Article:
Owens, D, Wood, C, Greenwood, DC et al. (2 more authors) (2005) Mortality and suicide after non-fatal self-poisoning: 16-year outcome study. British Journal of Psychiatry, 187 (5). 470 - 475. ISSN 0007-1250

https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.187.5.470

Mortality and suicide after non-fatal self-poisoning: a 16-year outcome study of patients attending accident and emergency

David Owens, Christopher Wood, Darren C Greenwood, Tom Hughes, Michael Dennis

David Owens MD* Senior Lecturer, Academic Unit of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, University of Leeds
Christopher Wood MSc Research Assistant, Academic Unit of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, University of Leeds
Darren C Greenwood MSc Lecturer in Medical Statistics, Biostatistics Unit, School of Medicine, University of Leeds
Tom Hughes MD Consultant Psychiatrist, Leeds Mental Health Teaching NHS Trust
Michael Dennis MD Senior Lecturer in Old Age Psychiatry, Department of Psychiatry, University of Leicester

Work undertaken in the Academic Unit of Psychiatry and Behavioural Sciences, School of Medicine, University of Leeds, 15 Hyde Terrace, Leeds LS2 9LT

* Corresponding author: d.w.owens@leeds.ac.uk

Preferred section of Journal
Papers

Source of funding
The study was funded through a grant from the UK National Health Service's Northern and Yorkshire Regional Research Capacity Committee

Word count
Approx 3500 words

Running title
Suicide after non-fatal self-poisoning

Structured summary

Background

Suicide reduction is government strategy in many countries. We need to quantify the connection between non-fatal self-poisoning and eventual suicide.

Aims

To determine mortality after an episode of self-poisoning, and to identify predictors of death by any cause or by suicide.

Method

A retrospective single–group cohort study was undertaken with 976 consecutive patients attending a large accident and emergency unit in 1985-86 after non-fatal self-poisoning. Information about deaths was determined by the national statistics office.

Results

94% of the original patients were traced 16 years later. 17% had died, 3.5% by probable suicide. Subsequent suicide was related to numerous factors evident at the time of the episode of self-poisoning but, when examined for their independent effects, only the severity of the self-poisoning episode and relevant previous history seemed important.

Conclusions

Patients attending general hospital after self-poisoning all require good basic assessment and care responsive to their needs. Attempts to reduce the huge excess of suicide subsequent to self-harm are not likely to achieve much if they are based on the identification of sub-groups through ‘risk assessment’.

Declaration of interest

None

Introduction

Suicide reduction has recently become the aim of governmental strategies: for example, in England (Department of Health, 1983, 2002) the USA (Vastag, 2001), Australasia and Nordic countries (Taylor *et al*, 1997), and globally through a campaign of the World Health Organisation (WHO website, 2004). The main suggested targets for intervention have been people with undetected depression and patients recently or currently in psychiatric care – usually with so-called severe mental illness. Less attention has been paid to those who are known to hospital services because of non-fatal self-harm, although recent primary research (Jenkins *et al*, 2002; Hawton *et al*, 2003) and systematic review (Owens *et al*, 2002) have confirmed that their rate of subsequent suicide is far higher than expected. Unfortunately much research on suicide after non-fatal self-harm is poor, based on small and highly selected samples, weak methods for detecting suicides during the follow-up, and flawed analysis (Owens *et al*, 2002). We therefore set out to determine long-term mortality and cause of death for around 1000 consecutive patients who attended one of the UK's largest accident and emergency departments because of self-poisoning during a brief period in the mid-1980s.

Methods

The study sample comprised all episodes of self-poisoning that had resulted in attendance at the accident and emergency department at Nottingham, UK, during nine months between November 1985 and July 1986 (Owens *et al*, 1991). Nottingham is a large city in the east midlands of England and its accident and emergency department is one of the busiest in the UK. The only exclusions from the sample were patients aged under 14 years and episodes where the self-poisoning was deemed accidental. Episodes were included if, at the person's arrival, accident and emergency clerical staff recorded the reason for attending as 'overdose' or 'self-poisoning'. At that stage they attached a research data-sheet to the clinical record. The researchers (DO & MD) examined accident and emergency records every week to ensure inclusion of episodes not identified at arrival but subsequently diagnosed as self-poisoning by accident and emergency medical staff. The original study compared the characteristics and short-term outcome of patients admitted briefly to the general hospital with those of patients who returned home directly from accident and emergency (Owens *et al*, 1991).

For the present investigation, each person's first attendance during the study period was used as the index episode. We provided the Office for National Statistics with identifying data on each person in the sample and they determined, until the end of 2002, whether each person was alive or had died during the follow-up period of 16-17 years. The Office for

National Statistics sent us lists of those who could not be traced and of those who had died. In the case of deceased patients the Office for National Statistics sent us a draft of the death certificate, including ICD-10 coding; we did not have access to coroners' notes concerning the deaths. Data from death certificates were also obtained for deaths in England and Wales, and Scotland.

In the original study, medical staff in the accident and emergency unit had completed checklists about the patients while they were in the emergency room. Checklists asked about potential risk factors for seriousness of the index episode as a suicide attempt and for adverse outcome, with items such as past self-harm, psychiatric history, living arrangements, and social and medical status. We were able to collect fairly complete data about variables that could routinely be extracted from the accident and emergency case records such as age and sex, substances ingested, and whether poisoning was accompanied by cutting. In the case of alcohol consumption around the time of the self-poisoning, we always made a judgement that it had not taken place unless it was specifically stated in the record that the person gave an account of taking alcohol, or a smell of alcohol was mentioned, or a breath test or blood test was positive for alcohol. Unfortunately, the checklists were not always complete; for the many risk factors enquired about, the median valid sample size was 71% of the total sample (Owens *et al*, 1991). In view of the absent data, only some of these potential risk factors are examined in the findings of the present study; where they are analysed, valid sample size is shown. In the case of rating the level of consciousness, we

have complete data because we always judged that the person was fully conscious unless the checklist or the case record said otherwise.

Data were analysed using SPSS version 10.1 and Stata version 8.2. Cox's proportional hazards regression was used to model survival to death either by suicide or all-causes. When, in certain analyses, Cox regression proved impossible – due to insufficient outcome events for the model – logistic regression was used. Ethical approval for the investigation was received from the Nottingham Research Ethics Committee.

Results

Index episodes

We identified 1091 episodes, 40% (441/1091) by males. In 22 episodes (2%) self-poisoning was accompanied by self-cutting. In 39% (423/1091) of episodes alcohol consumption was reported by the patient or detected by staff. In 539 episodes (50%) patients ingested analgesics (mainly paracetamol); in 364 episodes (34%) minor tranquillizers; in 127 (12%) antidepressants; in 75 (7%) other psychotropic drugs; in 14 (1.3%) non-ingestible substances; and in 230 episodes (21%) other miscellaneous drugs. In 32% (346/1091) of episodes the person had taken more than one drug. In 581/1091 (53%) episodes, the patient's state of consciousness was recorded on our checklists or in accident and emergency records as alert, in 303 (28%) mildly drowsy, in 150 (14%) very drowsy, and in 57 (5%) cases as unconscious. Admission to hospital took place in 69% (755/1091) of episodes (2% to the psychiatric unit, 67% to general wards).

The sample consisted of 976 people because 115/1091 episodes were repeats. Over the 365 days from their index attendance 119/976 people repeated (12.2%). At least 273/976 (28%) patients had undertaken a previous episode, and at least 268/976 (28%) had seen a psychiatrist in the past.

Mortality

The Office for National Statistics traced 912 of the 976 people (94%). Those not traced were closely similar to those traced, in terms of age and sex. By the end of 2002, at least 157/912 (17%) people had died (Table 1). The category of probable suicide incorporates deaths designated by coroners as suicides or open verdicts; in addition, all the deaths in our category of 'probable suicide' were coded by the Office for National Statistics as X60-X84 (intentional self-harm) or Y10-Y34 (event of undetermined intent). From this point forward, the term 'suicides' will be used for this broader group. Table 2 sets out the timing of deaths. Suicides took, on average, half as long to occur as did other deaths. Median time to death for the 32 suicides was 4.1 years (interquartile range 1.5 to 8.3) while the median was 8.3 years (3.5 to 12.6) for the 125 deaths that were not suicides (difference in medians 4.3 years, bootstrapped 95% CI 1.6 to 6.9).

Table 1 and Table 2 about here

Characteristics of those who died in the follow-up period

Table 3 sets out mortality according to a variety of patient characteristics. As expected, proportionately more males than females had died regardless of cause (hazard ratio 1.4, 95% CI 1.0 to 1.9); for suicides rather than all deaths, the hazard ratio (3.0, 95% CI 1.4 to 6.2) was much higher. Age at index episode was associated with death by any cause, and with suicide (see Table 3).

Table 3 about here

Substances ingested in the self-poisoning episode were related to long-term outcome: if either tranquillizers or antidepressants were taken, all-cause and suicide mortalities were higher than expected. The number of separate drugs taken in the index episode did not seem to affect outcome. Impairment of consciousness at the non-fatal episode was, however, progressively related to subsequent death from any cause and from suicide. The 20 patients who cut as well as poisoned themselves at the index episode showed a marked excess of suicides. Alcohol consumption at the time of non-fatal self-harm showed no important relation with mortality.

Self-poisoning leads to a diurnal consultation pattern in which there is disproportionate attendance during the evening and early hours of the night. We found that those who attended during the eight hours that might represent the normal working day (8am to 4pm) were those more likely to die during follow-up – whether by any cause or by suicide.

Basic decisions about the clinical management of the index episode, categorised into three groups, showed a relation to eventual mortality. Compared with patients admitted to hospital (mainly to general medical or short-stay wards, a few to psychiatric units), those who were assessed by a psychiatrist in the accident and emergency department before discharge home showed the highest suicide rate, while those who were either discharged by accident and emergency staff or took their own decision to leave the unit had the lowest overall mortality.

During 16-17 years of follow-up, more of those who had repeated non-fatal self-harm within a year of the index episode had died than had those who had not repeated. Non-fatal repetition was however more firmly related to deaths regardless of cause than to death by suicide; in the case of suicides, the confidence interval for the hazard ratio is wide (Table 3).

Our checklists asked accident and emergency staff to collect information about a number of personal characteristics but the data were incomplete, with the deficits confounded by time of day and by patients' consciousness (Owens *et al*, 1991). Analysis of mortality according to a history of self-harm, psychiatric history, living alone, marital status, and the making of threats or leaving notes suffer from this shortfall in data – rendering uncertain the meaning of our findings. We are not reporting results for the other incompletely collected variables because either there was no unexpected relation with mortality or no clear relation with subsequent suicide: for recent physical illness, employment, contact with

general practitioner, and refusal of any care offered in accident and emergency.

The patient's report of past self-harm (whether or not it had resulted in attendance at hospital) was associated with all-cause mortality but not definitely with suicide, although data were missing on 28% of cases. Relations with all-cause mortality and with suicide were, however, found for past psychiatric contact (whether reported on the checklist, in the accident and emergency record, or found on the Nottingham psychiatric case register), and for whether or not patients were living alone at the time of the index self-harm.

Interplay of risk factors

Cox's proportional hazards regression models were used to determine which factors independently affected survival.

Death from any cause

Our model for survival to death from all causes included all the variables set out in Table 3, entered simultaneously. But, despite many relations between single variables and survival, only three variables showed a clear effect when the factors are considered together: increasing age (hazard ratio 1.07 per year, 95% confidence interval 1.06 to 1.08), male sex (1.9, 1.3 to 2.6) and whether the person had cut himself or herself as well as self-poisoned (4.2, 1.8 to 10.0).

Suicide

There were too few suicides for robust modelling of all the variables included in Table 3. For suicide, only four variables could be included simultaneously in our survival analysis model: age, male sex, use of tranquillizers or antidepressants, and impairment of consciousness. Of these, only age (hazard ratio 1.02 per year, 95% confidence interval 1.0 to 1.04) and male sex (2.9, 1.4 to 6.1) showed an independent relation to suicide.

Secondary regression analysis of suicide data

Disappointed by the few variables that the model could incorporate, we reanalysed these data using logistic regression – a less satisfactory technique in this project because it ignores the differences between patients' length of follow-up. In this more speculative regression model, however, we were able to include all the variables in Table 3: impairment of consciousness (P-value for linear trend over categories = 0.007), previous self-harm (odds ratio 0.3, 95% confidence interval 0.08 to 0.9), psychiatric history (3.9, 1.2 to 13.1), being admitted during the daytime (4.1, 1.2 to 14.3), and discharge directly from accident and emergency after psychiatric assessment (4.6, 1.1 to 19.0) were the only factors to play a clearly independent role.

Discussion

Methodological considerations

The present study has three clear strengths. First, it is based on a consecutive sample of patients who attended hospital over a very short period of time and is not, as are many studies of self-harm, restricted to patients seen by mental health services or admitted to wards in the general hospital. Population rates of self-poisoning in Nottingham, based on these data, were higher than those reported elsewhere at the index time (Dennis *et al*, 1990), so we consider the sample highly representative of people attending UK hospitals due to self-poisoning. Second, we were able to trace a high proportion of the sample, with only 6% untraced. Third, we have used survival analyses that take account of variable duration of follow-up.

Our large sample allows reasonably precise estimates of incidence of suicide, but there are few suicides for the analysis of patients' characteristics, particularly in the mathematical models. We were limited also by the lack of data that were recorded consistently in accident and emergency records and research checklists that were filled in by accident and emergency staff at all hours of the day and night; however, no epidemiologically sound research on self-harm has been able to overcome this disadvantage of 24-hour sampling in emergency units.

High mortality rates after self-harm

Our sample, from a large industrial city, was collected in just 9 months and followed up for a highly uniform time: all for between 16 and 17

years. When our findings are compared with those analysed recently in a study in Oxford, UK the similarities are striking despite great differences in the timing of sampling and follow-up. The huge sample of more than 11,000 patients from the socially more affluent Oxford were assembled over a 20-year period between 1978 and 1997 and traced for between 3 and 22 years. They found 3.0% incidence of suicide at 15 years after self-harm (Hawton *et al*, 2003), compared with our 3.5% at 16 years. Using age-standardisation, they estimated that suicides were 66 times more likely in the first year after self-harm than in the general population of England and Wales. In the Oxford study 10% of the sample undertook self-injury but not self-poisoning; it is unlikely that this sampling discrepancy greatly distorts the comparability of the two studies. The present work and other findings (Jenkins *et al*, 2002; Hawton *et al*, 2003) point to the persistence of a very high rate of suicide over many subsequent years; non-fatal self-harm is plainly a sign of long-term needs. Mortality from causes other than suicide is also many times higher than the expected rate.

Possible underestimation of subsequent suicide

Despite the comments in the preceding paragraph, there are at least two reasons why our findings may fall short of a completely accurate representation of mortality due to suicide after non-fatal self-harm. First, suicide may be more likely following self-injury than after self-poisoning. This relationship seems, however, to be complex: non-fatal episodes involving violent methods of injury (such as hanging or jumping) may be

linked with high intent and have a high subsequent suicide rate but, on the other hand, episodes that involve self-cutting may be associated with lower intent and lower suicide rate (Harriss *et al*, 2005). It is not obvious, therefore, whether the inclusion of self-injury episodes would have led us to a slightly higher or slightly lower estimate of suicide following self-harm.

Second, some verdicts of accident or misadventure may have been suicides. We did not gain access to coroners' records of deaths but studies where such records are scrutinised have found that misclassification can be detected and that suicide can sometimes be imputed (Foster *et al*, 1997). For example, verdicts of accident and misadventure in our sample included several deaths from road traffic accidents, by drowning, and by drug overdose. A small number of these or other deaths may have been misclassified because we adhered to the operational definition of suicide or open verdicts.

Predicting suicide

We found that suicide after self-harm was associated with various clusters of factors. First, there are characteristics that precede the episode of self-harm: being older, being male, living alone, and reporting past psychiatric contact. Second, there are aspects of the act of self-harm: taking psychotropic drugs, or cutting as well as self-poisoning. Third, we found associations with the attendance at the emergency unit: attending in the daytime, and being drowsy or unconscious. Fourth, we found a less

certain association with later events: being discharged directly from the unit after psychiatric assessment, and with early non-fatal repetition of self-harm.

The first three of these clusters suggest grounds for a strategy of risk assessment and intervention targeted at high-risk groups, but closer scrutiny does not support such a proposal. The only factors evident at the time of assessment in accident and emergency that showed independent effect on suicide as the outcome were matters of previous history and severity of the current episode – the prognostic markers common to most medical assessments. Discharge after assessment by a psychiatrist, in particular, did not have an independent effect – presumably because the decision by staff in accident and emergency to seek an immediate psychiatric opinion reflects higher risk that was evident through other features of the person or episode.

Our findings are puzzling in relation to the clinical significance of a history of self-poisoning because previous studies have suggested that it is a risk factor (Hawton & Fagg, 1988; Zahl & Hawton, 2004). When no other variables were adjusted for, our results confirm this - that previous overdose seemed potentially to indicate a small (but not statistically significant) increase in risk of suicide (risk ratio 1.4, 95% confidence interval 0.6 to 3.1). Previous findings, however, have not been adjusted for other variables. After allowing for other factors in the logistic regression model, past self-poisoning emerged as a potentially protective factor (odds ratio 0.3), though the confidence interval was very wide

(0.08 to 0.9), indicating that a wide range of interpretations is possible. Moreover, previous self-poisoning is strongly related to having seen a psychiatrist and adjustment for this factor in the same model is likely to explain the discrepancy. Without adjustment for past psychiatric contact the odds ratio for a history of previous self-poisoning increases substantially and no longer appears to have a significant protective effect.

Taking the best predictor among all the variables that we analysed individually, the relative risk of subsequent suicide for any impairment of consciousness compared with being alert is 2.6 (from Table 3, combining the 3 levels of impairment). With an incidence of subsequent suicide at 16 years of 3.5%, the positive predictive value of this item is 2%. It seems clear that a 'high risk strategy' – attempting to identify those individuals who qualify for special attention – is a hopeless approach to the problem of suicide subsequent to self-harm. The predictive values of the patient characteristics that point to higher than average risk are just too poor to be useful, even in groups of patients at high risk (Powell *et al*, 2000). Estimates of average risk for a group are not usually matched by any corresponding ability to predict which individuals are headed for the bad outcome (Rose, 1992).

These predictive values are derived from a relatively small study and may be imprecise because of sampling variability and incomplete collection of data by the accident and emergency staff. But even were the corrected predictive values rather higher, the practical consequences would be

likely to be similar to those set out here. Were the shorter term risk of suicide to be considered – instead of the long-term risk, as here – then the predictive values would be weaker still, because the incidence of suicide is much lower in the short term.

Aware that non-fatal self-harm is the best risk factor we have for the potential prevention of suicide, how then should health services react to self-harm episodes? The first answer lies in adopting a 'population strategy' rather than a 'high-risk strategy' (Rose, 1992): one that consistently offers good basic assessment and care responsive to the needs of all who attend hospital after self-harm. This prescription may seem bland but there is plenty to be done because, unfortunately, current practice in the assessment and care following self-harm is too often woefully poor (Hughes *et al*, 1998; Kapur *et al*, 1998; Head *et al*, 1999; Hickey *et al*, 2001; Slinn *et al*, 2001; Kapur *et al*, 2002; National Institute for Clinical Excellence, 2004). Second, we need large randomised trials of widely practicable interventions after self-harm (Geddes, 1999); as things stand we know little about what might be effective, because hardly any worthwhile research has been undertaken (NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 1998; Comptois, 2002). Governmental strategies for suicide prevention should emphasise 'risk assessment' less and the assessment of needs rather more.

Acknowledgements

The study was funded through a grant from The UK National Health Service's Northern and Yorkshire Regional Research Capacity Committee;

Christopher Wood's salary was paid by the grant. We are grateful to Penny Wakefield for collecting data and to the NHS Central Register, Office for National Statistics for their prompt and careful work.

Clinical implications

- The excess of suicides continues to climb over many years after non-fatal self-poisoning

- In self-poisoning, few characteristics of patients or episodes are useful predictors of subsequent suicide

- Improvement in services for assessment and care of all those attending after self-poisoning is the logical clinical response to our weak evidence about how to identify high risk and what intervention to choose

Limitations

- A small number of patients (6% of the total) could not be traced 16 years later

- There were too few probable suicides (32) to allow for the inclusion of many variables in the most suitable type of regression model

- Collection of data in the accident and emergency at all times of day and night restricted the depth and coverage of variables studied

References

Comptois KA (2002) A review of interventions to reduce the prevalence of parasuicide. *Psychiatric Services*, **53**, 1138-1144.

Dennis MS, Owens DW, Jones SJ (1990) Epidemiology of deliberate self-poisoning: trends in hospital attendances. *Health Trends*, **22**, 125-126.

Department of Health (1993) *The health of the nation key area handbook: mental illness*. London: DoH.

Department of Health (2002) *National suicide prevention strategy for England*. London: DoH.

Geddes J (1999) Suicide and homicide by people with mental illness. *BMJ*, **318**, 1225-1226.

Harriss L, Hawton K, Zahl D (2005) Value of measuring suicidal intent in the assessment of people attending hospital following self-poisoning or self-injury. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **186**, 60-66.

Hawton K, Fagg J (1988) Suicide, and other causes of death, following attempted suicide. *British Journal of Psychiatry,* **152**, 359-366.

Head L, Campbell-Hewson GL, O'Keane V (1999) No harm done? Psychological assessment in the A&E department of patients who deliberately harm themselves. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, **33**, 51-55.

Hickey L, Hawton K, Fagg J *et al* (2001) Deliberate self-harm patients who leave the accident and emergency department without a psychiatric assessment. A neglected population at risk of suicide. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, **50**, 87-93.

Hughes T, Hampshaw S, Renvoize E *et al* (1998) General hospital services for those who carry out deliberate self-harm. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, **22**, 88-91.

Jenkins GR, Hale R, Papanastassiou M *et al* (2002) Suicide rate 22 years after parasuicide: cohort study. *BMJ*, **325**, 1155.

Kapur N, House A, Creed F *et al* (1998) Management of deliberate self poisoning in adults in four teaching hospitals: descriptive study. *BMJ*, **316**, 831-832.

Kapur N, House A, Dodgson K (2002) Effect of general hospital management on repeat episodes of deliberate self-poisoning: cohort study. *BMJ*, **325**, 866-867.

NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (1998) Deliberate self-harm. *Effective Health Care Bulletin*, **4**, 1-12.

National Institute for Clinical Excellence (2004) *The short-term physical and psychological management and secondary prevention of self-harm in primary and secondary care*. London: NICE.

Owens D, Dennis M, Jones S *et al* (1991) Self-poisoning patients discharged from accident and emergency: risk factors and outcome. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, **25**, 218-222.

Owens D, Horrocks J, House A (2002) Fatal and non-fatal repetition of self-harm: systematic review. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **181**, 193-199.

Powell J, Geddes J, Deeks J *et al* (2000) Suicide in psychiatric hospital in-patients: risk factors and their predictive power. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **176**, 266-272.

Rose G (1992) *The strategy of preventive medicine*. Oxford: Oxford Medical Publications.

Slinn R, King A, Evans J (2001) A national survey of the hospital services for the management of adult deliberate self-harm. *Psychiatric Bulletin,* **25**, 53-55.

Taylor SJ, Kingdom D, Jenkins R (1997) How are nations trying to prevent suicide? An analysis of national suicide prevention strategies. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, **95**, 457-463.

Vastag B (2001) Suicide prevention plan calls for physicians' help. *JAMA,* **285**, 2701-2703.

WHO website about SUPRE (suicide prevention):
www.who.int/mental_health/prevention/suicide/supresuicideprevent/en/

Zahl DL, Hawton K (2004) Repetition of deliberate self-harm and subsequent suicide risk: long-term follow-up study of 11 583 patients. *British Journal of Psychiatry,* **185**, 70-75.

Table 1 Tracing of patients in the study, showing causes of death

	Numbers of people	Proportion of all patients (N = 976)	Proportion of those traced (N = 912)
Total	976	100%	100%
Untraced	64	6.6%	-
Alive	755	77.3%	82.8%
Dead	157	16.1%	17.2%
Natural causes of death	106	10.9%	11.5%
Probable suicide	32	3.3%	3.5%
(Suicide)	(22)	(2.3%)	(2.4%)
(Open)	(10)	(1.0%)	(1.1%)
Other unnatural causes	19	1.9%	2.2%
(Misadventure)	(6)	(0.6%)	(0.7%)
(Accident)	(7)	(0.7%)	(0.8%)
(Miscellaneous)	(6)	(0.6%)	(0.7%)

Table 2 Timing of deaths, by any cause and by suicide; proportions represent (i) all patients (N=976) and (ii) only those traced (N=912)

	Number of patients	Proportion of all patients (N = 976)	Proportion of those traced (N = 912)	95% confidence intervals (for N=912)
Total	976	100%	100%	
Died of any cause during 16-17 years of follow-up	157	16.1%	17.2%	14.9 to 19.8%
Died by 1 year	21	2.2%	2.3%	1.5 to 3.5%
Died by 2 years	32	3.3%	3.5%	2.5 to 4.9%
Died by 5 years	63	6.5%	6.9%	5.4 to 8.7%
Died by 8 years	86	8.8%	9.4%	7.7 to 11.5%
Died by 10 years	100	10.2%	11.0%	9.1 to 13.2%
Probable suicide during 16-17 years of follow-up	32	3.3%	3.5%	2.5 to 4.9%
Suicide by 1 year	5	0.5%	0.5%	0.2 to 1.3%
Suicide by 2 years	11	1.1%	1.2%	0.7 to 2.1%
Suicide by 5 years	20	2.0%	2.2%	1.4 to 3.4%
Suicide by 8 years	24	2.5%	2.6%	1.8 to 3.9%
Suicide by 10 years	26	2.7%	2.9%	2.0 to 4.1%

Table 3 Survival analyses of time to death (i) from all causes and (ii) from suicide, according to characteristics of patients traced (N=912)

	All causes			Suicide		
	Proportion of deaths in category (%)	Hazard ratio	95% CI	Proportion of suicides in category (%)	Hazard ratio	95% CI
Sex						
Female	84/552 (15%)	1		11/552 (2.0%)	1	
Male	73/359 (20%)	1.4	1.0, 1.9	21/359 (5.8%)	3.0	1.4, 6.2
Age						
Per year		1.08	1.07, 1.08		1.03	1.00, 1.05
Used tranquilizers / antidepressants						
No	47/501 (9.4%)	1		10/501 (2%)	1	
Yes	110/411 (27%)	3.2	2.2, 4.4	22/411 (5%)	2.9	1.4, 6.1
Number of drugs taken						
Per drug		1.0	0.9, 1.3		1.2	0.8, 1.7
State of consciousness						
Alert	54/490 (11%)	1		10/490 (2.0%)	1	
Mildly drowsy	54/257 (21%)	2.0	1.4, 2.9	12/257 (4.7%)	2.4	1.0, 5.5
Very drowsy	30/118 (25%)	2.5	1.6, 4.0	7/118 (5.9%)	3.1	1.2, 8.2
Unconscious	19/47 (40%)	4.4	2.6, 7.4 $P_{trend}<0.001$	3/47 (6.4%)	3.5	1.0, 12.8 $P_{trend}=0.009$
Was cutting evident						
No	151/892 (17%)	1		29/892 (3.3%)	1	
Yes	6/20 (30%)	1.8	0.8, 4.1	3/20 (15%)	4.6	1.4, 15.3
Current episode alcohol related						
No	103/571 (18%)	1		22/571 (3.9%)	1	
Yes	54/337 (16%)	0.9	0.6, 1.2	10/337 (3.0%)	0.7	0.4, 1.6
Time of attendance						
midnight-8am	29/229 (13%)	1		4/229 (1.7%)	1	
8am - 4pm	69/254 (27%)	2.4	1.6, 3.7	17/254 (6.7%)	4.2	1.4, 12.3
4pm - midnight	58/424 (14%)	1.1	0.7, 1.7	11/424 (2.6%)	1.5	0.5, 4.7
Accident & emergency management						
Admitted to hospital	122/630 (19%)	1		23/630 (3.7%)	1	
Psychiatric assessment & discharge	5/28 (18%)	0.9	0.4, 2.2	4/28 (14%)	3.9	1.4, 11.4
Discharge from A&E without specialist assessment	30/254 (12%)	0.6	0.4, 0.9	5/254 (2.0%)	0.5	0.2, 1.4
Non-fatal repetition within 1 year						
No	128/801 (16%)	1		25/801 (3.1%)	1	
Yes	29/111 (26%)	1.7	1.1, 2.6	7/111 (6.3%)	2.1	0.9, 4.8
Previous self-poisoning						
No	43/399 (11%)	1		13/399 (3.3%)	1	
Yes	59/255 (23%)	2.3	1.5, 3.4	11/255 (4.3%)	1.4	0.6, 3.1
Missing data	55/258 (21%)	2.1	1.4, 3.1	8/258 (3.1%)	1.0	0.4, 2.4
Seen psychiatrist in the past						
No	37/380 (10%)	1		8/380 (2.1%)	1	
Yes	65/250 (26%)	3.0	2.0, 4.5	15/250 (6.0%)	3.1	1.3, 7.3
Missing data	55/282 (20%)	2.2	1.4, 3.3	9/282 (3.2%)	1.6	0.6, 4.1
Living alone						
No	74/563 (13%)	1		15/563 (2.7%)	1	
Yes	40/133 (30%)	2.5	1.7, 3.7	9/133 (6.8%)	2.7	1.2, 6.2
Missing data	43/216 (20%)	1.6	1.1, 2.3	8/216 (3.7%)	1.4	0.6, 3.3
Told someone of threat or wrote note						
No	63/398 (16%)	1		16/398 (4.0%)	1	
Yes	35/226 (16%)	1.0	0.6, 1.5	6/226 (2.7%)	0.7	0.3, 1.7
Missing data	59/288 (20%)	1.3	0.9, 1.9	10/288 (3.5%)	0.9	0.4, 1.9
Marital status						
Married	47/247 (19%)	1		8/247 (3.2%)	1	
Widowed	27/38 (71%)	5.9	3.7, 9.5	2/38 (5.3%)	2.2	0.5, 10.6
Divorced / separated	11/80 (14%)	0.7	0.4, 1.3	4/80 (5.0%)	1.5	0.5, 5.0
Single	31/400 (7.8%)	0.4	0.2, 0.6	11/400 (2.8%)	0.8	0.3, 2.0
Missing data	41/147 (29%)	1.5	1.0, 2.3	7/147 (4.8%)	1.5	0.5, 4.1

Where numbers do not sum to the total in the sample, this discrepancy is due to small amounts of missing data.