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Editor’s Note: The Expert Clinical Management series consists of shorter, practical review articles focused on the optimal approach to a specific sign, symptom, disease, procedure, technology, or other emergency department (ED) challenge. These articles—typically solicited from recognized experts in the subject area—will summarize the best available evidence relating to the topic while including practical recommendations where the evidence is incomplete or conflicting.

INTRODUCTION
Caring for ED patients with suicidal thoughts and behaviors is challenging, given time pressures, boarding of patients waiting for psychiatric beds, and the inherent difficulty in predicting imminent self-harm. However, providers—like patients—should not lose hope: most suicidal crises are short-lived and repeated attempts are not inevitable.1 Not every ED patient with suicidal thoughts needs inpatient admission or even a mental health consultation, and ED providers should take pride in their skills in caring for this at-risk population.

IDENTIFICATION OF SUICIDAL PATIENTS
Approximately 8% of all adult ED patients, regardless of chief complaint, have had recent suicidal ideation or behaviors,2,3 but many will not disclose unless asked. The Joint Commission requires suicide screening and assessment for patients with primary emotional or behavioral disorders or presenting symptoms.4 This mandate could be fulfilled with targeted screening (eg, all patients with mental health complaints) or universal screening (all ED patients). As in the case of screening for any condition, a program not designed to fit an ED’s flow and culture may not perform, and there will be some patients who do not answer questions honestly. Early data suggest screening does identify people with otherwise hidden suicidal ideation5 without negatively affecting ED flow,6 and cost-effectiveness analyses are in progress. In this article, we focus on management of suicidal ED patients, regardless of how they are identified.

GENERAL APPROACH
Suicidal patients are in acute emotional pain and, like patients in physical pain, deserve care that is empathetic and patient centered. Small efforts, such as explaining what to expect and providing basic comforts7,8 can improve the patient’s experience. ED providers may be skeptical about the preventability of suicide or may harbor biases against patients with mental illness,9 so providers should strive to overcome their own areas of discomfort. Establishing rapport through a sympathetic but direct approach can enhance communication with the patient and thereby the quality of the assessment. Asking a patient about suicidal thoughts or plans does not incite or encourage suicidal behavior,10 and providers should ask specific questions about the nature and content of suicidal thoughts, as described below in greater detail.

Information from appropriate collateral sources is particularly important for suicidal patients; relevant sources include out-of-hospital or police personnel, the patient’s family or friends, or outpatient health care providers.10,11 Asking the patient for permission enhances rapport, but an ED provider can make these contacts without consent when necessary to protect the individual or the public from an imminent and serious safety threat.12

SAFETY PRECAUTIONS
Patients being evaluated for suicidal thoughts or behaviors should not be allowed to leave the ED until the evaluation is complete13 and should be protected from self-harm while in the ED.14,15 Typically, this includes placing the patient in a private room without access to potentially dangerous objects (eg, belts, shoelaces, sharp medical instruments).14 Mechanical or chemical restraints can be traumatic to the patient and impair rapport, so
ED providers should first try to verbally calm agitated patients (for example, by having extra personnel step out of sight and by engaging in collaborative, respectful conversation). Providers should advocate for a written ED policy concerning care of suicidal patients to clarify pathways and support provider actions, including use of constant observation, personal searches by security staff, or restraints.16

FOCUSED MEDICAL ASSESSMENT
A focused medical assessment—a term experts prefer over “medical clearance,”17 which implies absence of medical issues—aims to identify medical issues requiring emergency or urgent treatment. A focused medical assessment relies primarily on the history and physical examination, including evaluation of the patient’s cognitive and emotional status and identification of drug ingestion, trauma, or other medical conditions that may affect the patient’s mental state. Routine diagnostic testing, including nontargeted laboratory or radiographic studies, has not demonstrated clinical benefit18-21 and is not recommended.17 However, mental health consultants often will request tests such as toxicologic screens.

SUICIDE RISK ASSESSMENT
There are many risk factors for suicide; some are fixed and some fluctuate, and their strength and interaction vary among and within individuals. An ED suicide risk assessment aims to determine appropriate treatment, including options across the spectrum from discharge with outpatient services to involuntary psychiatric hospitalization. Ultimately, risk assessment remains an inexact science, and the process should incorporate an individual’s personal history, current mental state, home environment, and specific suicidal thoughts or behaviors.

A small subset of patients with suicidal thoughts or behaviors can be managed by the ED provider and discharged home without a mental health consultation.8 Analogous to the use of decision rule-out algorithms for patients with chest pain, the emergency provider should ask initial questions to triage patients and then consult a specialist when indicated. Emergency physicians pride themselves in risk-stratifying patients for myriad physical conditions without consulting specialists for every patient potentially at risk. Similarly, we suggest emergency physicians take ownership (and pride) in identifying which suicidal patients do not require an emergency mental health consultation. These lowest-risk patients are those with no suicide plan or intent, no previous suicide attempt, no history of significant mental illness or substance abuse, and no agitation or irritability (Figure 1). These patients are often already identifiable to experienced clinicians; as an example, a middle-aged woman with her first bout of depression and vague suicidal thoughts who says she has a strong support system and would not actually kill herself because of her religion. The new Suicide Prevention Resource Center ED Guide,8 developed with input from multidisciplinary experts and the major emergency medicine organizations, supports providers’ decision to forgo consultation in these low-risk cases. Specifically, the guide includes a 6-question decision support tool (Figure 1),8 which can be used to document medical decisionmaking justifying why a mental health consultation is or is not indicated. It may be especially useful in settings with universal screening, where there may be a larger volume of patients identified with low levels of suicidality.

The majority of suicidal ED patients, however, do need a comprehensive risk assessment to inform decisionmaking about treatment and disposition. For an adequate risk assessment, the patient should be cognitively able to participate; those intoxicated with alcohol or drugs should be observed and then have their cognitive capacity reassessed.8,17 To our knowledge, there are no data to support a particular blood alcohol level as the point required for a patient with normal vital signs and a noncontributory history and examination result can undergo a psychiatric evaluation.17 However, as with urine testing, toxicologic screens may help mental health consultants identify concomitant substance abuse problems, so the issue merits discussion and collaboration. Patients who express suicidal thoughts when intoxicated and then deny them when more sober pose a particular and frustrating challenge, especially because those with chronic alcohol or substance abuse may be frequent ED visitors. Both acute and chronic alcohol use raise the risk of suicide; more than a third of suicide decedents use alcohol before their death,22 and adults with a substance use disorder are more likely to have serious suicidal thoughts, plans, and attempts.23 Although the most conservative approach is to observe intoxicated patients until they are cognitively able to participate in a comprehensive suicide risk assessment, more work in this area is clearly needed.

Comprehensive assessments are typically conducted by mental health consultants (eg, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers), who generally have both more training and more time to spend with patients. Emergency physicians, however, retain final authority over and responsibility for discharge decisions. Consultations may be conducted either in person (by an on-site mental health
specialist or one who comes to the ED on request) or remotely by electronic communication ("telepsychiatry")\(^8\); decisions about consultations often depend on the ED environment and available resources. If a mental health consultant is not readily available, the ED provider can use the Suicide Assessment Five-Step Evaluation and Triage (SAFE-T) (Figure 2).\(^{24}\) This tool, available as a pocket-card and smartphone application,\(^{25}\) guides a provider through a stepwise evaluation of a patient’s risk and protective factors and the specifics of the suicidal thoughts or plans to

---

**Figure 1.** Framework for care and evaluation of suicidal patients in the ED, intended for use with adult ED patients who do not require medical hospitalization for concomitant acute or chronic medical problems. Patients who are intoxicated or otherwise lacking in decisionmaking ability should be treated, observed, and reevaluated as clinically indicated. *See Figure 2. Adapted from Capoccia and Labre, 2015.\(^8\)
estimate overall risk. Even when the ED provider is not completing the comprehensive assessment, the SAFE-T domains provide useful reminders about specific questions to ask patients.

ED-BASED INTERVENTIONS

Suicidal patients often have long ED lengths of stay while awaiting evaluation or psychiatric hospitalization. Brief ED interventions may be both therapeutic and helpful in preventing future self-harm, and they may be especially important for patients being discharged home. Recommended interventions focus on helping patients develop skills to recognize and cope with suicidal thoughts, including action plans for making their environment safer and for identifying sources of help. Although interventions may be most effective when implemented as a bundle, local practices should be tailored to both need and feasibility.8

Recommended interventions focus on helping patients develop skills to recognize and cope with suicidal thoughts, including action plans for making their environment safer and for identifying sources of help. Although interventions may be most effective when implemented as a bundle, local practices should be tailored to both need and feasibility.8

Figure 2. SAFE-T. Risk assessment modified slightly47–49 from original SAFE-T.24,25 CNS, Central nervous system; ECT, electroconvulsive therapy.

Templated materials and other resources exist for each of the example interventions discussed below (Table).8

Patient education and joint safety planning in the ED should include personalized plans with warning signs, follow-up, and emergency contacts.8,26,27 Safety planning is distinct from “contracting for safety,” which has not been shown to prevent suicide and is no longer recommended.27 Safety planning uses a step-by-step approach to help patients identify mechanisms for coping and help-seeking during crises. The plan can be completed on paper and then stored in a free smartphone application (eg, MY3, Suicide Safe). Discharged suicidal patients need rapid referral for outpatient follow-up care because the days just after discharge from an ED are a high-risk period. Making a specific appointment before the individual leaves the ED and enlisting help from family or friends may help ensure follow-up.28
Counseling to reduce home access to lethal means (eg, firearms, toxic medications) is an important aspect of ED care of suicidal patients. There is evidence that such counseling by providers can affect home storage behaviors and is acceptable to patients. The rationale behind means restriction is that suicidal acts are often impulsive and occur during short-lived crises, and that survival depends on the lethality of the chosen method. Guns have the highest suicide case-fatality rate (>90%), and numerous studies have shown both an association between gun access and suicide risk and that safe gun storage (ie, locked, unloaded, and separated from ammunition) can mitigate this risk. State “gag laws” do not prohibit physicians from asking suicidal patients about gun access. ED providers should counsel all suicidal patients and their families to store firearms off site (eg, at a gun shop, police department, other legal option) during a crisis; gun cabinets or locks at home may be a reasonable alternative as long as the patient does not have access.

DISPOSITION

For patients in acute crisis with moderate to high suicide risk, psychiatric hospitalization remains the typical disposition. In such cases, voluntary hospitalization is preferable when possible, in alignment with goals of collaborative, patient-centered care. When involuntary hospitalization (“emergency commitment”) is required, providers should adhere to their state laws because these vary in definitions, length of commitment, and other requirements.

Patients whose risk for imminent suicide is deemed acceptably low can often be managed as outpatients, depending on ED and outpatient resources. Such patients should be discharged to supportive, stable environments without access to guns or lethal medications. Caring contacts (Table), which are brief telephone, e-mail, or mail contacts after discharge, appear to decrease suicide attempts and deaths. All patients should be given the number for the National Suicide Prevention Hotline (1-800-273-TALK [8255]), a national, free telephone and online chat resource with crisis guidance, connection to local resources, and special services for veterans.

CONCLUSION

Through an empathetic, evidence-based, and collaborative approach to managing suicidal patients, ED providers can help prevent future injury and death. Focused medical assessment and suicide risk assessment can help providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table. ED-based brief suicide prevention interventions. *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief patient education</td>
<td>Goal: Instill hope of recovery, reduce shame and stigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include: Diagnosis, home care, follow-up instructions, warning signs for return to ED or call to crisis line Use teach-back techniques and provide written version with community resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety planning</td>
<td>Structured plan to identify coping strategies and contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal means counseling</td>
<td>Goal: Reduce patient access to lethal methods (eg, guns, toxic medications) Discuss options for safe storage with others or in home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid referral</td>
<td>Follow-up appointment within 7 days (ideally ≤24 h) Troubleshoot barriers (eg, transportation) to facilitate follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring contacts (after discharge)</td>
<td>Brief communications (letter, telephone, text, e-mail) to promote treatment adherence and feeling of connectedness May be automated or made by nonclinical staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Each of the above should also include crisis line information: 1-800-273-8255 and http://www.suicidepreventionlifeline.org/ (online chat available).
determine whether a mental health consultation is required and whether the patient needs hospitalization. Brief ED interventions—including counseling about reducing access to firearms and toxic medications—may be both feasible and effective, depending on the ED environment and resources. Suicide remains a leading cause of death in the United States, but ED providers have an opportunity to ease emotional pain and save lives.
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