Group 1 (comparison) (N=60) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 2 (intervention) (N=1) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 3 (intervention) (N=4) Number of suicides (mean per station)	Group 4 (intervention) (N=6) Number of suicides (mean per station)																																					
2000-2007	67 (1.117)	5 (5)	13 (3.25)	17 (2.83)																																					
2008	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	3 (0.750)	3 (0.500)																																					
2009	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0.667)																																					
2010	5 (0.082)	0 (0)	1* (0.250)	0 (0)																																					
	Effect	95% CI	P-value																																						
Blue lights	-1.788	-3.431,-0.143	0.003																																						
Constant	-18.373	-20.477-16.269	<0.000																																						

<p>The Japan Society for the Promotion of Sciences and the Nomura Foundation in Japan.</p>	<p><i>Installation of blue lights at 14 stations</i> 1 station in 2008 4 in 2009 6 in 2010 1 in 2011 0 in 2012 2 in 2013 Blue lights stay on from sunset to sunrise</p> <p>Exclusion criteria</p> <p>Not known</p>		<p>Mean number of suicides per year for each groups of stations before and after the installation of blue lights. In parentheses – (number of station-years)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Study period-2000-2013</th> <th>Group 1 Blue lights</th> <th>Group 2 No blue lights</th> <th>Group 3 No blue lights</th> <th>Group 4 No blue lights</th> <th>Group 5 No blue lights</th> <th>Group 6 No blue lights</th> <th>Group 7 No blue lights</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Before 2000-2008</td> <td>0.435 (115)</td> <td>0.269 (182)</td> <td>0.234 (201)</td> <td>0.275 (189)</td> <td>0.245 (200)</td> <td>0.259 (220)</td> <td rowspan="2">0.0090 (546)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>After 2008-2013</td> <td>0.189 (53)</td> <td>0.274 (84)</td> <td>0.269 (93)</td> <td>0.275 (91)</td> <td>0.266 (94)</td> <td>0.245 (102)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Group 1: Stations with blue lights installed (N=14) Group 2: One station away Group 3: Two stations away Group 4: Three stations away Group 5: Four stations away Group 6: Five stations away Group 7: Six or more stations away</p> <p>*Group 1 refers to the stations who had blue lights installed from 2008-2013 (14 stations). The average number of suicides decreased after the installation of blue lights which is consistent with study 1 * The number in the post installation period for group 1 refers to 10 suicides. However 9 happened in the day when the lights were off *Clearly no major increase or decrease in the average number of suicides before and after the installation of blue lights at nearby stations</p> <p>Regression analysis Incident rate ratio (IRR) = 0.258; 95% CI (0.127-0.523) Introduction of blue lights resulted in a decrease in the number of suicides by 74% (CI: 48-87%)</p> <p>No significant results to suggest that the installation of blue lights increased suicides at nearby stations</p>	Study period-2000-2013	Group 1 Blue lights	Group 2 No blue lights	Group 3 No blue lights	Group 4 No blue lights	Group 5 No blue lights	Group 6 No blue lights	Group 7 No blue lights	Before 2000-2008	0.435 (115)	0.269 (182)	0.234 (201)	0.275 (189)	0.245 (200)	0.259 (220)	0.0090 (546)	After 2008-2013	0.189 (53)	0.274 (84)	0.269 (93)	0.275 (91)	0.266 (94)	0.245 (102)
Study period-2000-2013	Group 1 Blue lights	Group 2 No blue lights	Group 3 No blue lights	Group 4 No blue lights	Group 5 No blue lights	Group 6 No blue lights	Group 7 No blue lights																			
Before 2000-2008	0.435 (115)	0.269 (182)	0.234 (201)	0.275 (189)	0.245 (200)	0.259 (220)	0.0090 (546)																			
After 2008-2013	0.189 (53)	0.274 (84)	0.269 (93)	0.275 (91)	0.266 (94)	0.245 (102)																				
<p>Limitations identified by author External validity limited because the analysis relies on data from a single railroad company – the installation of blue lights may not be as effective in other areas</p>																										

Does not consider the possibility that people may jump in front of a train at a railway crossing as opposed to a station platform
Blue lights installed by other railway companies may be less effective due to differences in numbers, locations, and types of blue lights
Study does not examine the underlying suicide prevention of blue lights – may have a calming effect, but this hypothesis has not been systematically examined
Based on observational data- may not indicate a causal relationship between installation of blue lights and decreased suicide rates
The decision to install blue lights at stations may have been influenced by the number of suicides at the stations in previous years – to address this the effect of blue lights on the number of suicides was re-examined by controlling for the number of suicides in the previous year or the previous three years
Blue lights only expected to stop people jumping in front of trains at night, not during the day time.

Limitations identified by review team
Study described as an observational before and after study – however due to the control group (stations without blue lights) it was decided it was a prospective cohort study
Neither of the studies differentiated between suicide events that occurred at the end of platforms where blue lights are installed and those that occurred from other parts of the platforms where blue lights would not be effective, making it difficult to conclude that the reduction was definitely a result of the installation of the lights.

E.1.13 Pelletier 2007

Pelletier A R. (2007). Preventing suicide by jumping: the effect of a bridge safety fence. *Injury prevention: journal of the International Society for Child and Adolescent Injury Prevention*, 13(1), pp.57-9.

Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results															
<p>Author/year Pelletier, 2007</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Before and after analysis comparing number of suicides in two periods.</p> <p>Aim of the study To study the effects of a safety net on the Memorial Bridge in Augusta and other local jumping from height hot-spots.</p> <p>Location and setting</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable.</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics The median age of case patients was 39.5 years (range 21–72 years), and all were white; 11 (79%) case patients were male; 8 (57%) were single, 4 (29%) were married, 1 (7%) was divorced and 1 (7%) was widowed; 10 (71%) were living in Augusta at the time of their death; the other 4 (29%) lived in neighbouring communities; 7 (50%) suicides occurred on a Friday or Saturday; 10 (71%) of the deaths were witnessed; 7 (50%) occurred between noon and 17:59 h. No more than two deaths occurred in any month of the year. No seasonal patterns</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>The jumping site was a 2-lane, 2100 foot long bridge, 100 foot above Kennebec River. An 11 foot-high safety fence was installed on each side of the bridge in 1983. The Memorial Bridge is located near a state psychiatric hospital.</p> <p>Intervention period: 1 Jun 1983 to 31 Jul 2005 (22-year post-intervention period)</p> <p>Control group: 1 Apr 1960 to 31 May 1983 (22-year pre-intervention period). Note: data for 1968 were not available.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Number of suicides.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Number of jumping suicides at sites, before and after installation of safety net (22 & 22 years respectively)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Location</th> <th>Pre-installation</th> <th>Post-installation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Memorial Bridge</td> <td>14</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Augusta (minus memorial bridge)</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Augusta total</td> <td>23</td> <td>9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The suicide rate in Augusta from 1 April 1960 to 31 May 1983 was 26/100 000/year and from 1 June 1983 to 31 July 2005 was 23.8/100 000/year, a decrease of 9% (p=0.49).</p> <p>Author's conclusions: The results of the study indicated that the safety fence installed in 1983 was effective in preventing further suicides from the Memorial Bridge. The number of suicides related to jumping from other structures in Augusta remained</p>	Number of jumping suicides at sites, before and after installation of safety net (22 & 22 years respectively)			Location	Pre-installation	Post-installation	Memorial Bridge	14	0	Augusta (minus memorial bridge)	9	9	Augusta total	23	9
Number of jumping suicides at sites, before and after installation of safety net (22 & 22 years respectively)																		
Location	Pre-installation	Post-installation																
Memorial Bridge	14	0																
Augusta (minus memorial bridge)	9	9																
Augusta total	23	9																

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Memorial Bridge in Augusta, Maine, US</p> <p>Length of study The study period included 22 years and 2 months both before and after installation of the safety fence in June 1983.</p> <p>Source of funding There was no external funding for this study. The work was conducted by a federal employee with the Centres for Disease Control and Prevention.</p>	<p>were noted. Death was due to drowning in 8 (57%) cases and due to blunt trauma in 6 (43%) cases.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Potential cases were identified by examining death certificates with International Classification of Diseases (ICD) codes for suicides in Augusta caused by jumping from a high place or drowning. For each potential case identified through death certificates, additional information was sought from the archives of the Kennebec Journal newspaper, death investigations conducted by the state medical examiner and medical records of the state psychiatric hospital in Augusta. Information from these sources was used to describe the general characteristics of cases.</p> <p>Data Collection: Data on all suicides in Augusta and in Maine during the study period were obtained from death certificates using ICD codes for suicide. Population data for Augusta and Maine were obtained from the US census.</p>		<p>unchanged after installation of the fence, suggesting that suicidal individuals did not seek alternative sites. Although the decline in the suicide rate in Augusta after installation of the safety fence was not statistically significant, measuring the effect of a safety fence on the overall suicide rate in a community can be difficult because of the relatively small percentage of suicides from jumping</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author Data for 1968 were not available. However, it is unlikely that one year's data would have had a substantial effect on the study results given the length of the overall time period examined. Electronic death records from 1960 to 1974 do not meet current data quality standards. This may have resulted in an underestimate of suicides from the Memorial Bridge during that time period. Data were not available for non-fatal incidents involving the Memorial Bridge. Focusing only on deaths underestimates the public health effect of suicide attempts from the bridge.</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team There are potential biases and inaccuracies in the death certificates. The large drop in suicide rates by jumping across the city appear to be explained by the barrier only. There could be chance fluctuations in rates, economic changes, social changes, or other interventions to restrict the means of completing suicide that are not identified by the authors. Although the authors acknowledge difficulties of measuring an effect of a safety fence when there are small numbers, the issue is not explored further.</p>			

The proximity to the bridge of the psychiatric hospital was noted, but further data and safety of patients was not described.

E.1.14 Perron et al 2013

Perron S, Burrows S, Fournier M, Perron PA, and Ouellet F. (2013). Installation of a bridge barrier as a suicide prevention strategy in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. *American journal of public health, 103*(7), pp.1235-9.

Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																																			
<p>Author/year Perron et al, 2013</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Uncontrolled before & after study, natural experiment.</p> <p>Aim of the study To determine whether the installation of a suicide prevention barrier on Jacques-Cartier Bridge led to displacement of suicides to other jumping sites on Montreal Island and Montérégie, Quebec, the 2 regions it connects.</p> <p>Location and setting Jacques-Cartier Bridge, which spans the St. Lawrence River between Montréal Island and Montérégie, Montreal, Quebec, Canada</p> <p>Length of study</p>	<p>Number of participants The study was a natural experiment.</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics</p> <p>Individuals who jumped from Jacques-Cartier Bridge was younger than those who used other sites. The average age of suicide victims was higher in the period after installation of the barrier for all sites except Jacques-Cartier Bridge, for which there was a decrease. Most suicides by jumping were male. Jumping from Jacques-Cartier Bridge mean age (SD): Before barrier 34.9yrs (12.2) After barrier 31.8yrs (12.2) Male no (%) Before barrier 121 (82%) After barrier 121 (92%) Jacques-Cartier Bridge was the only single structure that attracted individuals from regions beyond neighbouring municipalities (13% travelled from elsewhere in Québec).</p> <p>Inclusion criteria</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: the existing 1.1 meter steel palisade fencing was extended a further 1.4 meters and curved inwardly at the top, making it high and difficult to climb.</p> <p>Intervention period: 5 (2005–2009) after installation.</p> <p>Control period: 13.5 (1990–June 2004) before installation.</p> <p>Analyses Incidence rate ratios (IRRs) were calculated and represent the ratio of the incidence rate before and after the installation of the barrier. To assess possible displacement, regression models were ran for suicides from Jacques-Cartier Bridge only and then combined them in a stepwise fashion with suicides from 5 categories of other jumping sites. P value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Suicide rates -</p> <p>Suicide rates by jumping from Jacques-Cartier Bridge decreased after installation of the barrier (incidence rate ratio [IRR] = 0.24; 95% confidence interval [CI] = 0.13, 0.43), which persisted when all bridges (IRR = 0.39; 95% CI = 0.27, 0.55) and all jumping sites (IRR = 0.66; 95% CI = 0.54, 0.80) in the regions were considered.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Suicide rate/100 000</th> <th colspan="2">No. annual suicides*</th> <th>P value</th> <th>IRR (95% CI)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Jump Location</th> <th>before</th> <th>after</th> <th>before</th> <th>after</th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Jacques Cartier</td> <td>0.324</td> <td>0.079</td> <td>10.0</td> <td>2.6</td> <td><.001</td> <td>0.24 (0.13, 0.43)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>all bridges</td> <td>0.577</td> <td>0.225</td> <td>17.9</td> <td>7.4</td> <td><.001</td> <td>0.39 (0.27, 0.55)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>all jumping sites</td> <td>1.168</td> <td>0.768</td> <td>36.1</td> <td>25.0</td> <td><.001</td> <td>0.66 (0.54, 0.80)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Corrected per capita to suicides in 1990 population; not standardised for age.</p> <p>Authors conclusions</p>		Suicide rate/100 000		No. annual suicides*		P value	IRR (95% CI)	Jump Location	before	after	before	after			Jacques Cartier	0.324	0.079	10.0	2.6	<.001	0.24 (0.13, 0.43)	all bridges	0.577	0.225	17.9	7.4	<.001	0.39 (0.27, 0.55)	all jumping sites	1.168	0.768	36.1	25.0	<.001	0.66 (0.54, 0.80)
	Suicide rate/100 000		No. annual suicides*		P value	IRR (95% CI)																																
Jump Location	before	after	before	after																																		
Jacques Cartier	0.324	0.079	10.0	2.6	<.001	0.24 (0.13, 0.43)																																
all bridges	0.577	0.225	17.9	7.4	<.001	0.39 (0.27, 0.55)																																
all jumping sites	1.168	0.768	36.1	25.0	<.001	0.66 (0.54, 0.80)																																

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>28.5 years: 13.5 (1990–June 2004) before and 5 (2005–2009) after installation).</p> <p>Source of funding</p> <p>Not reported.</p>	<p>To be included in the data collection the death had to be ruled a suicide by the Québec chief coroner’s office.</p> <p>Data Collection: data were extracted suicide deaths among Québec residents from the data banks of the Québec chief coroner’s office for January 1, 1990–December 31, 2009.</p> <p>Jacques-Cartier Bridge is 1 of several bridges spanning the St. Lawrence River between Montréal Island and the Montérégie region on the south shore (Figure 1). We considered jumping sites within the 2 regions, including bridges connecting them, for potential evidence of displacement. The bridge used for a suicide was usually recorded, but in some cases the body was retrieved from the St. Lawrence River and, although bodily injury indicated a fall from height, the exact bridge used was unknown.</p> <p>- Population counts for Québec and Montréal Island and Montérégie were derived from census data for 1991, 1996, 2001, and 2006 and assumed linear population growth for the periods 1991–1996, 1996–2001, and 2001–2006. Population growth was estimated by extrapolating backward for 1990 to 1991 and forward for 2006 to 2009.</p>		<p>Little or no displacement to other jumping sites may occur after installation of a barrier at an iconic site such as Jacques-Cartier Bridge. A barrier’s design is important to its effectiveness and should be considered for new bridges with the potential to become symbolic suicide sites.</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author</p>			

Variables other than the barrier may possibly have influenced suicide rates at the same time at which the barrier was installed. For example, we observed an overall decrease in rates of suicide by all methods and by jumping in the province of Québec. However, the decreasing trend is unlikely to explain all of our results.

Québec suicide records have been shown to be valid and reliable, with little underreporting. The decision to ascribe a death to suicide is based on the balance of evidence indicating suicidal intent. Although some unintentional deaths or homicides may be misclassified as suicides after a fall from height, it is unlikely to present a serious bias.

Using the date when the body was discovered as the date of death for some cases will have added some inaccuracy but is unlikely to affect annual trends.

Limitations identified by review team
Not identified

E.1.15 Reisch and Michel (2005)

Reisch T and Michel K. (2005). Securing a suicide hot spot: effects of a safety net at the Bern Muenster Terrace. <i>Suicide & life-threatening behaviour</i> , 35(4), pp.460-7.																								
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																					
<p>Author/year Reisch & Michel, 2005</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Interrupted time series analysis assessing expected and observed numbers of suicides in 2 periods: 1995-98 (4 yr pre-intervention period) and 1999-2002 (4 yr post-intervention period).</p> <p>Aim of the study To study the effects of a safety net on the Muenster Terrace and other local jumping from height hot-spots in Bern. The researchers also considered the number of media reports on jumping at hot-spot sites and the</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable.</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics</p> <p>Not reported.</p> <p>Data indicate that people with suicide by jumping living outside Bern were 14 for the pre- installation period (1995-98); the total number for Bern sites over this period was 45.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria All deaths by suicide for Bern for the study period, confirmed by 2 datasets. Data Collection: Data were collected from the Swiss Federal Office for Stats; data includes year, residence and method of suicide used. Bern City police data was also used</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: In December 1998, a safety net was built to prevent people from leaping from a high terrace. The barrier is made of 4m wide metal mesh, 7m below the top level. It was built, largely, to protect people below the terrace. Commentators questioned the general prevention factor as there were 2 bridges of 50m height within 5 minutes' walk from Muenster Terrace.</p> <p>Intervention period: 1999-2002 (4 yr post-intervention period).</p> <p>Control period: 1995-98 (4 yr pre-intervention period).</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Outcomes: Suicide numbers for the reporting periods. Note: data is missing for the primary outcomes, although data were reported for this study in a systematic review (see below).</p> <p>In the four years after the safety net was built no more suicides at the Muenster terrace occurred and the number of suicides in Bern decreased.</p> <p>Three models were used to calculate statistical differences before and after the installation of the barrier. Using the best fitting model (the logarithmic model) the results suggest a significant reduction of suicides by jumping after installation of the net. The difference between the expected and observed numbers was significant (73 expected, 44 observed; binominal test: $p < 0.01$)</p> <p>Author's conclusions: the reduction of the deaths by jumping from the Muenster Terrace does not explain the decrease of suicides by jumping in Bern.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Data reported by Reisch & Michel:</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Jump location</th> <th>Pre- 95-98 (4yrs)</th> <th>Post- 95-98 (4yrs)</th> <th>Rate ratio</th> <th>CI</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Muenster Terrace</td> <td>NR</td> <td>0</td> <td>NR</td> <td>NR</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bern (all sites) suicides</td> <td>45</td> <td>44</td> <td>NR</td> <td>NR</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Data reported by Reisch & Michel:					Jump location	Pre- 95-98 (4yrs)	Post- 95-98 (4yrs)	Rate ratio	CI	Muenster Terrace	NR	0	NR	NR	Bern (all sites) suicides	45	44	NR	NR
Data reported by Reisch & Michel:																								
Jump location	Pre- 95-98 (4yrs)	Post- 95-98 (4yrs)	Rate ratio	CI																				
Muenster Terrace	NR	0	NR	NR																				
Bern (all sites) suicides	45	44	NR	NR																				

residency of people who jumped at these sites. Location and setting Muenster Terrace, Bern, Switzerland. Length of study 8 years. Data were collected for the 2 periods (4yr & 4yr), pre and post-intervention. Source of funding Not reported.	as a record of death and location of death. Both data sets are completed by law and considered to be accurate and comprehensive; authors report there is a low likelihood of undetected death at Muenster Terrace.		by jumping				
			Data reported in Pirkis et al 2013 (systematic review)				
			Jump location	Pre-95-98 (3yrs)	Post-95-98 (3yrs)	Rate ratio	CI
			Muenster Terrace	7	0	0	0.0 to 0.69
			Bern (all sites) suicides by jumping	19	13	0.68	0.31 to 1.46
NR, not reported.							
Limitations identified by author Small numbers of suicide limit the power of the statistical analyses. Changes in suicide by jumping may be related to unrelated fluctuations. Limitations identified by review team There is a lack of reporting of data for the site: The authors do not report rates at the Muenster and other Bern jumping sites. The records might be prone to bias because people found dead beneath certain bridges or after falling from any bridge or building are more likely to have been ruled as having died by suicide than by causes such as homicide or unintentional death. The safety net was introduced to protect people below the terrace, rather than reduce suicide per se. The safety net did not prevent jumping across all of the Terrace. Although the safety net appeared to stop jumping, it is not clear whether the effect was temporary or related to the effect of media reporting about safety around the site.							

E.1.16 Sinyor et al 2017/Sinyor and Levitt 2010

Sinyor Mark, Schaffer Ayal, Redelmeier Donald A, Kiss Alex, Nishikawa Yasunori, Cheung Amy H, Levitt Anthony J, and Pirkis Jane (2017) Did the suicide barrier work after all? Revisiting the Bloor Viaduct natural experiment and its impact on suicide rates in Toronto. <i>BMJ open</i> 7(5), e015299 Sinyor M, and Levitt A J. (2010). Effect of a barrier at Bloor Street Viaduct on suicide rates in Toronto: Natural experiment. <i>BMJ (Online)</i> , 341(7765), pp.185.			
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results

<p>Author/year Sinyor et al 2017 Sinyor & Levitt, 2010</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Uncontrolled before & after study, natural experiment.</p> <p>Aim of the study To determine whether rates of suicide changed in Toronto after a barrier was erected at Bloor Street Viaduct, and whether media reporting had any impact on suicide rates.</p> <p>Location and setting Toronto, Canada</p> <p>Length of study Data were collected for the periods: 1993-2003 (eleven years before the barrier) and July 2003-June 2014 (eleven years after the barrier).</p> <p>Source of funding American Foundation for Suicide Prevention and the University of Toronto, Department of Psychiatry Excellence Fund.Sinyor</p>	<p>Number of participants The study was a natural experiment involving 5403 people who died by suicide in the city of Toronto.</p> <p>People who died by jumping characteristics The study provides data for the last known residences of people who died by jumping from Toronto bridges. jumping from Bloor Street Viaduct</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Sinyor and Levitt (2010)Location of last known residence of people who died by jumping from Toronto bridges. No (%)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Location of residence</th> <th>Bloor street</th> <th>Other bridges</th> <th>Post-barrier</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Toronto</td> <td>17 (29.8)</td> <td>23 (40.4)</td> <td>41 (67.2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Suburbs or beyond</td> <td>2 (3.5)</td> <td>0 (0)</td> <td>9 (14.8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>No fixed/unknown</td> <td>4 (7.0)</td> <td>11 (19.3)</td> <td>11 (18.0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Of the 57 people who completed suicide by jumping from Toronto bridges from 1999-2001 (before the barrier), only two were known to live outside the city and both jumped at Bloor Street Viaduct.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria To be included in the data collection the death had to occur between 1 January 1993 and 31 December 2014 and be ruled a suicide by the coroner's office.</p> <p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010) To be included in the data collection the death had to be ruled a suicide by the coroner's office</p>	Sinyor and Levitt (2010)Location of last known residence of people who died by jumping from Toronto bridges. No (%)				Location of residence	Bloor street	Other bridges	Post-barrier	Toronto	17 (29.8)	23 (40.4)	41 (67.2)	Suburbs or beyond	2 (3.5)	0 (0)	9 (14.8)	No fixed/unknown	4 (7.0)	11 (19.3)	11 (18.0)	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: barrier at Bloor Street Viaduct, was constructed between April 2002 and June 2003. The barrier is about 5 m high and consists of thousands of thin steel rods spaced closely together and supported externally by an angled steel frame. Jumping at other locality hotspots were noted to assess whether the barrier prevents suicides or simply result in people substituting one bridge for another or attempting suicide by other means.</p> <p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010) Intervention period: July 2003-June 2014 (four years after the barrier)</p> <p>Sinyor et al (2017) Intervention period: July 2003-June 2007/2014 (four eleven years after the barrier)</p> <p>Control period: 1993-2003 (eleven years before the barrier)</p> <p>Statistical analysis Sinyor et al (2017)</p> <p>To examine differences between suicide rates before and after the barrier the authors carried out Poisson regression analyses with time (prebarrier/postbarrier) and population adjusted suicide deaths per year as the independent and dependent variables, respectively.</p> <p>For the media analysis, Poisson regression was run to compare the</p>	<p>Primary outcomes Sinyor et al 2017Changes in yearly rates of suicide by jumping at Bloor Street Viaduct, other bridges including nearest comparison bridge and walking distance bridges, and buildings, and by other means.</p> <p>Relationship between media reporting of suicide and suicide rates.</p> <p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010) Changes in yearly rates of suicide by jumping at Bloor Street Viaduct, other bridges, and buildings, and by other means.</p> <p>Results: Suicide rates</p> <p>Rates of suicide before and after the suicide barrier are presented in the table below. Only one person has died by jumping off the Bloor Street Viaduct since the barrier was completed. Per-capita rates at that location declined from 9.0 deaths per year before the barrier to 0.1 deaths per year after the barrier (p=0.002).</p> <p>Suicide deaths from bridges in Toronto declined by a similar absolute number (18.8 deaths per year before the barrier vs 10.0 deaths per year after the barrier, p<0.0001).</p> <p>There was no statistically significant rise in deaths by jumping from other bridges in the city overall, walking distance bridges, the nearest comparison bridge or from buildings.</p> <p>There was a numeric but non-significant reduction in overall suicide deaths by jumping (57.0 deaths per year before the barrier vs 51.3 deaths per year after the barrier, p=0.07).</p> <p>Suicide deaths from the nearest comparison bridge rose in the years when the barrier was constructed and in the 2 years afterwards, but suicide deaths at that location have declined to prebarrier levels.</p> <p>Per capita rates of suicide overall and by means other than jumping declined significantly over the study period (p<0.0001; p=0.001, respectively).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Obs</td> <td>Cor*</td> <td>Obs</td> <td>Cor*</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Obs	Cor*	Obs	Cor*		
Sinyor and Levitt (2010)Location of last known residence of people who died by jumping from Toronto bridges. No (%)																														
Location of residence	Bloor street	Other bridges	Post-barrier																											
Toronto	17 (29.8)	23 (40.4)	41 (67.2)																											
Suburbs or beyond	2 (3.5)	0 (0)	9 (14.8)																											
No fixed/unknown	4 (7.0)	11 (19.3)	11 (18.0)																											
	Obs	Cor*	Obs	Cor*																										

<p>and Levitt (2010) received no funding.</p> <p>according to the standard of a high degree of probability.</p> <p>Data Collection Suicides: Sinyor and Levitt (2010) Records from the Office of the Chief Coroner of Ontario covering all suicides in Ontario were examined.</p> <p>Sinyor et al (2017) The barrier at the Bloor Street Viaduct was completed in 2003. Accordingly, the study classified the 11 year from January 1993 to December 2003 as being before the barrier and the 11 years from January 2004 to December 2014 as being after the barrier.</p> <p>Data Collection Media: A media tracking service, provided media articles related to suicide. 11 local and national publications with the highest circulation in the Toronto media market: were identified. A database search was run for suicide and related keywords. Trained coders included articles with a major focus on suicide (having greater than two sentences or a short paragraph devoted to the subject).</p> <p>Coders then searched the identified articles for the keywords 'Viaduct', 'Bridge' and 'Jump'. Identified articles were then coded on a yes/no basis for whether they (1) were related to the Bloor Street Viaduct, (2) if so, if they expressed negative views about the barrier or suicide barriers in general (defined as describing the barrier as a poor use of resources, an ineffective strategy or both) and/or included the cost of the barrier, (3) were related to jumping from a bridge other than the Bloor Street Viaduct and/or (4) included a message of hope that suicide is preventable. None of these codes were mutually exclusive. Five inter-rater reliability tests were spaced throughout coding, and collectively, 94% agreement was achieved.</p>	<p>population-adjusted counts of suicide per year in relation to the yearly number of articles. Because of the risk that media reports on a given year could be the result of specific deaths rather than the cause of them, the models applied a 1 year lag on the article predictor variable. That is, the analysis tested whether media occurrences on the previous calendar year had any relationship with suicide deaths.</p> <p>P value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.</p> <p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010) To examine differences between suicide rates before and after the barrier the authors carried out Poisson regression analyses. They analysed demographic data using two tailed, independent sample t tests for continuous variables and two sided χ^2 tests for categorical variables. P value less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Toronto (total)</td> <td>257.0</td> <td>247.8</td> <td>234.2</td> <td>211.7</td> <td><0.001</td> <td>0.85 (0.79 to 0.93)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jumping</td> <td>59.3</td> <td>57.0</td> <td>56.7</td> <td>51.3</td> <td>0.07</td> <td>0.90 (0.80 to 1.01)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Building</td> <td>39.6</td> <td>38.1</td> <td>45.5</td> <td>41.2</td> <td>0.29</td> <td>1.08 (0.94 to 1.24)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Bridge</td> <td>19.6</td> <td>18.8</td> <td>11.1</td> <td>10.0</td> <td><0.0001</td> <td>0.53 (0.40 to 0.71)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bloor St Viaduct</td> <td>9.5</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>0.002</td> <td>0.009 (0.0005 to 0.19)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other bridges</td> <td>10.1</td> <td>9.6</td> <td>11.0</td> <td>10.0</td> <td>0.84</td> <td>1.03 (0.76 to 1.40)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Walking distance bridges</td> <td>6.7</td> <td>6.3</td> <td>5.5</td> <td>5.0</td> <td>0.36</td> <td>0.79 (0.48 to 1.30)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nearest comparison bridge</td> <td>2.3</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>2.4</td> <td>0.77</td> <td>1.11 (0.54 to 2.29)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other means</td> <td>197.7</td> <td>190.8</td> <td>177.5</td> <td>160.4</td> <td>0.001</td> <td>0.84 (0.76 to 0.93)</td> </tr> </table>	Toronto (total)	257.0	247.8	234.2	211.7	<0.001	0.85 (0.79 to 0.93)	Jumping	59.3	57.0	56.7	51.3	0.07	0.90 (0.80 to 1.01)	Building	39.6	38.1	45.5	41.2	0.29	1.08 (0.94 to 1.24)	All Bridge	19.6	18.8	11.1	10.0	<0.0001	0.53 (0.40 to 0.71)	Bloor St Viaduct	9.5	9.0	0.1	0.1	0.002	0.009 (0.0005 to 0.19)	Other bridges	10.1	9.6	11.0	10.0	0.84	1.03 (0.76 to 1.40)	Walking distance bridges	6.7	6.3	5.5	5.0	0.36	0.79 (0.48 to 1.30)	Nearest comparison bridge	2.3	2.2	2.6	2.4	0.77	1.11 (0.54 to 2.29)	Other means	197.7	190.8	177.5	160.4	0.001	0.84 (0.76 to 0.93)
	Toronto (total)	257.0	247.8	234.2	211.7	<0.001	0.85 (0.79 to 0.93)																																																										
	Jumping	59.3	57.0	56.7	51.3	0.07	0.90 (0.80 to 1.01)																																																										
	Building	39.6	38.1	45.5	41.2	0.29	1.08 (0.94 to 1.24)																																																										
	All Bridge	19.6	18.8	11.1	10.0	<0.0001	0.53 (0.40 to 0.71)																																																										
	Bloor St Viaduct	9.5	9.0	0.1	0.1	0.002	0.009 (0.0005 to 0.19)																																																										
	Other bridges	10.1	9.6	11.0	10.0	0.84	1.03 (0.76 to 1.40)																																																										
	Walking distance bridges	6.7	6.3	5.5	5.0	0.36	0.79 (0.48 to 1.30)																																																										
	Nearest comparison bridge	2.3	2.2	2.6	2.4	0.77	1.11 (0.54 to 2.29)																																																										
Other means	197.7	190.8	177.5	160.4	0.001	0.84 (0.76 to 0.93)																																																											

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>* Corrected per capita to suicides in 1993 population; not standardised for age. **IRR of suicides postbarrier compared with prebarrier; df=15.</p>																																														
<p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">A mean of 9.3 suicides took place annually before the barrier and none after the barrier (P<0.01). Jump Location</th> <th colspan="2">Mean ann. suicide pre-barrier</th> <th colspan="2">Mean ann. suicide post-barrier</th> <th rowspan="2">P value</th> <th rowspan="2">Incident rate ratio (95% CI)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Obs</th> <th>Cor*</th> <th>Obs</th> <th>Cor*</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Building</td> <td>39.7</td> <td>38.5</td> <td>45.8</td> <td>42.7</td> <td>0.32</td> <td>1.11 (0.90 to 1.36)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>All Bridges</td> <td>18.6</td> <td>17.9</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>14.2</td> <td>0.22</td> <td>0.79 (0.55 to 1.15)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bloor st</td> <td>9.6</td> <td>9.3</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td><0.01</td> <td>0.05 (0.01 to 0.31)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other bridges</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>8.7</td> <td>15.3</td> <td>14.2</td> <td>0.01</td> <td>1.64 (1.13 to 2.39)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>* Corrected per capita to suicides in 1993 population; not standardised for age.</p> <p>Results: Media analysis</p>								A mean of 9.3 suicides took place annually before the barrier and none after the barrier (P<0.01). Jump Location	Mean ann. suicide pre-barrier		Mean ann. suicide post-barrier		P value	Incident rate ratio (95% CI)	Obs	Cor*	Obs	Cor*	Building	39.7	38.5	45.8	42.7	0.32	1.11 (0.90 to 1.36)	All Bridges	18.6	17.9	15.3	14.2	0.22	0.79 (0.55 to 1.15)	Bloor st	9.6	9.3	0	0	<0.01	0.05 (0.01 to 0.31)	Other bridges	9.0	8.7	15.3	14.2	0.01	1.64 (1.13 to 2.39)
A mean of 9.3 suicides took place annually before the barrier and none after the barrier (P<0.01). Jump Location	Mean ann. suicide pre-barrier		Mean ann. suicide post-barrier		P value	Incident rate ratio (95% CI)																																								
	Obs	Cor*	Obs	Cor*																																										
Building	39.7	38.5	45.8	42.7	0.32	1.11 (0.90 to 1.36)																																								
All Bridges	18.6	17.9	15.3	14.2	0.22	0.79 (0.55 to 1.15)																																								
Bloor st	9.6	9.3	0	0	<0.01	0.05 (0.01 to 0.31)																																								
Other bridges	9.0	8.7	15.3	14.2	0.01	1.64 (1.13 to 2.39)																																								

			<p>The authors found no significant relationship between number of articles and suicide deaths by jumping or overall in the following year.</p> <p>Articles about suicide at the Bloor Street Viaduct were associated with a significant increase in suicide deaths by jumping from bridges the following year (incidence rate ratio (IRR) 1.011, 95% CI 1.0014 to 1.0207, p=0.02). These articles were also associated with a decline in suicide deaths by jumping from buildings the following year (IRR 0.9939, 95% CI 0.9902 to 0.9976, p=0.001).</p> <p>Articles describing the cost of the barrier were associated with an increase in suicides on bridges (IRR 1.025, 95% CI 1.0001 to 1.05, p=0.05).</p> <p>Messages of hope were associated with a decrease in suicide deaths by jumping from buildings only (IRR 0.9869, 95% CI 0.9776 to 0.9962, p=0.006).</p> <p>There was no significant impact of articles expressing negative views about the suicide barrier or articles about bridges other than the Bloor Street Viaduct.</p> <p>Authors conclusion</p> <p>The study demonstrated that, over the long term, suicide by jump declined in Toronto after the barrier with no associated in suicide by other means. That is, the barrier appears to have had its intended impact at preventing suicide despite a short-term rise in deaths at other bridges that was at least partially influenced by a media effect.</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author</p>			<p>Sinyor et al (2017) Potential ecological fallacy. As an uncontrolled natural experiment, it is possible that factors that could not be accounted for may have impacted suicide rates. (e.g. societal changes that might have impacted on chosen suicide methods, the impact of economic changes). Only able to examine print and online media sources. The authors speculate that these should serve as a proxy for other types of media reporting including television and radio reports although this was not established. Possibility that a small number of suicide deaths by jumping from bridges or buildings in Toronto were either never identified or was misclassified by the coroner as accidental or due to homicide.</p> <p>Sinyor and Levitt (2010)</p> <p>Despite the relatively high rate of suicides by jumping at Bloor Street Viaduct, the absolute numbers may have been too low to achieve adequate power in a study of this kind.</p> <p>The relative comprehensiveness of the chief coroner's records, it is possible that suicide rates by all causes were overestimated or underestimated in the period before or after the barrier owing to incompleteness or inaccuracy of records.</p> <p>The coroner's records might be prone to bias because people found dead beneath certain bridges or after falling from any bridge or building are more likely to have been ruled as having died by suicide than by causes such as homicide or unintentional death.</p> <p>The possibility that rates of suicide at other bridges increased after the barrier for reasons other than substitution of location cannot be discounted. These reasons might include chance fluctuations in rates, economic changes, social changes, or other interventions to restrict the means of completing suicide.</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team</p> <p>There may be biases in coroner's reporting of suicide cases based on changes in culture and attitudes to suicide. Study weakness exists relating to any naturalistic experiment.</p>

E.1.17 Skegg and Herbison (2009)

Skegg K and Herbison P. (2009). Effect of restricting access to a suicide jumping site. <i>The Australian and New Zealand journal of psychiatry</i> , 43(6), pp.498-502.												
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results									
<p>Author/year Skegg and Herbison 2009</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Quasi-experimental</p> <p>Aim of the study To assess whether loss of vehicular access would lead to a reduction in suicide and emergency police callouts for threatened suicide at the site.</p> <p>Location and setting In the city of Dunedin, a rocky headland (Lawyer's Head) projecting into the Pacific Ocean nears a population city beach, New Zealand. Length of study August 1996 to July 2006</p> <p>Source of funding Not reported.</p>	<p>Participant characteristics and number Not applicable</p> <p>Characteristics of the Cantonal Hospital In the city of Dunedin, a rocky headland (Lawyer's Head) projecting into the Pacific Ocean near a population city beach has acquired a reputation as a place from which jumping will result in almost certain death. Lawyer's Head became a high-frequency location, with symbolic significance for local people. Not only were some people actually dying by jumping off it, but also many threatened jump off it not infrequently resulting in police being informed. At times this information would lead to a police callout to Lawyer's Head.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Suicide jumps off the cliff (Lawyer's Head) Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Data collection Between August 1996 and July 2006, and for a 2 year period of closure (1 August 2016-31 July 2008). Information from 3 data sources was checked: Coroner's</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison Intervention: The only vehicular access to the headland was closed by the Dunedin City Council on 1 August 2006 because a new sewage outfall was being built. Comparison: The number of suicides jumping or falling from a height before and after restricted access to Lawyer's Head.</p>	<p>Primary outcomes <i>Number of suicides</i> Between August 1996 and July 2006, and for a 2 year period of closure (1 August 2016-31 July 2008)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Time period</th> <th>No. episode of jump</th> <th>No. of death</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Before restricted access</td> <td>16</td> <td>14 (11 suicide based on coroner's verdict)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 years after restriction of access</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The difference was statistically significant both for the total of 16 jumping episode and 13 deaths with suicide/open verdicts. During the 4 year period prior to restrict access to Lawyer's Head there were 77 police callouts (19.3 per year). In the 2-year period following restricted access, there was 19 callouts (9.5 per year). These figures give an incident rate difference of 9.8 (95%CI 3.7 to 15.8) and an incident rate ratio of 2.0 (95%CI 1.2 to 3.5) indicating a statistically significant reduction in callouts.</p> <p>Author Conclusions The study reported in the 2 years following erection of a fate preventing vehicular access to a cliff that had become of high-frequency location, no deaths by jumping occurred either at the cliff or anywhere else in the city of Dunedin.</p>	Time period	No. episode of jump	No. of death	Before restricted access	16	14 (11 suicide based on coroner's verdict)	2 years after restriction of access	0	
Time period	No. episode of jump	No. of death										
Before restricted access	16	14 (11 suicide based on coroner's verdict)										
2 years after restriction of access	0											

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

	pathologist' records, the police records, and the records of Dunedin Marine Search and Rescue.		
<p>Limitations identified by author The present study was that numbers per year rather than incidence rates were used. There was no evidence of any decline in the local suicide rate that could explain the present results. The small size of the population at risk. Without including those with open verdicts would have been too few deaths to show a significant difference.</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Data on the number of suicides jumps at the cliffs by each calendar year was not available.</p>			

E.1.18 Stack (2015)

<p>Stack S. (2015). Crisis phones-Suicide prevention versus suggestion/contagion effects: Skyway Bridge, 1954-2012. Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention, 36(3), pp.220-224.</p>																												
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																									
<p>Author/year Stack 2015</p> <p>Quality score -</p> <p>Study type Retrospective cohort study</p> <p>Aim of the study To assess the impact of crisis lines on the number of suicides from the Skyway Bridge</p> <p>Location and setting Skyway bridge, St Petersburg, Florida, USA – ranked fourth in the USA for the number of bridge suicides</p>	<p>Number of participants Not applicable</p> <p>Participant characteristics <i>Number of suicidal persons who used the phones:</i> 27 people used the phones over the 10 year period after they were installed. However 80 people died by suicide without picking up the phones during this period.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Unknown</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Unknown</p> <p>Data collection</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison Six crisis phones with signs were installed in 1999 at Skyway Bridge, Florida. The bridge was selected as the site for intervention as it was one of the first sites to install phones (July 1999) with direct links to a crisis counsellor. This allows for assessing the impact of phones over a long follow up period.</p> <p>Bridge suicide phones were publicised with signs on the bridge and coverage in the media.</p> <p>Intervention group: The bridge is 4.1 miles long. Crisis phones were placed on the bridge where the highest area is reached (193 feet). This area of the bridge has an emergency lane where cars can stop – which is the most common site for suicides.</p> <p>Data on the number of suicides from the bridge were collected at several year points before the installation of crisis phones. (x=2, x=7, x =13)</p>	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <p>Regression analysis:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1997-1998 vs (2000-2001</th> <th>1992-1998 vs 2000-2006</th> <th>1986-1998 vs 2000-2006</th> <th>1986-1998 vs 2000-2012 *</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Phones vs Pre-phones</td> <td>-5.0 (2.0) t = -2.50</td> <td>1.71 (1.83) t = 0.935</td> <td>4.46 (1.26) t = 3.52</td> <td>2.73 (1.57) t = 1.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Florida suicide rate</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-1.22 (.703) t= 1.75)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Constant</td> <td>10.0 (1.41) t= 7.07</td> <td>5.57 (1.296) t = 4.29</td> <td>3.69 (.89) t = 4.12</td> <td>22.67 (10.89) t = 2.08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>R²</td> <td>.758</td> <td>.068</td> <td>.341</td> <td>.418</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Compared with the control for the Florida suicide rate</p>		1997-1998 vs (2000-2001	1992-1998 vs 2000-2006	1986-1998 vs 2000-2006	1986-1998 vs 2000-2012 *	Phones vs Pre-phones	-5.0 (2.0) t = -2.50	1.71 (1.83) t = 0.935	4.46 (1.26) t = 3.52	2.73 (1.57) t = 1.74	Florida suicide rate	-	-	-	-1.22 (.703) t= 1.75)	Constant	10.0 (1.41) t= 7.07	5.57 (1.296) t = 4.29	3.69 (.89) t = 4.12	22.67 (10.89) t = 2.08	R ²	.758	.068	.341	.418
	1997-1998 vs (2000-2001	1992-1998 vs 2000-2006	1986-1998 vs 2000-2006	1986-1998 vs 2000-2012 *																								
Phones vs Pre-phones	-5.0 (2.0) t = -2.50	1.71 (1.83) t = 0.935	4.46 (1.26) t = 3.52	2.73 (1.57) t = 1.74																								
Florida suicide rate	-	-	-	-1.22 (.703) t= 1.75)																								
Constant	10.0 (1.41) t= 7.07	5.57 (1.296) t = 4.29	3.69 (.89) t = 4.12	22.67 (10.89) t = 2.08																								
R ²	.758	.068	.341	.418																								

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Length of study Suicide data retrieved from 1954-2012. Crisis phones were installed in 1999.</p> <p>Source of funding Not reported</p>	<p>Yearly suicide counts were found for the year the bridge opened in 1954 through to 2012. Crisis phones were installed in 1999 so this year was omitted from the analysis. The analysis compared the number of suicides before the year of intervention (1999) and after for the same duration of years. Suicide data for the complete window of 1954-2012 was also reported.</p> <p>Overall suicide data for Florida was taken from the Suicide Prevention Coalition and the Florida State Department of Health (2012).</p> <p>In contrast to most other locales, the local paper has had a long standing policy that since suicides on the bridge occur in public, that it will publish an article on every suicide on the bridge as well as individual characteristics. This information is provided in detail on a readily accessible website.</p> <p>A search was made through available reports for the numbers of persons who used the crisis phones.</p>	<p>Control group: Data on the number of suicides from the bridge were collected at several year points after the installation of crisis phones. (x=2, x=7, x=13)</p> <p>Suicide rates in the state of Florida were also incorporated as a control</p>	<p>Numbers are unstandardized regression co-efficient. Standard errors are in the parentheses. T statistics refer to t ratios. Those highlighted in red were statistically significant (p<0.05)</p> <p>The control period was further extended back to the beginning of the series, 1954. Over this long period, the installation of phones was associated with 7.3 additional suicides per year (p<0.000) compared with the control period 0r 1954-1998.</p> <p><i>2 years pre and post phones (x=2)</i> – Suicides declined by 5.0 per year, but the decline was not statistically significant.</p> <p><i>7 years pre and post phones (x=7)</i> – The experimental period did not differ from the control period but the direction was positive with 1.71 more suicides per year in the former.</p> <p><i>13 years pre and post phones (x=13)</i> - 4.46 additional suicides per year on average, over the period after installation compared with the control period.</p> <p><i>Control for suicide rates in Florida</i> – The coefficient was negative, the suicide rates in Florida declined over time despite the rates increasing at the Bridge (no evidence that this was related).</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author Generalisability limited due to the Skyway Bridge having no pedestrian walkways – pedestrian bridges are thought to promote additional opportunities for suicides. The impact of crisis phones may be different on pedestrian bridges to the extent that jumpers spend more time on the bridge and are more likely to notice the phones. Any changes in suicide rates from the bridge may be a reflection of larger social forces affecting suicide throughout the state, such as the great recession. Study is based on just one location</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Comparison of the rates of suicide in the overall Florida region - not specific to a particular site or method of suicide</p>			

E.1.19 Ueda (2015)

Ueda M, Sawada Y, Matsubayashi T (2015) The effectiveness of installing physical barriers for preventing railway suicides and accidents: Evidence from Japan Journal of affective disorders 178 1-4																																																																																	
Study details	Research Parameters	Population / Intervention	Results																																																																														
<p>Author/year Ueda et al 2015</p> <p>Quality score +</p> <p>Study type Aim of the study To examine whether the installation of half-height PSD's has contributed to the reduction of the incidents of fatal and non-fatal railway suicide. The study also tests whether the installation of PSDs has resulted in the reduction of unintentional falls onto railway tracks (not reported here).</p> <p>Location and setting Tokyo metropolitan area</p> <p>Length of study Suicide and accident data between 2004 and 2014 provided by one major railway company</p> <p>Source of funding Supported by Japan Society of Science</p>	<p>Number of stations included in analysis 168</p> <p>Participant characteristics and number Not applicable</p> <p>Characteristics of PSD's at stations At the beginning of the study period in April 2004, 19/168 stations had PSDs installed. 52 stations were subsequently fitted with half height PSDs at different timings. By March 2014, 71 stations (42.76% of 168) had PSD's. Among them, 73.24% had half-height PSDs and the rest had full height PSD's.</p> <p>The height of half height PSDs is 1.3m which is not impossible for an adult to climb over. They are not fitted with alarm systems.</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Both fatal and non-fatal incidents of suicide. Incidents of suicide were determined as such only when the motives for entering train tracks became evident based on</p>	<p>Intervention / Comparison</p> <p>Intervention: The number of suicides throughout the installation of half and full heights PSD's at stations with them fitted</p> <p>Comparison: The number of suicides throughout the installation of half and full heights PSD's at stations without them fitted</p>	<p>Primary outcomes <i>Number of suicides</i></p> <p>The average number of suicides per station-month was 0.007 (SD= 0.084).The minimum number was 0, while the maximum was 1. The station with the largest number of suicides had a total of 7 suicides during the study period. The total number of suicides during the 10 year study period was 144</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">Stations without PSDs</th> <th colspan="2">Stations with PSDs</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>N (station-months)</th> <th>Suicides</th> <th>N (station-months)</th> <th>Suicides</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2004</td><td>1758</td><td>19</td><td>258</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2005</td><td>1752</td><td>14</td><td>264</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2006</td><td>1675</td><td>13</td><td>341</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2007</td><td>1504</td><td>22</td><td>512</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2008</td><td>1441</td><td>14</td><td>575</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>2009</td><td>1440</td><td>13</td><td>576</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2010</td><td>1411</td><td>14</td><td>605</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2011</td><td>1320</td><td>13</td><td>696</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>2012</td><td>1241</td><td>6</td><td>775</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>2013</td><td>1201</td><td>9</td><td>815</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Total</td><td>-</td><td>137</td><td>-</td><td>7</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Poisson Regression results</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Co ef</th> <th>95% CI</th> <th>P-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Effect of PSD on suicides</td> <td>-1.427</td> <td>-2.458,-0.397</td> <td>0.007</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N</td> <td>20,160</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Stations without PSDs		Stations with PSDs		Year	N (station-months)	Suicides	N (station-months)	Suicides	2004	1758	19	258	0	2005	1752	14	264	0	2006	1675	13	341	0	2007	1504	22	512	1	2008	1441	14	575	2	2009	1440	13	576	1	2010	1411	14	605	1	2011	1320	13	696	1	2012	1241	6	775	0	2013	1201	9	815	1	Total	-	137	-	7		Co ef	95% CI	P-value	Effect of PSD on suicides	-1.427	-2.458,-0.397	0.007	N	20,160		
	Stations without PSDs		Stations with PSDs																																																																														
Year	N (station-months)	Suicides	N (station-months)	Suicides																																																																													
2004	1758	19	258	0																																																																													
2005	1752	14	264	0																																																																													
2006	1675	13	341	0																																																																													
2007	1504	22	512	1																																																																													
2008	1441	14	575	2																																																																													
2009	1440	13	576	1																																																																													
2010	1411	14	605	1																																																																													
2011	1320	13	696	1																																																																													
2012	1241	6	775	0																																																																													
2013	1201	9	815	1																																																																													
Total	-	137	-	7																																																																													
	Co ef	95% CI	P-value																																																																														
Effect of PSD on suicides	-1.427	-2.458,-0.397	0.007																																																																														
N	20,160																																																																																

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

<p>Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research, the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare of Japan Grant, the Itochube Foundation and the Sumitomo Life Insurance Research Grant for Female Researchers.</p>	<p>the investigation by the police or by victims own account.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria All stations of the network from the railway company, except for ones on the newest line which started in 2008 (8.7% of all stations) were included in the analysis. These stations were excluded because their suicide records were available only for a subset of years – only 1 suicide occurred between 2008 and 2013 at these stations.</p> <p>Data collection The railway company maintains a database that records all incidents and suicides (both fatal and non-fatal) that occurred on its railway system. Data on suicides covers the period of April 2004-March 2014.</p> <p>Monthly data was used for analysis, and the unit of observation was the station-month. The total number of station-month observations totalled 20,160 (=168 stations x 120 months)</p>		<p>The regression coefficient was estimated to be negative, indicating that the number of suicides became lower after installation of PSD's. To interpret the substantive effect of the PSD's the incidence Rate Ratio (IRR) was computed at 0.240 with a 95% confidence interval 0.086-0.673. This suggested that the introduction of PSD's resulted in a decrease in the number of fatal and non-fatal suicides by 76% (CI 33-93%).</p> <p>Author Conclusions</p> <p>Installing PSD's can be an effective method of suicide prevention. The installation of PSD's contributed to a large reduction of suicide attempts at railway stations; however it was also found that half-height doors cannot completely block intentional area and can be climbed over.</p>
<p>Limitations identified by author Data from only one railway company, thus the generalisability of results may be limited. Potential substitution effects are not examined – possible that the locations of suicides were shifted to stations in other networks without PSDs</p> <p>Limitations identified by review team Although the majority of stations had half-height PSDs fitted there is no clear indication of whether the suicides after the installations were at stations fitted with half-height or full height PSDs- therefore the effectiveness of each of these barriers cannot be adequately compared. Study reports both fatal and non-fatal suicides together</p>			

No clear and before and after design – at the start of the study (2004) some stations already had PSD's fitted which gradually increased over time.

Appendix F: GRADE tables

F.1 Physical barriers

Quality assessment							Number of suicides		Effect		Committee confidence
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Pre intervention (per year)	Post intervention (per year)	IRR (95% CI)	Difference in number of suicides per year	
All physical barriers											
Suicides at sites where physical barriers installed											
11 studies ^b	Before-after	No serious ¹	No serious ²	No serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	1001 over 317 study-years (3.16 per year)	116 over 161 study-years (0.72 per year)	0.2 (0.15 to 0.38)	2.4 fewer per year	HIGH
Subgroup – Suicides at jump sites with physical barriers (such as bridges, cliffs, viaducts) only											
8 studies ^c	Before-after	No serious ¹	No serious ⁵	No serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	669 over 238.7 study-years (2.80 per year)	98.0 over 108 study-years (0.91 per year)	0.26 (0.14 to 0.48)	1.9 fewer per year	HIGH
Subgroup – Suicides at sites with safety net only											
2 (Reisch and Michel 2005; Hemmer et al 2017)	Before-after	Serious ⁶	No serious	No serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	63 over 58 study-years (1.1 per year)	8 suicide over 33 study-years	0.21 (0.10 to 0.46)	1.0 fewer per year	MODERATE

^b 12 studies as following: Beautrais 2009; Bennewith 2007/2011; Chung 2016;; Hemmer et al 2017; Law et al 2014; Lockeley et al 2014;; Pelletier 2007; Perron et al 2013; Reisch and Michel 2005; Sinyor and Levitt 2017; Ueda 2015.

^c 7 studies as following: Beautrais 2009; Bennewith 2007/2011; Hemmer et al 2017; Law et al 2014; Lockeley et al 2014; Pelletier 2007; Perron et al 2013; Sinyor and Levitt 2017.

								(0.23 per year)			
Subgroup – Suicides at sites with platform screen doors (railway or subway stations) only											
2 (Chung et al 2016; Ueda et al 2015)	Before-after	Serious ⁸	No serious	No serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	269 over 20 study-years (13.5 per year)	10 over 20 study-years (0.5 per year)	0.19 (0.09 to 0.37)	13.0 fewer per year	MODERATE
Displacement to other sites with no physical barriers in place											
7 studies ^d	Before-after	No serious ¹	No serious ²	No serious ³	Serious ⁷	none	216.1 over 58.5 study-years (3.69 per year)	284.5 over 45 study-years (6.32 per year)	1.46 (0.84 to 2.54)	1.1 more per year	MODERATE
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns over pre and post intervention periods varied across studies, missing or in-completing study data but had little effect on pooled estimated effect. 2. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates some variability but heterogeneity could due to different types of interventions included in the subgroups. 3. Interventions, population and outcomes are in line with review protocol. 4. 95% CI of estimated effect not crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference. 5. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates some variability but the direction of all estimated effect was the same - favouring post-intervention, only 2 studies had 95%CI of estimated effect crossing 1 accounting for 21.6% of weight. 6. Observation period was sensitive to fluctuations (Reisch and Michel 2005); concerns over the completing data collection (Hemmer et al 2017) 7. 95% CI of estimated effect crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference. 8. Selection bias (data from one subway or train operator and did no include suicide cases at station run by other subway or railway operators) 											

F.2 Restriction on road access (due to road maintenance or outbreak of foot & mouth disease)

Quality assessment							No of suicides		Effect		Committee confidence
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Pre intervention (per year)	Post intervention (per year)	IRR (95% CI)	Difference in number of suicides per year (range)	

^d 7 studies as following: Beutrais 2009; Bennewith 2007/2011; Law et al 2014;; Pelletier 2007; Perron et al 2013; Reisch and Michel 2005; Sinyor and Levitt 2017)
[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

Suicides											
2 (Issa and Bennett 2005; Skegg and Herbison 2009)	Naturalistic studies	Serious ¹	No serious ²	No serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	234 over 24 study-years (9.75)	0	0.12 (0.02 to 0.87)	9.75 fewer per year (14.5 fewer to 1.1 fewer)	MODERATE
1. Concerns over accuracy of reporting and suicide cases. 2. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates little variability. 3. Intervention, targeted population and outcomes are in line with review protocol 4. 95% CI of estimated effect not crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference.											

F.3 Blue lighting at train stations

Quality assessment							No of suicides		Effect		Committee confidence
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	before blue lighting installed	after blue lighting installed	IRR (95% CI)	Difference in number of suicides per year	
Suicides											
1 (Matsubayashi et al 2013)	Before-after	Serious ¹	NA	No serious ²	No serious ³	none	112 over 11 study-years (10.2 per year)	16 over 11 study-years (1.5 per year)	0.14 (0.08 to 0.24)	8.7 fewer	MODERATE
Number of suicide attempts											
1 (Ichikawa et al 2014)	Before-after	Serious ¹	NA	No serious ²	No serious ³	none	79 over 7 study-years (11.3)	53 over 3 study-years (17.7)	1.55	6.4 more	MODERATE

[Suicide prevention]: evidence reviews for change or reduce access to means DRAFT [(February 2018)]

									(1.11 to 2.22)		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selection bias (concerns over study selection (both studies had data from one railway or subway company) and no. of suicides recorded at the ends of platforms. 2. Intervention, targeted population and outcomes are in line with review protocol. 3. 95% CI of estimated effect not crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference. 											

F.4 Encouraging help-seeking: crisis telephones or signpost at sites

Quality assessment							No of suicides		Effect		Committee confidence
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Pre intervention (per year)	Post intervention (per year)	IRR (95%CI)	Difference in number of suicides per year	
Suicides											
4 ^e	Before-after	Serious ¹	Serious ²	No serious ³	Serious ⁴	none	199 over 36.6 study-years (5.44 per year)	146 over 21.4 study-years (6.82 per year)	0.91 (0.43 to 1.93)	1.39 ⁵ more per year	VERY LOW
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns over accuracy of data collection in three studies (King and Frost 2005; Stack 2015) which together account for more than 50% of weighted in the meta-analysis) 2. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates high variability (the direction of the estimated effect of Stack 2015 was opposite to the rest of studies; 95%CIs of estimated effected in Lester 2005 and Lockley 2014 were cross 1) 3. Interventions, targeted population and outcomes are in line with review protocol. 4. 95% CI of estimated effect crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference. 5. Absolute difference between before and after the intervention, and heterogeneity is not taken into account. 											

^e 4 studies as following: King and Frost 2005;Lester 2005; Lockley 2014;Stack 2015;


F.5 Surveillance

Quality assessment							No of suicides		Effect		Committee confidence
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Pre intervention (per year)	Post intervention (per year)	IRR (95%CI)	Difference in number of suicides per year	
Suicides at sites											
3 ^f	Before-after	Serious ¹	Serious ²	Serious ³	No serious ⁴	none	145 over 18.6 study-years (7.79 per year)	55 over 10.4 study-years (5.29 per year)	0.68 (0.50 to 0.94)	2.50 fewer per year	LOW
Suicides at nearby sites											
1 (Bennewith 2007/2011;)	Before-after	Serious ¹	NA	No serious ³	Serious ⁶	none	31 over 5.0 study-years (6.2 per year)	42 over 5.0 study-years (8.4 per year)	136 (0.85 to 2.16)	2.2 more per year	LOW
<p>1. Missing or incompleteness of data (Bennewith et al 2007/2011) study intervention took varying time to complete and took effect at different time (Lockley et al 2014)</p> <p>2. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates some variability (95%CI of estimated effect in Lester 2005 and Lockley 2014 were cross 1)</p> <p>3. Interventions, targeted population and outcomes are in line with review protocol.</p> <p>4. 95% CI of estimated effect not crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference.</p> <p>5. Visual interpretation of forest plot indicates little variability.</p> <p>6. 95% CI of estimated effect crossing line of no effect which the committee agreed should be the minimal important difference.</p>											


^f 4 studies as following: Lester 2005; Bennewith, Lester 2007/2001; Lockley et al 2014

Appendix G: Forest plot


G.1 Physical barrier



G.2 Restriction on road access



G.3 Encouraging help-seeking



G.4 Surveillance

