| **Reference to review** | **Intervention** | **Comparison** | **Population** | **Outcome** | **Assessment times**  **(if stated)** | **N of studies** | **n (total)** | **Effect size [95% confidence interval)** | **GRADE LEVEL** | **1. ROB**  **2. Imprecision**  **3. Inconsistency**  **4. Indirectness**  **5. Publication bias** | **GRADE applied by:** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Hawton 2015 | Dialectical behaviour therapy | TAU or other routine management | Patients with multiple episodes of SH or emerging personality problems | Frequency of SH post-intervention | Post-intervention | 2 | 104 | MD -0.79  (-2.78, 1.20)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton 2015 | Individual CBT-based psychotherapy | TAU | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 6 months follow-up | 1 | 39 | OR 1.88  (0.3, 11.73)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊝⊝⊝  VERY LOW | 1. D2  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton 2015 | Group-based psychotherapy | TAU or other routine management | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 6 months | 2 | 430 | OR 1.72  (0.56, 5.24)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton 2015 | Group-based psychotherapy | TAU or other routine management | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 12 months | 3 | 490 | OR 0.80  (0.22, 2.97)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Therapeutic assessment | TAU (standard assessment) | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 12 months following entry to the study | 1 | 69 | OR 0.75  (0.18, 3.06)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Therapeutic assessment | TAU (standard assessment) | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 24 months following entry to the study | 1 | 69 | OR 0.69  (0.23, 2.14)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Compliance enhancement | TAU | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 6 months | 1 | 63 | OR 0.67  (0.15, 3.08)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊝⊝⊝  VERY LOW | 1. D2  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Home-based family intervention | TAU | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 6 months assessment | 1 | 149 | OR 1.02  (0.41,2.51)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D2  2. -  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Remote contact interventions | TAU | Children and adolescents | Repetition of SH | At 12 months | 1 | 105 | OR 0.5  (0.12, 2.04)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊝⊝⊝  VERY LOW | 1. D2  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Dialectical behaviour therapy | TAU or other | Patients with multiple episodes of SH or emerging personality problems | Repetition of SH | Post intervention | 2 | 105 | OR 0.72  (0.12, 4.40)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Mentalisation | TAU or other | Patients with multiple episodes of SH or emerging personality problems | Repetition of SH | Post intervention | 1 | 71 | OR 0.26  (0.09, 0.78)  **Favours intervention** | **⊕⊕⊕⊝**  **MODERATE** | 1. D1  2. -  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| O’Connor 2013 | Psychotherapy | Enhanced usual care | Adolescents | Suicidal attempts | Follow-up at 12 months | 1 | 112 | RR 1.44  (0.36, 5.76)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Overview authors |
| O’Connor  2013 | Psychotherapy | Usual care | Adolescents | Suicide attempts | Follow-up between 6-18 months | 9 | 1331 | RR 0.99  (0.75, 1.31)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. -  3. -  4. D1  5. - | Overview authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Individual CBT-based psychotherapy | TAU | Children and adolescents | Suicidal ideation | At 6 months follow-up | 1 | 30 | MD -5.11  (-30.48, 20.26)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊝⊝⊝  VERY LOW | 1. D2  2. -  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Individual CBT-based psychotherapy | TAU | Children and adolescents | Suicidal ideation | At 12 months follow-up | 1 | 30 | MD -8.44  (-29.54, 12.66)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊝⊝⊝  VERY LOW | 1. D2  2. -  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Dialectical behaviour therapy | TAU or other | Patients with multiple episodes of SH or emerging personality problems | Suicidal ideation | Post intervention | 2 | 100 | SMD -0.62  (-1.07, -0.16)  **Favours intervention** | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Group-based psychotherapy | TAU or other | Children and adolescents | Suicidal ideation | At 6 months | 2 | 421 | MD 1.27  (-7.74, 10.28)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Group-based psychotherapy | TAU or other | Children and adolescents | Suicidal ideation | At 12 months | 3 | 471 | MD -1.51  (-9.62, 6.59)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. D1  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| Hawton  2015 | Home-based family intervention | TAU or other | Children and adolescents | Suicidal ideation | At 6 months assessment | 1 | 149 | MD -5.1  ((-17.37, 7.17)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D2  2. -  3. -  4. -  5. - | Review authors |
| O’Connor  2013 | Psychotherapy | Usual care | Adolescents | Suicidal ideation | Follow-up 1.5 – 12 months | 6 | 629 | SMD -0.22  (-0.46, 0.02)  No evidence of benefit or harm | ⊕⊕⊝⊝  LOW | 1. D1  2. -  3. -  4. D1  5. - | Overview authors |

**SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE S6 Summary of comparisons pooled.**

Abbreviations: MD: mean difference; OR: odds ratio; RR: relative risk; SH: self-harm; SMD: standardised mean difference; TAU: treatment as usual

Reasons for downgrading evidence: 1 = serious limitation in the Risk of bias; 2 = imprecision (e.g. wide confidence intervals or small sample size); 3 = Inconsistency (e.g. high I2); 4 = indirectness (e.g. variation in participants, intervention, comparisons or outcomes); 5 = publication bias; D1 = one downgrade; D2 = two downgrades

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence  
**High quality**: Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.  
**Moderate quality**: Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.  
**Low quality**: Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.  
**Very low quality**: We are very uncertain about the estimate.