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Emergency Medicine

- “The medical specialty dedicated to the diagnosis and treatment of unforeseen illness or injury” (American College of Emergency Physicians)

- Emergency physicians “care for all patients regardless of age, gender, time of presentation, or ability to pay”

- Unique focus on preventing short-term morbidity & mortality
Conceptual framework of ED use

- Outpatient medical settings (e.g., primary care)
- Hotline/advice line
- Outpatient mental health settings
- Inpatient medical setting
- Inpatient psychiatric setting
- Outpatient (discharge home)
Typical ED process

- Patients cared for by nurse(s) and ED physician
  - Board-certified in Emergency Medicine after EM residency
  - Sees ~15-40 patients per 8-hour shift
  - Cares for multiple patients at once
  - Calls consultants as needed
  - Focus on disposition
ED visits in the US, 2010

Top 10 reasons:
1. Abdominal pain
2. Chest pain
3. Fever
4. Headache
5. Back pain
6. Shortness of breath
7. Cough
8. Pain
9. Vomiting
10. Throat symptoms

Visits for mental health

- ED visits for mental health reasons rising
- 39-43% of suicide decedents visit an ED in the year before death
- Multiple ED visits may indicate elevated suicide risk
Identification of suicidal patients

- Many—but not all—patients come with psychiatric reason for visit
  - Estimated 3-11% of all ED patients have “occult” suicidal ideation

- Screening options
  - Indicated
  - Selective
  - Universal

Either of these likely fulfills Joint Commission requirement (National Patient Safety Goal 15)
Emergency Dept Safety and Follow-up Evaluation Study

**Aims:** Test Universal Screening and Telephone Counseling

**Treatment as usual**
- EDs determine screening and care

**Universal suicide screening**
- EDs determine care

**Intervention**
- ED: Safety form and MD screener
- Cohort: telephone counseling

Survey
ED-SAFE: Universal screening

Patient Safety Screener

1. Over the past 2 weeks, have you felt down, depressed, or hopeless?
2. Over the past 2 weeks, have you had thoughts of killing yourself?
3. Have you ever attempted to kill yourself?

4. If Yes to item 3: when did this last happen?
Care of suicidal patients

Once suicidality recognized:

→ Questioning by ED physician
  → If ED physician concerned, next step varies:
    ● On-site psychiatry or trained social workers (available 24/7 vs limited hours)
      or
    ● Off-site psychiatry or mental health team comes to ED
Problem: Inadequate resources

- Limited inpatient beds and outpatient resources
  → long ED waits for suicidal patients under less-than-ideal circumstances

- Limited mental health professional availability
  • Especially in rural areas or at smaller hospitals

- With time pressures and growing ED volumes, these issues add to provider frustration
But: Does every suicidal patient need a mental health consult in the ED?

Suicidal?
- Yes
  - “Medical clearance”
  - Psych consult
  - Dispo per psych
- No
  - Medical treatment
  - Dispo per ED team

Chest pain?
- Yes
  - “Medical clearance”
  - Cadiology consult
  - Dispo per cardiology
- No
  - Medical treatment
  - Dispo per ED team
Current assessment options

Examples of available tools that might be in use

- Modified SAD PERSONS
- Manchester Self-Harm Rule
- Short version of Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale

None is ideal for use in busy EDs in US
Emergency Dept Safety and Follow-up Evaluation Study

- **Treatment as usual**
  - EDs determine screening and care
- **Universal suicide screening**
  - EDs determine care
- **Intervention**
  - ED: Safety form and MD screener
  - Cohort: telephone counseling

**Survey**

- **71% response rate**
  - 64% female
  - Median age 40
  - 68% nurses

- **Working in healthcare**
  - Median 13 years
- **Cared for median 15 suicidal patients per month**
- **43% thought “most/all suicides are preventable”**
Physician & nurse self-confidence in skills for care of suicidal ED patients

(ED-SAFE phase 3; N=420)

- Screen for Suicidality: 80%
- Further Assess Suicide Risk: 70%
- Provide Brief Counseling: 50%
- Create Personalized Safety Plan: 40%

Physician & nurse opinions of ED environment (ED-SAFE phase 1 & 3)

- ED leadership supports suicide interventions
- Mental health staffing is sufficient
- Universal screening will increase psychiatric evaluations
- Universal screening will slow down care

Physician & nurse opinions of ED environment (ED-SAFE phase 1 & 3)

- ED leadership supports suicide interventions
- Mental health staffing is sufficient
- Universal screening will increase psychiatric evaluations
- Universal screening will slow down care
Reported behaviors for most/all ED patients
(ED-SAFE nurses & physicians, phase 1 & 3)

- Screen for suicidal ideation
- Assess risk severity
- Create safety plan
- Briefly counsel
- Provide referrals

For patients who are suicidal

Reported behaviors for most/all ED patients (ED-SAFE nurses & physicians, phase 1 & 3)

For patients who are suicidal

- Screen for suicidal ideation
- Assess risk severity
- Create safety plan
- Briefly counsel
- Provide referrals

“Who is responsible for talking to patients about access to lethal means?”

- **Assess** access to lethal means
- **Counsel** about restricting access to lethal means

Betz et al. Lethal means restriction for suicide prevention: Beliefs and behaviors of emergency department providers. Depress Anxiety 2013.
“Who is responsible for talking to patients about access to lethal means?”

Assess access to lethal means

Counsel about restricting access to lethal means

Betz et al. Lethal means restriction for suicide prevention: Beliefs and behaviors of emergency department providers. Depress Anxiety 2013.
"I often/almost always ask if there are firearms at home" (ED-SAFE phase 3)

Suicidal in past month, not now
Suicidal today, without plan
In ED for overdose, no longer suicidal
Suicidal with non-gun plan
Suicidal with gun plan

Next Steps: Many Challenges

- Who will do suicide screening and assessment?
- Variation in ED capability
- Inadequate training for MDs and RNs
- Need evidence-based ED tools for
  - Rapid risk assessment
  - Stratification and thresholds for hospitalization
  - Options for brief ED treatment
- Need better access to inpatient or outpatient mental health resources
Implementing Suicide Prevention Strategies in Emergency Departments: Barriers and Solutions to Overcome Them

Leslie S. Zun, MD
Professor and Chairman
Mount Sinai Hospital
Objectives

- To understand emergency medicine
- To learn how to approach emergency care providers
- To determine how to modify physician behavior in the emergency department
History of emergency medicine

- Emergency Departments
  - Staffed by physicians of various backgrounds
  - No specialty training
- American College of Emergency Physicians
  - Established 1968
- American Academy of Emergency Medicine
  - Established in the 90s
- American Board of Emergency Medicine
  - Formed 1979
  - Independent specialty 1988
Role of emergency medicine

- Providers of emergency care
  - Non urgent
  - Urgent
  - Emergent
- Coordinator of follow up care
- Emergency department as a safety net
- Emergency department in a managed care environment
Engaging the emergency department sector

- How to engage emergency departments and organizations at the state and local level?
- Come ready to offer solutions
- Build relationships
Barrier: It can be difficult to engage the emergency department sector

How to engage EDs at the state and local level?

- American College of Emergency Physicians
  - State chapters
- American Academy of Emergency Medicine
  - State and regional chapters
- Emergency Nurses Association
  - State and local chapters
- Contract Management Company
- Hospital system
How to approach emergency providers

- Learn about the emergency department
  - Primary patients served
  - Teaching or non-teaching
  - Problem areas
  - Contracted, employed or other

- Find out who is nurse manager, medical director, chair

- Time, date & location of MD, PA, RN meetings
  - Possibility to present material at a staff, regional or system meeting
Building relationships with emergency departments

- Build relationships
  - Find the champion
  - Connect with the department medical director or chair
  - Connect with the nurse manager
  - Role of social work
  - Role of psychiatry
How to change emergency physician behavior

- “Cowboy/Cowgirl” – the first one on the block to try something
- One starts to use it and it spreads
- Comes from psychiatry department
- Literature based
- Advantages and persuasion to try it
- Guidelines demonstrates improved care
Come ready to offer solutions

- Emergency departments are busy places
- Anything that can make the job easier will be appreciated
- Can it expedite patient care?
- Can it reduce the number of patients boarded in the emergency department?
Barrier: Developing the evidence base for these interventions

- Consensus guidelines based on available research and RAND methodology
  - Some studies are difficult to perform in the emergency department
    - Especially
      - Mental health patients
      - Randomized controlled trials
- Consensus guidelines are the best available
- Consensus guidelines may be used prior to randomized controlled trials
Developing the evidence base for these interventions

- Build evaluation into your prevention approaches and collect feedback from emergency department sector
  - Obtain feedback on the use and utility of the guidelines
  - Obtain information about how the tool is used and improvements
Addressing emergency department lack of time and training

- Tools in the guide are designed for feasibility in the emergency department
  - Tool was designed by group composed of emergency physicians and psychiatrists
- Guide can be used as basis for training materials
  - Emergency departments have a need for training in dealing with psychiatric patients
Behavioral Emergencies Meeting

6th Annual National Update on Behavioral Emergencies Conference
December 2-4, 2015; Las Vegas, Nevada
www.behavioralemergencies.com
A New Resource to Promote Suicide Prevention for Adults in ED’s

SPRC R2P Webinar
June 16, 2015

Michael H. Allen, M. D.
Professor of Psychiatry and Emergency Medicine
University of Colorado School of Medicine
Medical Director
Rocky Mountain Crisis Partners
Usual ED Care

University of Colorado Hospital
66 yo male presents after stepping on a nail
H/O of depression, prostate cancer, Type 2 DM
Denied using alcohol, drugs or tobacco
Affable, in no physical or emotional distress
Normal X-ray, DPT and oral antibiotics

Ordinarily, treated and released
Universal Screening

*Joint Commission NPSG 15, ED – SAFE*

Screen for depression and suicidal ideation

Emergency nurse was surprised to find

- Detailed suicide plan, look accidental
- Sister would receive death benefits
- 1 year anniversary of partner’s death
- Pending eviction, loss of his garden
ED Visits and Suicide Deaths

8 Health Systems, 8 States, N = 5984 suicides 2000-2010
Within 4 weeks of death, N = 4988 enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deaths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any visit</td>
<td>2488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Mental Health</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Chem Dependency</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Other</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Mental Health</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Mental Health</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22%
ED SAFE Retrospective, \( n=800 \)

- Only 4.9\% of patients were screened
  - Sites varied from 3 – 23\%
- 2.9\% had any mention of suicide
- Most with SI had an indication
  - 92\% had some risk factor at triage
  - 59\% had past or current SI or behavior
  - 33–36\% documented substance problem
- Most with an indication were *not* screened, “very selective”
## Double the detection rate

### 3.4 M add’l episodes per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Definition of Ideation</th>
<th>Freq (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen (2013)</td>
<td>CSSRS Passive SI</td>
<td>79/1068 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSSRS Active SI</td>
<td>24/1068 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Any SI and history of attempt</td>
<td>12/1068 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SAFE Retro</td>
<td>Any mention of suicidal behavior</td>
<td>23 / 800 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SAFE TAU</td>
<td>Any mention of suicidal behavior</td>
<td>2771 / 94,385 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED SAFE Phase 3</td>
<td>Any intentional self-harm ideation or behavior, 75% suicidal</td>
<td>4901 / 236,789 (5.9 -7.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increase the Denominator to 4M

National Survey on Drug Use and Health, 2008-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SI</th>
<th>Attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total US</td>
<td>9031 K</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>3941 K</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Subst Abuse</td>
<td>2613 K</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Clinic</td>
<td>847 K</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Double the number referred to MH?

*Increase waiting time*

Half get admitted?

*Increase boarding*
Implications

Currently ignoring half the problem
- Can dramatically increase detection
- Space, training, culture = triage
- Rights, preferences of recipients
- Identify those at low risk, less urgent
  - Improve care
    - Providing brief interventions in the ED and
    - Enhancing transitions of care
- Secondary screening, negative prediction
## PERC Rule for Pulmonary Embolism

Rules out PE if all criteria are present and pre-test probability is ≤15%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age &gt; 50</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR ≥ 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂ Sat on Room Air &lt; 95%</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior History of DVT/PE</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Trauma or Surgery</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemoptysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exogenous Estrogen</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilateral Leg Swelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **No need for further workup, as <2% chance of PE.**

If no criteria are positive and clinician's pre-test probability is <15%, PERC Rule criteria are satisfied.
**Negative Prediction**

*Modified SAD PERSONS*

- 5 negative items
  1. Prior attempt or psych care
  2. Alcohol or drug abuse
  3. Intent
  4. Age 19 – 45
  5. Rational (neg rational thinking loss)

- 99.3% *no attempt* at 6 months

SPRC Emergency Department Project

Develop a **consensus-based** guide for use in emergency departments

- For patients with *known suicide risk* who may be appropriate to treat and release
- Include **decision support** for disposition
- Include **interventions and discharge planning**
- Build on past/current efforts
- Involve **emergency medicine community**
Caring for Adult Patients with Suicide Risk

A Consensus Guide for Emergency Departments

• Full guide
• Quick guide
• Technical report

www.sprc.org/ed-guide
Building Consensus

- RAND Corporation and Social Science Research and Evaluation (SSRE)
- Two remote studies; Used Expert Lens model
- 70-82% participation
- RAND Appropriateness Method for analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Number (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physicians (non-MH)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>9 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical researcher</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide prevention professional</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrists</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>4 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency nurses (non-MH)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric nurse</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agency representative</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy expert</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide attempt survivor</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide loss survivor</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple affiliations by panelists.
# Consensus Panel Studies

*Team of 6-8 experts from different perspectives, details available*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1: July – August 2013</th>
<th>Study 2: February – March 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area of Focus:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Area(s) of Focus:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rate <em>item usefulness</em> in making disposition decisions for patients with suicidal ideation (i.e., discharge or further assess)</td>
<td>• Evaluate a draft decision support guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To inform the development of a decision support guide</td>
<td>• Rate <em>interventions and discharge planning strategies in EDs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To inform the development of a decision support guide</td>
<td>• To affirm decision support guide approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To highlight recommended interventions and discharge planning practices in a provider guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optimal Assessment Tool for ED Setting: 5-7 Items

- Mode = 5 items
- Median = 6
- 61% 7 items or less

N = 41; mean = 7.15; median = 6; mode = 5
Item selection for Study 1

✓ 13 suicide risk tools
✓ 47 items
✓ Reduced to 13 items
✓ Wording based on validated tools
### Scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Question</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm Suicidal Ideation</td>
<td>0 = “No” on all 1-6. Provide intervention prior to discharge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSACTION QUESTION: CONFIRM SUICIDAL IDEATION**

Have you had recent thoughts of killing yourself? Is there other evidence of suicidal thoughts, such as reports from family or friends? (Note: Not part of scoring.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Thoughts of Carrying Out a Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Recently, have you been thinking about how you might kill yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>If yes, consider the immediate safety needs of the patient.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Suicide Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Do you have any intention of killing yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Past Suicide Attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Have you ever tried to kill yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4</th>
<th>Significant Mental Health Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Have you had treatment for mental health problems? Do you have a mental health issue that affects your ability to do things in life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>Substance Use Disorder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Have you had four or more (female) or five or more (male) drinks on one occasion in the past month or have you used drugs or medication for non-medical reasons in the past month? Has drinking or drug use been a problem for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>Irritability/Agitation/Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Recently, have you been feeling very anxious or agitated? Have you been having conflicts or getting into fights? Is there direct evidence of irritability, agitation, or aggression?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decision Support Guide Rating

How would you rate this for the purpose of helping ED providers determine which suicidal patients may be appropriate to discharge without further assessment?

67% “good” or “excellent”
### Summary Findings: Areas of Consensus

#### Table 1: Areas of Expert Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Clinically Useful</th>
<th>Facilitates Continuity of Care</th>
<th>Feasible</th>
<th>Patient-Centered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief patient education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient-administered safety planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinician-administered safety planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal means counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis center helpline information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief motivational interviewing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telepsychiatry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid follow-up/referral</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent contact or caring contacts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ED-Based Suicide Prevention Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief Intervention</th>
<th>Recommended by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus Panel (1) Best Practices Registry (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis center/hotline information should be provided as part of each intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief patient education</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety planning</td>
<td>(1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethal means counseling</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid referral</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring contacts</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✔ Bundle interventions
- ✔ Patient-centered
- ✔ Use of crisis centers
- ✔ Tailor to patient needs & ED resources
3.3 Lethal Means Counseling

In the Lethal Means Counseling intervention, the provider assesses whether a patient at risk for suicide has access to firearms or other lethal means (e.g., prescription medications), and works with the patient and his or her friends, family, or outpatient provider to discuss ways to limit this access until the patient is no longer feeling suicidal.

Action Steps

» Tell the patient and his or her friends or family that suicide risk can sometimes escalate rapidly, so it is important to consider the patient’s access to lethal means during these periods of increased risk.

» Ask the patient and his or her supports about the patient’s access to lethal means, particularly firearms. If the patient has access to firearms, ask about the location (e.g., closet, car, attic).

» Provide appropriate counseling to patients who report having access to lethal means. For a list of points to cover in a brief counseling session, view the Lethal Means Counseling Recommendations for Clinicians sheet available from Means Matter.

» Identify strategies for limiting access to lethal means, such as storing firearms at a friend’s house until the suicidal crisis has passed, and allowing a family member to keep medications under lock and key and dispense them as necessary in order to prevent self-poisoning.

Lethal Means Counseling Resources

» Recommendations for Clinicians—Lethal means counseling, Means Matter, Harvard School of Public Health

» Recommendations for Families—Information on lethal means, Means Matter, Harvard School of Public Health

» Counseling on Access to Lethal Means (CALM)—Online training course, Suicide Prevention Resource Center

» Firearm Safety and Injury Prevention—Policy, American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP)
Discharge Planning Checklist

- Involve the patient as a partner
- Make follow-up appointments
- Review and discuss the Patient Care Plan (discharge plan)
- Discuss barriers
- Provide crisis center phone number
- Discuss limiting access to lethal means
- Provide written instructions and education materials
- Confirm that the patient understands the Patient Care Plan
- Share patient health information with referral providers
- Communicate your concern
1 Identification of individuals at risk may occur as a result of (1) patient disclosure; (2) reports by family, friends, or other collaterals; (3) individual indicators such as depression, substance use or debilitating illness; or (4) primary screening.
2 See Appendix C for information on primary screening.
3 Consult your ED’s policies to determine how medical clearance applies to this diagram.
Quick Guide

- Two 8.5x11 sides folded
- Companion to the full guide
- Topics covered:
  - Diagram
  - Decision support tool
  - ED-based interventions
  - Discharge planning checklist
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