



## Commentary

## Treating self-harm in young people

Rohan Borschmann<sup>a,b,c,d,\*</sup>, Paul A. Moran<sup>e</sup><sup>a</sup> Justice Health Unit, Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, 207 Bouverie street, Carlton VIC 3010, Australia<sup>b</sup> Centre for Adolescent Health, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Royal Children's Hospital, 50 Flemington Road, Parkville, Melbourne, VIC 3052, Australia<sup>c</sup> Health Services and Population Research Department, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, De Crespigny Park, Camberwell, London SE58AF, UK<sup>d</sup> Melbourne School of Psychological Sciences, The University of Melbourne, Grattan Street, Parkville, Melbourne 3010, Australia<sup>e</sup> Centre for Academic Mental Health, Department of Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Oakfield House, Oakfield Grove, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK

Over the past decade, the extent of disease burden associated with self-harm in young people has become strikingly clear. Across the globe, self-inflicted injuries result in the deaths of more girls aged 15–19 years than any other cause [1]. For many young people, their self-harming behaviour resolves spontaneously [2], yet for others, self-harm can dominate their lives and impose a considerable strain on family and peer relationships. The longer-term consequences of adolescent self-harm cannot be underestimated. In a recent population-based cohort study of young Australians, adolescent self-harm was linked to social disadvantage, anxiety, and substance use up to 20 years later [3]. The imperative to effectively help young people who self-harm, and their families, has never been clearer. Yet, the evidence base for effective interventions designed to reduce adolescent self-harm remains extremely limited [4].

In this context, the article by David Cottrell and colleagues [5] is a welcome addition to the literature. Family factors have long been recognised as playing an important role in the development of self-harm in young people, and intervening at the family level therefore represents an entirely sensible strategy. In a recently published pragmatic randomised controlled trial (the Self-Harm Intervention: Family Therapy [SHIFT] trial), Cottrell et al. [6] evaluated the effectiveness of a brief manualised family therapy versus treatment-as-usual in reducing repeated self-harm leading to hospital attendance in the UK. In the original trial – the largest evaluation of a self-harm intervention to date – 832 participants aged 11–17 years who had self-harmed at least twice and been referred to child and adolescent mental health services were randomised to the intervention or control arm. At 18 months post-randomisation, there was no significant difference in the proportion of participants presenting to hospital for repeated self-harm between the intervention group (28%) and the control group (25%). Trials of adolescent mental health treatments often lack long-term follow-up data and it is possible that the effects of family therapy may emerge over longer periods of time. Thus, in

this issue, Cottrell et al. [5] report the results of an extended follow-up of participants from their original SHIFT trial.

Using hospital episode statistics to extend the follow-up period to 36 months, the authors again found no difference between the proportion of participants attending hospital following self-harm in the intervention group (40.5%) and the control group (39.8%). Rates of self-harm continued from 18–36 months at much the same rate as they did over the first 18 months. Younger girls and participants whose index episode combined self-injury and poisoning were at greater risk of repetition, suggesting that clinicians should exercise particular caution with these groups of patients. Furthermore, over the 36-month follow-up, almost one in three participants (31.3%) were admitted to hospital for an adversity-related injury – including self-harm, violence, or substance abuse – as opposed to only 4% of the general population of young people [5], highlighting the broader vulnerability of young people who self-harm.

The extended follow-up period, use of linked hospital data, and minimal attrition (97% of participants were followed up) are clear strengths of the study. The authors acknowledge that the 'dose' of family therapy may have been insufficient to produce meaningful change and, given that the causes and functions of self-harm are so often multi-faceted, effectively reducing self-harm in young people may require longer, more intense treatment. Additionally, as most young people who self-harm do not seek medical attention [7], the true proportion of participants from either trial arm who engaged in further self-harm cannot be established using linked medical records alone. Self-harm is notoriously difficult to assess accurately and the most comprehensive method of capturing self-harm episodes involves triangulating multiple data sources, including self-report, clinician/informant interviews, and linked administrative datasets. Furthermore, the longer-term impact of the intervention on the quality of life of young people is unclear.

Self-harm is intimately linked to problems with emotion regulation, problem-solving, and interpersonal communication and so, along with mobilising the support of family and caregivers, these domains remain the focus for therapeutic interventions in this sphere [8]. However, in order to deliver effective treatments in the first place, we need to overcome the stigma and fear associated with talking about self-harm, and offer treatment at the right time and in the right place for young

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.100246>.

\* Corresponding author at: Justice Health Unit, Centre for Health Equity, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, 207 Bouverie street, Carlton VIC 3010, Australia.

E-mail address: [rohan.borschmann@unimelb.edu.au](mailto:rohan.borschmann@unimelb.edu.au) (R. Borschmann).<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100259>2589-5370/© 2020 Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license. (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

people. In this respect, school-based initiatives [9] hold promise, and monitoring for periods when young people are experiencing higher-than-usual stress [10] could lead to the delivery of more effective adaptive interventions. Ultimately, improving the lives of the millions of young people around the world who engage in self-harm will require coordinated and sustained action across multiple sectors (including health, education, and welfare), greater research funding, and adequately powered and rigorously-conducted multi-site trials. The field is still in its infancy and we have much to learn.

#### Declaration of competing interest

The authors report no conflicts.

#### Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:[10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100259](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100259).

#### References

- [1] Naghavi M. Global, regional, and national burden of suicide mortality 1990 to 2016: systematic analysis for the global burden of disease study 2016. *BMJ* 2019;364:194.
- [2] Moran P, Coffey C, Romaniuk H, et al. The natural history of self-harm from adolescence to young adulthood: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet* 2012;379(9812):236–43.
- [3] Borschmann R, Becker D, Coffey C, et al. 20-year outcomes in adolescents who self-harm: a population-based cohort study. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health* 2017;1(3):195–202.
- [4] Ougrin D, Tranah T, Stahl D, Moran P, Asarnow JR. Therapeutic interventions for suicide attempts and self-harm in adolescents: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2015;54(2):97–107 e2.
- [5] Cottrell D, Wright-Hughes A, Eisler I, et al. Longer-term effectiveness of systemic family therapy compared with treatment as usual for young people after self-harm: an extended follow up of pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020. doi: [10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.100246](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2019.100246).
- [6] Cottrell DJ, Wright-Hughes A, Collinson M, et al. Effectiveness of systemic family therapy versus treatment as usual for young people after self-harm: a pragmatic, phase 3, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2018;5(3):203–16.
- [7] Geulayov G, Casey D, McDonald KC, et al. Incidence of suicide, hospital-presenting non-fatal self-harm, and community-occurring non-fatal self-harm in adolescents in England (the iceberg model of self-harm): a retrospective study. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2018;5(2):167–74.
- [8] Iyengar U, Snowden N, Asarnow JR, Moran P, Tranah T, Ougrin D. A further look at therapeutic interventions for suicide attempts and self-harm in adolescents: an updated systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Front Psychiatry* 2018;9:583.
- [9] Wasserman D, Hoven CW, Wasserman C, et al. School-based suicide prevention programmes: the seyle cluster-randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;385(9977):1536–44.
- [10] Miller AB, Eisenlohr-Moul T, Glenn CR, et al. Does higher-than-usual stress predict nonsuicidal self-injury? evidence from two prospective studies in adolescent and emerging adult females. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2019;60(10):1076–84.