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More than 140 000 people present to hospital after an episode of self harm each year in England and Wales.1 Improving the general hospital management of these people is a key area in preventing suicide.2 Although professional consensus has been reached on how self harm services should be organised and delivered,3 wide variations in care delivery have been reported in two regions in England.4 Using a nationally representative sample, we investigated the variation in services and delivery of care for self harm patients in hospitals in England.

Participants, methods, and results

We selected a stratified random sample of 32 hospitals, four from each former health region (table and see bmj.com). At each hospital we interviewed two to five key emergency and psychiatric staff about hospital service structures and made arrangements with them to start audits of the processes of care. We assessed each hospital on 21 recommended self harm service standards (see table A on bmj.com).5 In 2001-2 each hospital did a prospective eight week audit of their management of self harm (see bmj.com). Trust staff used emergency department, medical, and mental health records if audit data were incomplete.

A designated self harm or liaison service was available at 23 of the 32 hospitals. At 11 hospitals, more than half of the 21 recommended service structures were not in place (median score 12; range 7 to 20). The most commonly available aspects of service were guidelines for medical management (at 31 hospitals) and 24 hour access to specialist psychosocial assessments (at 30 hospitals) (see table A on bmj.com).

Guidelines for assessing the risk of suicide for use by staff in emergency departments were available at 17 hospitals. Only 14 hospitals had self harm service planning meetings with mental health services, emergency department, or medical staff. Routine contact with patients' general practitioners within 24 hours of discharge from emergency departments happened at only half of the hospitals. Service scale scores were weakly associated with hospital size (rank correlation 0.20; P = 0.28).

During the eight week audit, staff identified 4222 episodes of self harm. Hospitals varied widely in the proportion of attendances leading to a psychosocial assessment (median 55%; range 36% to 82%), hospital admission (42%; 22% to 83%), psychiatric admission (9.5%; 2.5% to 23.8%), and mental health follow up (10.5%; 10.5% to 56%; 0.91; 0.04; 0.01 to 0.14; P<0.01).

Comment

Variability in organisation and provision of services for patients with self harm was striking. There was twofold variation across hospitals in levels of psychosocial assessment, fourfold variation in the proportion of...
**Summary:** mean (range) 10.6 (7.5-15) 57.9% (36.4%-81.7%) 75.2% (0-100%) 52.4% (31.5%-82.9%) 11.4% (6.0%-23.8%) 55.5% (44.6%-82.3%) 86 (64-147)

Hospitals with no designated self harm or liaison service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital size (No of acute beds 2000-1 to nearest 100)</th>
<th>Service scale (maximum 21)</th>
<th>No (%) receiving psychosocial assessment‡</th>
<th>No (%) admitted to hospital bed**</th>
<th>No (%) admitted to a psychiatric bed**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49 (76.5)</td>
<td>42 (60.5)</td>
<td>39 (57.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34 (53.1)</td>
<td>28 (100)</td>
<td>45 (70.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32 (42.1)</td>
<td>18 (90.0)</td>
<td>35 (44.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52 (76.5)</td>
<td>44 (100)</td>
<td>22 (32.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>36 (49.3)‡‡</td>
<td>9 (33.3)‡‡</td>
<td>23 (31.5)‡‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56 (67.5)</td>
<td>40 (90.9)</td>
<td>58 (69.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>66 (55.8)</td>
<td>44 (91.7)</td>
<td>68 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>67 (71.1)</td>
<td>44 (91.7)</td>
<td>68 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52 (56.4)</td>
<td>70 (47.6)</td>
<td>11 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** mean (range) 10.6 (7.5-15) 57.9% (36.4%-81.7%) 75.2% (0-100%) 52.4% (31.5%-82.9%) 11.4% (6.0%-23.8%) 55.5% (44.6%-82.3%) 86 (64-147)

**Note:**
- **Data provided by the hospital from a recent in-house audit.**
- **Data not included as missing for >10% episodes.**
- **Data missing for 10/4033 (0.3%).**
- **Data missing for 70/4033 (1.7%).**
- **Data missing for 100/4033 (2.5%).**
- **Data for this hospital are for a six week period.**
- **Data missing for 8/1736 (0.5%); because of missing data, the data shown are for episodes where the patient was not admitted to a psychiatric bed.**
- **Data missing for 15/4033 (0.6%).**
- **From Department of Health Hospital Activity Statistics.**
- **Data missing for 26/4033 (0.6%).**
- **Information on missing data not available for 189 episodes where management data were provided by the hospital from a recent in-house audit.**
- **Data missing for 6/1736 (0.6%); because of missing data, the data shown are for episodes where the patient was not admitted to a psychiatric bed.**
- **Data missing for 10/4033 (0.3%).**
- **Data missing for 70/4033 (1.7%).**
- **Data missing for 100/4033 (2.5%).**
- **Data for this hospital are for a six week period.**
- **Data provided by the hospital from a recent in-house audit.**
- **Data not included as missing for >10% episodes.**

---

**Variation in management of self harm patients across 32 English hospitals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital size (No of acute beds 2000-1 to nearest 100)</th>
<th>Service scale (maximum 21)</th>
<th>No (%) receiving psychosocial assessment‡</th>
<th>No (%) admitted to hospital bed**</th>
<th>No (%) admitted to a psychiatric bed**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>174 (70.7)</td>
<td>0 (0.6)</td>
<td>149 (60.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91 (57.6)</td>
<td>77 (48.7)</td>
<td>11 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66 (62.9)</td>
<td>21 (33.9)</td>
<td>58 (55.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>130 (48.5)</td>
<td>36 (34.6)</td>
<td>116 (43.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>37 (44.1)</td>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
<td>35 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>80 (65.2)</td>
<td>12 (34.5)</td>
<td>62 (42.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>83 (60.6)</td>
<td>28 (38.9)</td>
<td>53 (38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>118 (86.8)</td>
<td>3 (2.8)</td>
<td>120 (86.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40 (48.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42 (51.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>43 (36.4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>103 (50.2)</td>
<td>22 (23.7)</td>
<td>49 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>124 (70.5)</td>
<td>34 (34.3)</td>
<td>153 (83.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>39 (38.2)</td>
<td>8 (38.4)</td>
<td>35 (34.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>46 (35.7)</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
<td>52 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>104 (55.0)§§</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>59 (31.2)§§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>97 (71.9)</td>
<td>11 (14.5)</td>
<td>40 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32 (41.0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 (21.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>115 (71.9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58 (55.8)</td>
<td>13 (31.0)</td>
<td>26 (55.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>112 (44.8)</td>
<td>9 (11.1)</td>
<td>107 (42.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88 (85.2)</td>
<td>23 (32.4)</td>
<td>56 (41.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81 (54.7)</td>
<td>2 (3.0)</td>
<td>39 (26.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** mean (range) 10.6 (7.5-15) 57.9% (36.4%-81.7%) 75.2% (0-100%) 52.4% (31.5%-82.9%) 11.4% (6.0%-23.8%) 55.5% (44.6%-82.3%) 86 (64-147)

---
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