# Suicidal behaviours among deaf adolescents in Ghana: a cross-sectional study

# E. N. B. Quarshie<sup>1,2</sup>, D. Fobi<sup>3</sup>, E. K. Acheampong<sup>4</sup>, C. M. Honu-Mensah<sup>4</sup>, J. Fobi<sup>4</sup>, O. Appau<sup>4</sup>, J. Andoh-Arthur<sup>2</sup>, K. Oppong Asante<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Psychology, University of Leeds, Woodhouse, LS2 9JT, Leeds, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, University of Ghana, P.O. Box LG 84, Legon, Accra, Ghana
 <sup>3</sup>School of Education, University of Leeds, Woodhouse, LS2 9JT, Leeds, UK
 <sup>4</sup>Department of Special Education, University of Education, PO Box 25, Winneba, Ghana
 Address correspondence to Emmanuel Nii-Boye Quarshie, E-mail: enquarshie@gmail.com

# ABSTRACT

**Background** A growing global concern is that suicide research has paid little attention to young people with disabilities, particularly, in lowand middle-income countries (LAMICs). We aimed to estimate the 12-month prevalence of suicidal ideation and attempt and describe some associations among deaf adolescents in Ghana.

**Methods** This is a cross-sectional anonymous self-report survey involving a nationally representative random sample of 450 school-going deaf adolescents. Data analysis included bivariate and multivariable approaches.

**Results** The overall 12-month prevalence of suicidal ideation was 19-3% (95% confidence interval [CI] = 15-8–23-3) and suicidal attempt was 15-6% (95% CI = 12-3–19-2). Although alcohol use and parental divorce were strongly associated with increased odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt, high subjective mental well-being was associated with reduced odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt. Living with no parents and being a final year student were associated with suicidal ideation, while male gender was associated with suicidal attempt. **Conclusions** The prevalence of suicidal behaviours among school-going deaf adolescents in this study compares with estimates among in-school non-deaf adolescents in Ghana and other LAMICs in Africa, and also highlights the need for prevention efforts against the onset of suicidal ideation and possible transition to attempt and suicide among deaf adolescents.

Keywords deaf adolescents, Ghana, suicide, suicidal attempt, suicidal ideation

# Introduction

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines suicidal behaviour as 'a range of behaviours that include thinking about suicide (or ideation), planning for suicide, attempting suicide and suicide itself'.<sup>1</sup> Globally, suicide is the second leading cause of death among 15–19-year-olds,<sup>1,2</sup> with 79% of the annual world-wide suicide-related mortality reported in low- and middle-income countries (LAMICs).<sup>1,3,4</sup> Across the general population, suicidal ideation is a strong risk for attempting suicide; attempted suicide represents the single significant risk for suicide.<sup>1,5,6</sup>

Given that disabilities are associated with negative physical and mental health outcomes, persons with functional disabilities—related to hearing and sight—have been found to be at an increased risk of attempted suicide, suicide and other emotional and behavioural problems.<sup>7–12</sup> However, there is a growing global concern that suicide research has paid little attention to young people with disabilities, especially, in LAMICs: in particular, much of our understanding of suicidal behaviours among deaf adolescents is based on evidence from high-income countries.<sup>9,11,13–18</sup>

We performed and updated a systematic search for literature (We searched Global Index Medicus, Index Medicus

Emmanuel Nii-Boye Quarshie, Research fellow in youth self-harm and suicide prevention Daniel Fobi, PhD candidate in deaf education Emmanuel Kwasi Acheampong, Lecturer in deaf education Cyril Mawuli Honu-Mensah, Lecturer in audiology

Joyce Fobi, Teaching assistant in deaf education

Obed Appau, Principal research assistant in deaf education

Johnny Andoh-Arthur, Lecturer in community psychology and suicidology

Kwaku Oppong Asante, Senior lecturer in health psychology

for South-East Asia Region, PsycINFO, African Journals OnLine, MEDLINE and African Index Medicus up to July 2020, using keywords [e.g. ('suicide ideation' OR 'suicidal ideation' OR 'self-harm ideation' OR suicid\* OR self-injur\* OR mental) AND (deaf children OR 'deaf adolescents' OR 'deaf young people' OR disability OR adolescen\* OR child\* OR students OR teen\* OR 'young adults' OR youth OR pupils)]. We did not apply any date or language restrictions. Our geographic search filter to identify countries in within low- and middle-income context included names of the countries in both English and languages relevant to the countries. We supplemented the searches by reviewing references and forward citations of relevant articles.) from Africa to contextualize the current study. Apart from relevant studies involving school-going non-deaf adolescents, we found neither published primary studies nor systematic reviews or meta-analyses with included studies involving deaf adolescents from African countries.<sup>19-25</sup>

Among in-school non-deaf adolescents, recent regional systematic reviews and meta-analyses suggest that relative to other LAMICs, the 12-month prevalence estimate of suicidal ideation (20.4%, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 17.3, 23.6) is higher in sub-Saharan Africa, while the pooled estimate of suicidal attempt (19.3%, 95%CI = 14.2, 24.4) is comparable to what pertains in LAMICs within the Western Pacific region (20.5%, 95%CI = 14.3, 26.7).<sup>20–23</sup> The evidence also suggests that suicidal behaviours among adolescents are multicausal, with specific risk and protective factors existing at the personal level (e.g. female gender, alcohol and substance use, depression), family context (e.g. parental understanding, conflict with parents), school (e.g. schoolwork problems, bullying victimization) and other social relationship contextual factors (e.g. break-up, sexual abuse victimization, peer support).<sup>21–23</sup>

In Ghana, only one study has reported social discrimination as a critical reason for suicidal ideation among adult mothers with physical disabilities.<sup>26</sup> Evidence also suggests that although deaf adolescents have access to health facilities in Ghana, professional health care is hampered by communication barriers such as the lack of sign language interpreters.<sup>27</sup>

Taken together, considering that the reduction of suiciderelated deaths has been given special priority in the sustainable development goals, it is important to contribute sound and timely research evidence, particularly, among young vulnerable groups such as deaf adolescents in LAMICs to inform intervention and prevention efforts.

#### Aims of study

 Estimate the 12-month prevalence of suicidal behaviours (Suicidal behaviours denote two outcomes in this study: suicidal ideation and suicidal attempt.) among schoolgoing deaf adolescents (Schools for the deaf in Ghana are typically attended by young people with moderate to profound hearing loss. Based on the definition by Sawyer et al. (2018), we used the term adolescents to mean individuals aged 10–24 years. [Sawyer, S. M., Azzopardi, P. S., Wickremarathne, D., & Patton, G. C. (2018). The age of adolescence. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health,* 2(3), 223–228. doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30022-1].) in Ghana.

 (ii) Identify the common and unique factors associated with suicidal behaviours among school-going deaf adolescents in Ghana.

# Methods

#### Design, setting and participants

The community-agreed recommendations of Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guided the design and reporting of this study.<sup>28</sup> We conducted a cross-sectional survey, using a self-report anonymous questionnaire, among deaf students attending Junior High Schools (JHSs) (In Ghana, Junior High Schools have a 3-year duration and are targeted at young people aged 12-14 years, but due to significant delayed school enrolment of young people with disabilities, typically, late and older adolescents aged 15-24 years are also predominantly found at this level of basic education in special schools in Ghana.) in Ghana. At the time of designing this study (August 2019) there were 1030 students across all the 13 JHSs for the deaf in the country. We predetermined a minimum sample size of 288, using Yamane's (1967) formula for proportions, with 0.05 level of precision.<sup>29</sup> We used a two-stage cluster sampling approach to firstly select seven JHSs for the deaf with probability proportional to enrolment size across the 16 administrative regions of Ghana. In stage 2, classes were randomly selected with all students in each class eligible to participate in the survey. Figure 1 summarizes the school selection and sampling of participants for this study. We approached and invited 468 participants, but 450 provided complete data included in the final analysis, representing a response rate of 96.1% (171 females and 221 males; aged 13–24 years; mean = 18.4; standard deviation = 2.60; modal age = 18).

#### **Outcome measures**

Two outcome variables were included in this study: suicidal ideation and attempt. In order to facilitate comparison, we adopted two single-items from the 2012 Ghana WHO-Global School-based Health Survey (WHO-GSHS),<sup>30</sup> one each to measure suicidal ideation and attempt. Specifically, the item, 'during the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider



Fig. 1 Summary of school selection and participant sampling for survey.

attempting suicide?' was used to measure suicidal ideation; the responses were dichotomized as No (0) or Yes (1). Suicidal attempt was measured with the question 'during the past 12 months, how many times did you actually attempt suicide?' The responses were '0', '1', '2 or 3', '4 or 5' and '6 or more times'. Consistent with most published analyses of the WHO-GSHS data from sub-Saharan Africa,<sup>20–24</sup> we applied a binary recoding to this item for analysis, No (no attempt = 0) and Yes (one or more attempts = 1).

#### **Exposure variables**

This study involved 12 items assessing personal, family, school and interpersonal factors found in the 2012 Ghana

WHO-GSHS to be associated with suicidal behaviours as risk and protective factors (see in Supplementary Table 1). For example, alcohol use (never drink alcohol or  $\geq 1$  drinks), parental divorce (no/yes), schoolwork problems (no/yes), bullying victimization (no/yes) and break-up (no/yes). Also, this study adopted one item from the 5-item Duke University Religion Index (DUREL) to measure *religious participation*: 'How often do you attend church or other religious meetings?' with response rating options ranging from (1) 'never' to (6) 'more than once per week'.<sup>31</sup> Considering the strong association between suicidal behaviours, and psychological functioning, life satisfaction and one's ability to develop and maintain mutually beneficial social relationships,<sup>32</sup> we adopted the 14-item Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) to assess subjective mental well-being.<sup>13,33</sup> It is a 5-score scale, from 'none of the time' [1] to 'all of the time' [5] (e.g. 'I've been feeling optimistic about the future'), with the possible total score ranging from 14 to 70 points. Higher scores indicate better mental well-being. Internationally, the WEMWBS has demonstrated strong internal consistency and a satisfactory Cronbach's alpha;<sup>34</sup> the Cronbach's alpha in the current study was 0.83. Also, as shown in Supplementary Table 1, eight socio-demographic variables were included (e.g. gender, age, family structure). Prior to administration, the questionnaire was expert reviewed by two basic school Ghanaian Sign Language teachers and an adolescent suicide researcher.

#### Procedure

The survey took place from October 2019 to January 2020. The survey was administered to participants in their school's assembly hall or a larger classroom, with sitting arrangement spaced by reasonable distance to ensure privacy. We clarified participants' queries in the Ghanaian Sign Language—the sign language that is used for the instruction and examination of deaf students at all levels of education in Ghana. Averagely, the completion of the questionnaire lasted between 55 and 75 min. After completing the survey, each student placed their answered questionnaire in an opaque box before exiting the hall.

## Data analysis

All data analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 26.0 for Windows). As the loss of cases due to missing data was <5%, the list-wise deletion of missing data strategy was applied.<sup>35</sup> The coding of the variables included in our statistical analysis and proportion of missing data are shown in Supplementary Table 1. The data analysis proceeded in two stages. Firstly, we performed descriptive analysis by applying frequencies, proportions and the Pearson's Chi-square tests  $(\chi^2)$  and point-biserial correlation  $(r_{\rm pb})$  tests to examine the bivariate relationships between suicidal behaviours and the exposure variables and socio-demographic factors. Secondly, adjusted multivariable logistic regression analyses examining the possible associations between suicidal behaviours and the specified correlates and socio-demographic variables were performed. As recommended by leading logistic regression modelling experts, the candidate correlates were entered in the multivariable logistic regression models regardless of their statistically significant bivariate relationship with the

outcome variables.<sup>36–38</sup> The socio-demographic variables were included as covariates. We reported the results of the logistic regression as odds ratios with 95% confidence intervals (CI) and *P*-values. Statistically significant results were also determined using P < 0.05.

#### Ethics

This study was approved by the Department of Psychology Research Ethics Committee, University of Ghana, Accra. We followed the ethical procedures of the Ghana Education Service (GES) for conducting research involving students in special schools in Ghana. The Special Education Unit of GES and heads of all the participating schools permitted this study. Each participant signed a written consent form prior to responding to the survey; parents/guardians of underage participants provided consent and we obtained the assent of participants younger than 18 years, prior to responding to the survey.

# Results

# Prevalence estimates and bivariate associations of suicidal behaviours

The overall 12-month prevalence estimate of suicidal ideation was 19·3% (95% CI = 15·8–23·3) and suicidal attempt was 15·6% (95% CI = 12·3–19·2). More males than females reported suicidal ideation (female =  $17\cdot0\%$  [11·7–23·4]; male =  $20\cdot8\%$  [95% CI =  $16\cdot2-26\cdot0$ ]) and attempt (female =  $12\cdot3\%$  [95% CI =  $7\cdot8-18\cdot2$ ]; male =  $17\cdot6\%$  [95% CI =  $13\cdot3-22\cdot5$ ]). Overall, we found statistically significant bivariate associations between suicidal behaviours and most of the socio-demographic factors and exposure variables included in this study—see Tables 1 and 2.

Deaf adolescents who reported physical abuse victimization, weekly alcohol use, sexual abuse victimization and parental divorce were more likely to report suicidal ideation and attempt during the previous 12 months (Table 1). However, participants who reported high subjective mental well-being, frequent religious participation and high parental understanding were less likely to report both suicidal ideation and attempt (Table 2).

#### **Multivariable associations**

As shown in Table 3, although weekly alcohol use and parental divorce were strongly associated with increased odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt, high subjective mental wellbeing emerged as a strong correlate of reduced odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt. While living with no parents

# Table 1 Chi-square tests assessing the bivariate associations, stratified by suicidal behaviour

		Suicidal ideation in the previous 12 months				Suicidal attempt in the previous 12 months			
Variable	Sample distribution n (%)	No n (%)	Yes n (%)	χ2	<i>P</i> -value	No n (%)	<i>Yes</i> n (%)	χ2	<i>P</i> -value
Socio-demographic variables:									
Gender				0.997	·318			2.252	·133
Female	171 (38.0)	142 (83.0)	29 (17.0)			150 (87.7)	21 (12.3)		
Male	279 (62.0)	221 (79.2)	58 (20.8)			230 (82.4)	49 (17.6)		
Deafness status				8.083	.004			5.685	·017
Postnatal	168 (37.3)	124 (73.8)	44 (26-2)			133 (79-2)	35 (20.8)		
Congenital	282 (62.7)	239 (84.8)	43 (15-2)			247 (87.6)	35 (12.4)		
Grade:				3.239	·198			·691	·708
JHS 1	216 (48.0)	181 (83.8)	35 (16·2)			181 (83.8)	35 (16-2)		
JHS 2	73 (16-2)	59 (80.8)	14 (19.2)			64 (87.7)	9 (12.3)		
JHS 3	161 (35.8)	123 (76.4)	38 (23.6)			135 (83.9)	26 (16.1)		
Family structure				·002	·965				
Father has 1 wife	318 (72.6)	255 (80.2)	63 (19.8)			273 (85.8)	45 (14·2)	2.246	·134
Father has >1 wife	120 (27.4)	96 (80.0)	24 (20.0)			96 (80.0)	24 (20.0)		
Living arrangement:				12.592	.002			15.037	.001
Live with both parents	240 (54-4)	201 (83.8)	39 (16.3)			215 (89.6)	25 (10.4)		
Live with one parent	124 (28.1)	104 (83.9)	20 (16.1)			103 (83.1)	21 (16.9)		
Live with no parents	77 (17.5)	51 (66-2)	26 (33.8)			55 (71.4)	22 (28.6)		
In romantic relationship				4.643	.031			13.382	<.001
No	250 (56.3)	211 (84.4)	39 (15.6)			225 (90.0)	25 (10.0)		
Yes	194 (43.7)	148 (76.3)	46 (23.7)			150 (77.3)	44 (22.7)		
Religious group				7.232	.007			18.712	<.001
Christian	333 (74.5)	278 (83.5)	55 (16.5)			296 (88.9)	37 (11.1)		
Muslim	114 (25.5)	82 (71.9)	32 (28.1)			82 (71.9)	32 (28.1)		
Personal and lifestyle variables:									
Weekly alcohol use				29.037	<.001	302 (88.6)	39 (11.4)	21.204	<.001
Never drink alcohol	341 (77.0)	293 (85.9)	48 (14.1)			71 (69.6)	31 (30.4)		
>1 drink	102 (23.0)	63 (61.8)	39 (38.2)			( ,			
- Eamily factors:	, , ,	· · ·	· · ·						
Parental diverse				24 652	. 001			20.070	. 001
No	206 (66 8)	250 (07 2)	20 (12 0)	24.032	<.001	266 (20.0)	20 (10 1)	20.079	<.001
No	290 (00.6)	230 (07.2)	(۱۲۰۵) ۵۵ (۲۲۰۵) ۸۵			200 (09·9) 100 (72 E)	30 (10·1)		
Conflict with parapta	147 (55-2)	99 (07-5)	40 (32-7)	7 007	005	100 (73-3)	39 (20-3)	10 022	002
No.	277 (62 7)	22E (04 0)	40 (1E 0)	7.907	.005	JAC (00 0)	21/11 2)	10.025	·002
NO	277 (02.7)	235 (04·0)	42 (15·2)			240 (00·0)	21 (11·2)		
fes	(57.5)	122 (75-9)	45 (20-1)			120 (77.0)	57 (22.4)		
Schoolwork problems				1 01 7	029			1 101	041
	120 (20 1)	112 (00 0)	17 /12 2)	4.013	.028	116 (00.0)	12 (10 1)	4.184	•041
NO	129 (29.1)	112 (86·8)	70 (22.2)			259 (02.2)	13 (10·1)		
Yes	314 (70.9)	244 (77.7)	70 (22-3)			258 (82-2)	56 (17.8)		

(Continued)

		Suicidal ideation in the previous 12 months				Suicidal attempt in the previous 12 months			
Variable	Sample distribution n (%)	<i>No</i> n (%)	Yes n (%)	χ2	<i>P</i> -value	<i>No</i> n (%)	Yes n (%)	χ2	P-value
Bullying victimization				8.368	.004			6.071	·014
No	202 (44.9)	175 (86.6)	27 (13.4)			180 (89.1)	22 (10.9)		
Yes	248 (55.1)	188 (75·8)	60 (24.2)			200 (80.6)	48 (19.4)		
Interpersonal adversities:									
Break-up	298 (66-2)			2.786	.095			5.280	·022
No	152 (33.8)	247 (82.9)	51 (17.1)			260 (87.2)	38 (12.8)		
Yes		116 (76.3)	36 (23.7)			120 (78·9)	32 (21.1)		
Physical abuse victimization				37.398	<.001			15.445	<.001
No	292 (64.9)	260 (89.0)	32 (11.0)			261 (89.4)	31 (10.6)		
Yes	158 (35.1)	103 (65.2)	55 (34.8)			119 (75.3)	39 (24.7)		
Sexual abuse victimization				28.224	<.001			25.863	<.001
No	365 (82.6)	310 (84.9)	55 (15.1)			322 (88·2)	43 (11.8)		
Yes	158 (35-1)	45 (58-4)	32 (41.6)			50 (64.9)	27 (35.1)		

#### Table 1 Continued

Note:  $\chi 2 = Chi square$ 

Table 2 Point-biserial tests assessing the bivariate associations, stratified by suicidal behaviour

	Suicidal ide	ation in the previous	12 months	Suicidal att	Suicidal attempt in the previous 12 months			
Variable	n	r <sub>pb</sub>	P-value	n	r <sub>pb</sub>	P-value		
Socio-demographic variables:								
Age	450	.076	.106	450	.095	.044		
Personal and lifestyle variables:								
Subjective mental well-being	450	250	<.001	450	282	<.001		
Religious participation	444	132	.005	444	163	·001		
Family factors:								
Parental checking of homework	443	154	.001	443	064	·177		
Parental understanding	447		.008	447	123	.009		
Parental monitoring	445	063	·187	445	014	.775		
Parental intrusion of privacy	446	018	.712	446	037	.434		

Note: r<sub>pb</sub> = point biserial coefficient

(AOR = 2.358; 95% CI = 1.027, 5.414, P = .043), being in JHS 3 (AOR = 2.145; 95% CI = 1.004, 4.584, P = .049), and being deaf postnatally (AOR = 0.408; 95% CI = 0.205, 0.811, P = .011) were uniquely associated with increased odds of suicidal ideation, frequent parental checking of homework (AOR = 0.601; 95% CI = 0.448, 0.806, P = .001) was associated with reduced odds of suicidal ideation. Males were about two times likely than females to report suicidal attempt during the previous 12 months (AOR = 2.262; 95% CI = 1.032, 4.961, P = .042)—see Table 3.

# Discussion

#### Main findings of this study

Across the total sample, nearly two in 10 participants reported suicidal ideation, while one out of 10 participants reported suicidal attempt in the previous 12 months. The factors associated with suicidal ideation and attempt were multi-contextual: personal, family and school related. Although alcohol use and parental divorce were strongly associated with increased odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt, high subjective

Table 3	Multivariate	associations,	stratified	by suicidal	behaviour
---------	--------------	---------------	------------	-------------	-----------

Variables in model $\beta$ AOR         95% CI         Pvalue $\rho$ AOR         95% CI         Pvalue           Socio-demographic variables:		Suicidal ideation in the previous 12 months				Suicidal attempt in the previous 12 months			
Socio-demographic variables:         Socio-demographic variables:           Gender         434         1-543         -767, 3-105         -224         -816         2-262         1-032, 4-961         -042           Age         0.00         1.000         -866, 1-155         -998         -038         1-038         -888, 1-215         -638           Dearhess status        997         408         -205, 811         0.11        386         -680         -322, 1437         -312           Grade:	Variables in model	β	AOR	95% Cl	P-value	β	AOR	95% Cl	P-value
Gender4341.543.767, 3.105.224.8162.2621.032, 4.961.042Age.0001.000.866, 1.155.998.038.1038.888, 1.215.638Deafnes status	Socio-demographic variables:								
Age         000         1.000         866, 1.155         .98         0.38         1.038         .888, 1.215         .638           Deafness status	Gender	.434	1.543	·767, 3·105	·224	·816	2.262	1.032, 4.961	.042
Deafness status        897         408         -205, 811         -011        386         -680         -322, 1.437         -312           Grade:         JHS 1         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         -0.44         .957         .420, 2.184         .917           Family structure        458         .632         .266, 1.349         .236         .020         .1224         .433, 3.462         .704           Live with both parents         Reference         Reference         Reference         Reference         .020         .1357         .602, 3.058         .462           Live with one parents        721         .486         .216, 1.095         .082         .0351         .1357         .602, 3.058         .462           Live with one parents        721         .486         .1027, 5.414         .043         .891         .100         .105         .493, 2.480         .808           Religious group        200         .819         .383, 1.749         .666         .608         .836         .736, 1.067         .201           Weekly alcohol use         .950         .258         .1211, 5.50	Age	.000	1.000	·866, 1·155	.998	.038	1.038	·888, 1·215	·638
Grade:         matrix         Reference         Reference         Reference           JHS 1         Ref         Ref         2387         947, 6.014         0.60         2.02         1.224         4.33, 3.462         7.04           JHS 3         .763         2.145         1.004, 4.584         0.49         -0.44         957         4.20, 2.184         9.17           Family structure        458         0.32         2.96, 1.349         2.36         1.229         1.38         .522, 2.479         .745           Live with horparents         Reference	Deafness status	897	·408	·205, ·811	·011	386	·680	·322, 1·437	·312
JHS 1       Reference       Reference       Reference       Image: Note of the second sec	Grade:								
JHS 2       870       2.387       .947, 6.014       .065       .202       1.224       .433, 3.462       .704         JHS 3       .763       2.145       1.004, 4.584       .049      0.44       .957       .420, 2.184       .917         Family structure	JHS 1	Reference				Reference	e		
JHS 3       -763       2.145       1.004, 4.584       .049      044       .957       .420, 2.184       .917         Family structure      458       .632       .296, 1.349       .236       .129       1.138       .522, 2.479       .745         Living arrangement:	JHS 2	·870	2.387	·947, 6·014	.065	·202	1.224	·433, 3·462	·704
Family structure        458         632         -296, 1-349         -236         -129         1-138         -522, 2-479         -745           Living arrangement:         Live with hot parents         Reference         V <td>JHS 3</td> <td>.763</td> <td>2.145</td> <td>1.004, 4.584</td> <td>.049</td> <td>044</td> <td>.957</td> <td>·420, 2·184</td> <td>·917</td>	JHS 3	.763	2.145	1.004, 4.584	.049	044	.957	·420, 2·184	·917
Living arrangement:         Reference         Reference           Live with both parents         Reference         Reference         Reference           Live with nop parents         RS8         2.358         1.027, 5.414         .043         .901         .1537         .602, 3.058         .4037           In romantic relationship         .057         1.059         .499, 2.249         .881         .100         .105         .493, 2.480         .808           Religious group        200         .819         .383, 1.749         .606         .608         .846, 3.986         .121           Personal and lifestyle variables:	Family structure	458	·632	·296, 1·349	·236	·129	1.138	·522, 2·479	.745
Live with both parentsReferenceReferenceLive with nop parents721486216, 1.095.082.3051.357.602, 3.058.462Live with nop parents.8582.3581.027, 5.414.043.8912.437.971, 6.116.058In romantic relationship.0571.059.499, 2.249.881.1001.105.493, 2.480.808Religious group.200.819.383, 1.749.606.608.1.836.846, 3.965.125Personal and lifestyle variables:	Living arrangement:								
Live with one parent      721       .486       .216, 1.095       .082       .305       1.357       .602, 3.058       .462         Live with no parents       .858       .2.358       1.027, 5.414       .043       .891       2.437       .971, 6.116       .058         In romantic relationship       .057       1.059       .499, 2.249       .881       .100       1.105       .493, 2.480       .808         Religious group       .020       .819       .383, 1.749       .606       .608       1.836       .846, 3.986       .125         Personal and lifestyle variables:	Live with both parents	Reference				Reference	e		
Live with no parents       .858       2.358       1.027, 5.414       .043       .891       2.437       .971, 6.116       .058         In romantic relationship       .057       1.059       .499, 2.249       .881       .100       1.105       .493, 2.480       .808         Religious group      200       .819       .383, 1.749       .666       .608       1.836       .846, 3.986       .125         Personal and lifestyle variables:	Live with one parent	721	·486	·216, 1·095	.082	.305	1.357	·602, 3·058	·462
In romantic relationship.0571.059.499, 2.249.881.1001.105.493, 2.480.808Religious group200.819.383, 1.749.606.6081.836.846, 3.986.125Personal and lifestyle variables: </td <td>Live with no parents</td> <td>·858</td> <td>2.358</td> <td>1.027, 5.414</td> <td>.043</td> <td>.891</td> <td>2.437</td> <td>·971, 6·116</td> <td>·058</td>	Live with no parents	·858	2.358	1.027, 5.414	.043	.891	2.437	·971, 6·116	·058
Religious group200.819.383, 1.749.606.6081.836.846, 3.986.125Personal and lifestyle variables:Subjective mental well-being052.949.915, .984.005079.924.884, .965<.001	In romantic relationship	.057	1.059	·499, 2·249	·881	·100	1.105	·493, 2·480	·808·
Personal and lifestyle variables:	Religious group	200	·819	·383, 1·749	.606	.608	1.836	·846, 3·986	·125
Subjective mental well-being $052$ $.949$ $.915, .984$ $.005$ $079$ $.924$ $.884, .965$ $<.001$ Religious participation $038$ $.963$ $.806, 1.150$ $.676$ $121$ $.886$ $.736, 1.067$ $.201$ Weekly alcohol use $.950$ $2.585$ $1.211, 5.520$ $.014$ $1.010$ $2.745$ $1.251, 6.025$ $.012$ Family factors: $$	Personal and lifestyle variables:								
Religious participation      038       .963       .806, 1.150       .676      121       .886       .736, 1.067       .201         Weekly alcohol use       .950       .2585       1.211, 5.520       .014       1.010       2.745       1.251, 6.025       .012         Family factors:	Subjective mental well-being	052	.949	·915, ·984	.005	-·079	·924	·884, ·965	<.001
Weekly alcohol use       .950       2.585       1.211, 5.520       .014       1.010       2.745       1.251, 6.025       .012         Family factors:       .972       2.028       1.121, 4.346       .022       .779       2.180       1.028, 4.623       .042         Conflict with parents       .185       1.203       .594, 2.438       .607       .338       1.402       .652, 3.015       .386         Parental checking of homework      510       .601       .448, 806       .001      123       .885       .648, 1.207       .439         Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1.294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1.376       .994         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1.331       .975         Schoolwork problems       .405       1.500       .674, 3.338       .321       .305       1.356       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Religious participation	038	·963	·806, 1·150	.676	-·121	·886	·736, 1·067	·201
Family factors:       792       2:208       1:121, 4:346       .022       .779       2:180       1.028, 4:623       .042         Conflict with parents       .185       1:203       .594, 2:438       .607       .338       1:402       .652, 3:015       .386         Parental checking of homework      510       .601       .448, 806       .001      123       .885       .648, 1:207       .439         Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1:294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1:376       .994         Parental understanding       .026       1.026       .788, 1:336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1:552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1:425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1:31       .975         School factors:	Weekly alcohol use	·950	2.585	1.211, 5.520	·014	1.010	2.745	1.251, 6.025	·012
Parental divorce       .792       2.208       1.121, 4.346       .022       .779       2.180       1.028, 4.623       .042         Conflict with parents       .185       1.203       .594, 2.438       .607       .338       1.402       .652, 3.015       .386         Parental checking of homework      510       .601       .448, 806       .001      123       .885       .648, 1.207       .439         Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1.294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1.376       .994         Parental monitoring       .026       .1026       .788, 1.336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1.552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       .1112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.055       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Family factors:								
Conflict with parents       .185       1.203       .594, 2.438       .607       .338       1.402       .652, 3.015       .386         Parental checking of homework      510       .601       .448, 806       .001      123       .885       .648, 1.207       .439         Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1.294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1.376       .994         Parental monitoring       .026       1.026       .788, 1.336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1.552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1.331       .975         Schoolwork problems       .405       1.500       .674, 3.338       .321       .305       1.356       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Parental divorce	.792	2.208	1.121, 4.346	·022	.779	2.180	1.028, 4.623	·042
Parental checking of homework      510       .601       .448, .806       .001      123       .885       .648, 1.207       .439         Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1.294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1.376       .994         Parental monitoring       .026       1.026       .788, 1.336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1.552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1.331       .975         School factors:       .       .233       1.500       .674, 3.338       .321       .305       1.356       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Conflict with parents	·185	1.203	·594, 2·438	·607	.338	1.402	·652, 3·015	·386
Parental understanding      019       .981       .744, 1.294       .892      001       .999       .725, 1.376       .994         Parental monitoring       .026       1.026       .788, 1.336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1.552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1.331       .975         School factors:	Parental checking of homework	·510	·601	·448, ·806	.001	-·123	·885	·648, 1·207	·439
Parental monitoring       .026       1.026       .788, 1.336       .850       .132       1.142       .840, 1.552       .398         Parental intrusion of privacy       .106       1.112       .867, 1.425       .403       .005       1.005       .758, 1.331       .975         School factors:	Parental understanding	019	·981	.744, 1.294	·892	001	.999	.725, 1.376	·994
Parental intrusion of privacy $\cdot 106$ $1 \cdot 112$ $\cdot 867, 1 \cdot 425$ $\cdot 403$ $\cdot 005$ $1 \cdot 005$ $\cdot 758, 1 \cdot 331$ $\cdot 975$ School factors:       School vork problems $\cdot 405$ $1 \cdot 500$ $\cdot 674, 3 \cdot 338$ $\cdot 321$ $\cdot 305$ $1 \cdot 356$ $\cdot 564, 3 \cdot 264$ $\cdot 496$ Bullying victimization $\cdot 233$ $1 \cdot 262$ $\cdot 626, 2 \cdot 543$ $\cdot 515$ $\cdot 069$ $1 \cdot 071$ $\cdot 496, 2 \cdot 312$ $\cdot 861$ Interpersonal adversities:       Break-up $- \cdot 293$ $\cdot 746$ $\cdot 341, 1 \cdot 630$ $\cdot 463$ $- \cdot 287$ $\cdot 750$ $\cdot 329, 1 \cdot 713$ $\cdot 495$ Physical abuse victimization $1 \cdot 273$ $3 \cdot 572$ $1 \cdot 795, 7 \cdot 108$ $\cdot 000$ $\cdot 430$ $1 \cdot 537$ $\cdot 728, 3 \cdot 244$ $\cdot 260$ Sexual abuse victimization $1 \cdot 029$ $2 \cdot 798$ $1 \cdot 253, 6 \cdot 250$ $\cdot 012$ $\cdot 678$ $1 \cdot 969$ $\cdot 832, 4 \cdot 663$ $\cdot 123$ Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> $\cdot 272$ $\cdot 272$ $\cdot 229$ $\cdot 766 (\cdot 467)$ Overall percentage correctly classif	Parental monitoring	.026	1.026	·788, 1·336	·850	·132	1.142	·840, 1·552	.398
School factors:       -405       1.500       .674, 3.338       .321       .305       1.356       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Parental intrusion of privacy	·106	1.112	·867, 1·425	.403	.005	1.005	.758, 1.331	·975
Schoolwork problems       .405       1.500       .674, 3.338       .321       .305       1.356       .564, 3.264       .496         Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	School factors:								
Bullying victimization       .233       1.262       .626, 2.543       .515       .069       1.071       .496, 2.312       .861         Interpersonal adversities:	Schoolwork problems	.405	1.500	·674, 3·338	·321	.305	1.356	·564, 3·264	·496
Interpersonal adversities:         Break-up      293       .746       .341, 1.630       .463      287       .750       .329, 1.713       .495         Physical abuse victimization       1.273       3.572       1.795, 7.108       .000       .430       1.537       .728, 3.244       .260         Sexual abuse victimization       1.029       2.798       1.253, 6.250       .012       .678       1.969       .832, 4.663       .123         Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> .433       .402       .402       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .216 (.467)       .229       .216 (.467)       .216 (.	Bullying victimization	·233	1.262	·626, 2·543	·515	.069	1.071	.496, 2.312	·861
Break-up      293       .746       .341, 1.630       .463      287       .750       .329, 1.713       .495         Physical abuse victimization       1.273       3.572       1.795, 7.108       .000       .430       1.537       .728, 3.244       .260         Sexual abuse victimization       1.029       2.798       1.253, 6.250       .012       .678       1.969       .832, 4.663       .123         Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> .433       .402       .402       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .229       .206       .229 <t< td=""><td>Interpersonal adversities:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Interpersonal adversities:								
Physical abuse victimization       1·273       3·572       1·795, 7·108       ·000       ·430       1·537       ·728, 3·244       ·260         Sexual abuse victimization       1·029       2·798       1·253, 6·250       ·012       ·678       1·969       ·832, 4·663       ·123         Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> ·433       ·402       ·229       ·229       ·229         Hosmer-Lemeshow GOF test (sig.)       3·93 (·863)       7·66 (·467)       ·88.7	Break-up	293	.746	.341 1.630	.463	287	.750	.329 1.713	.495
Sexual abuse victimization       1.029       2.798       1.253, 6.250       0.012       678       1.969       .832, 4.663       .123         Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> .433       .402         Cox & Snell R <sup>2</sup> .272       .229         Hosmer-Lemeshow GOF test (sig.)       3.93 (.863)       7.66 (.467)         Overall percentage correctly classified       85.8       88.7	Physical abuse victimization	1.273	3.572	1.795 7.108	.000	.430	1.537	.728, 3.244	.260
Nagelkerke pseudo R <sup>2</sup> .433     .402       Cox & Snell R <sup>2</sup> .272     .229       Hosmer-Lemeshow GOF test (sig.)     3.93 (.863)     7.66 (.467)       Overall percentage correctly classified     85.8     88.7	Sexual abuse victimization	1.029	2.798	1.253 6.250	.012	.678	1.969	.832, 4.663	.123
Cox & Snell R <sup>2</sup> .272     .229       Hosmer-Lemeshow GOF test (sig.)     3.93 (.863)     7.66 (.467)       Overall percentage correctly classified     85.8     88.7	Nagelkerke pseudo $R^2$		.433	. 200, 0 200	0.2	0.0	.402	552, . 555	
Hosmer-Lemeshow GOF test (sig-) 3-93 (-863) 7-66 (-467) Overall percentage correctly classified 85-8 88-7	$Cox \& Snell B^2$		.272				.229		
Overall percentage correctly classified 85.8 88.7	Hosmer-Lemeshow GOE test (sig.)		3.93 (.86	3)			7.66 (.46	57)	
	Overall percentage correctly classified		85.8	_,			88.7	.,	

Note:  $\beta$  = beta value; AOR = adjusted odds ratios; CI = Confidence Interval; GOF = goodness of fit

mental well-being was associated with reduced odds of both suicidal ideation and attempt. Living with no parents, being a final year student and being deaf postnatally were strongly associated with increased odds of suicidal ideation, while male gender was associated with increased odds of suicidal attempt. Although age showed positive associations with suicidal ideation and attempt, these associations did not reach the desired statistical significance.

#### What is already known on this topic

Most of what is already known about this topic is from highincome context, with earlier systematic reviews identifying no studies from LAMICs.8,13 Earlier evidence from highincome countries suggests that lifetime estimates of suicidal ideation among deaf adolescents ranges widely between 4.6 and 44%, while 12-month attempted suicide ranges between 1.7 and 18%.13 Recently, a county-wide cross-sectional study from the USA has reported a 12-month prevalence estimates of attempted suicide (14.9%) among deaf adolescents.<sup>11</sup> Generally, major depression, family dysfunction, low academic performance, alcohol use, peer victimization and peer relationship difficulties and sexual abuse victimization have been reported as significant associations of suicidal ideation and attempt among adolescents with functional disabilities in high-income countries.<sup>11,13,14,39</sup> The only available study reporting evidence from a low-income country is a recent school-based cross-sectional survey from Pakistan that reports lifetime suicidal attempt (19%) and 12-month suicidal ideation (17%) among school-going deaf adolescents.<sup>15</sup>

#### What this study adds

This study represents a pioneering attempt at providing evidence on suicidal behaviours among deaf adolescents from Ghana; the evidence could be potentially informative for more expansive epidemiological studies from Ghana and other sub-Saharan African countries. Although the prevalence estimates and associated factors of suicidal behaviours in the current study are comparable to those reported among inschool non-deaf adolescents in Ghana and other countries in sub-Saharan Africa,<sup>19-24</sup> the adjusted multivariate logistic models of the current study have shown two new specific evidence: (1) there is a significant negative association between subjective mental well-being and both suicidal ideation and attempt, and (2) adolescents with congenital deafness are less likely to report suicidal ideation, compared to adolescents of postnatal deafness. These underscore the need for universal and targeted prevention efforts aimed at improving the mental well-being of school-going deaf adolescents in Ghana. Put together, although further studies (including qualitative research) are needed to explore the lived experiences and meanings of suicidal behaviours among school-going deaf adolescents in Ghana, the evidence of the current study could be pointing to the possibility that both adolescents without disabilities and those with disabilities may be faced with common multiple distress and challenges of health, education, growth and development, and family and social adversities in sub-Saharan Africa.<sup>40-44</sup>

#### Limitations of this study

Considering that in cross-sectional surveys both the outcome and exposure variables are measured at the same point in time, it stands to suggests that the evidence reported in this study cannot support causal inferences.<sup>45</sup> Although the use of single-item measures affords the opportunity of screening a larger sample at one point in time for suicidal behaviours, single-item measures have the potential of leading to misclassification of suicidal behaviour.46,47 Relatedly, the self-report approach used (instead of a diagnostic approach) might have yielded less reliable responses in respect of suicidal ideation and attempt. Furthermore, besides the high tendency of nondisclosure among young people in suicide research,<sup>48</sup> some participants in this study might have also provided socially desirable responses due to the highly stigmatized and criminalized nature of attempted suicide in Ghana.<sup>49,50</sup> While these limitations provide a critical basis for cautious interpretations of the findings, the inclusion of a nationally representative sample of deaf students in JHSs in Ghana could make the findings a good reflection of the national prevalence and associated factors of suicidal ideation and attempt among deaf students attending JHSs.

#### Conclusions

The prevalence of suicidal ideation and attempt among deaf adolescents in this study compares with estimates among nondeaf adolescents in Ghana and other LAMICs in Africa, but also highlights the need for targeted and universal prevention efforts against the onset of suicidal ideation and possible transition to attempt and suicide among deaf adolescents.

# Data availability statement

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

# **Conflict of interest**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

# Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

# **Authors' contributions**

E.Q. and D.F. contributed to the study concept and design; E.A., C.H.-M., J.F. and O.A. conducted the data collection; E.Q. performed statistical analysis of the data; J.A.-A. and K.O.A. contributed to the interpretation of the results; E.Q., D.F., E.A., C.H.-M., J.F. and O.A. drafted the manuscript and D.F., E.A., J.A.-A. and K.O.A. critiqued the manuscript for important intellectual content. All the authors contributed to the revision of the manuscript and approved the final version.

# Supplementary data

Supplementary data are available at the *Journal of Public Health* online.

#### Acknowledgements

We wish to thank all the Special Education Unit of the Ghana Education Service and heads of all the participating schools who granted permissions for this study. We also thank parents/guardians of the underage participants who consented for their wards to participate in this study. Finally, we thank all the students contributed data about their suicidal behaviours to this study.

# References

- 1 WHO. Preventing suicide, a global imperative. Geneva: WHO, 2014.
- 2 WHO. *Suicide: key facts*, 2019. from https://www.who.int/news-room/ fact-sheets/detail/suicide (5 March 2020, date last accessed).
- 3 Bachmann S. Epidemiology of suicide and the psychiatric perspective. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2018;**15**(7):1425.
- 4 Naghavi M, Global Burden of Disease Self-Harm Collaborators. 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.
- 5 Klonsky ED, May AM, Saffer BY. Suicide, suicide attempts, and suicidal ideation. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol* 2016;**12**:307–30.
- 6 Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D *et al.* Suicide and suicide risk. *Nat Rev* Dis Primers 2019;5(1):1–22.
- 7 De Leo D, Hickey PA, Meneghel G et al. Blindness, fear of sight loss, and suicide. Psychosomatics 1999;40(4):339–44.
- 8 Stevenson J, Kreppner J, Pimperton H et al. Emotional and behavioural difficulties in children and adolescents with hearing impairment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry 2015;24(5):477–96.
- 9 Fellinger J, Holzinger D, Sattel H et al. Correlates of mental health disorders among children with hearing impairments. *Dev Med Child Neurol* 2009;51(8):635–41.
- 10 Van Gent T, Goedhart AW, Treffers PD. Self-concept and psychopathology in deaf adolescents: preliminary support for moderating effects of deafness-related characteristics and peer problems. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2011;**52(6)**:720–8.

- Moses T. Suicide attempts among adolescents with self-reported disabilities. *Child Psychiatry Hum Dev* 2018;49(3):420–33.
- 12 Milner A, Bollier A-M, Emerson E *et al.* The relationship between disability and suicide: prospective evidence from the ten to men cohort. *J Public Health* 2019;**41**(**4**):707–13.
- 13 Turner O, Windfuhr K, Kapur N. Suicide in deaf populations: a literature review. Ann Gen Psychiatry 2007;6(1):26.
- 14 Gryglewicz K, Bozzay M, Arthur-Jordon B et al. A silenced population: uncovering correlates of suicidal-related behavior among deaf and hard-of-hearing youth. Crisis 2017;38(6):433–42.
- 15 Akram B, Batool M. Suicidal behavior among the youth with and without sensory impairment: prevalence and comparison. OMEGA-Journal of Death and Dying 2020;81(3):393–403.
- 16 Van Gent T, Goedhart AW, Hindley PA et al. Prevalence and correlates of psychopathology in a sample of deaf adolescents. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 2007;48(9):950–8.
- 17 Titus JC, Schiller JA, Guthmann D. Characteristics of youths with hearing loss admitted to substance abuse treatment. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ* 2008;**13**(3):336–50.
- 18 Margaret Brown P, Cornes A. Mental health of deaf and hard-ofhearing adolescents: what the students say. J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ 2015;20(1):75–81.
- 19 Aggarwal S, Patton G, Reavley N *et al.* Youth self-harm in low-and middle-income countries: systematic review of the risk and protective factors. *Int J Soc Psychiatry* 2017;63(4):359–75.
- 20 Uddin R, Burton NW, Maple M et al. Suicidal ideation, suicide planning, and suicide attempts among adolescents in 59 low-income and middle-income countries: a population-based study. The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health 2019;3(4):223–33.
- 21 Biswas T, Scott JG, Munir K *et al.* Global variation in the prevalence of suicidal ideation, anxiety and their correlates among adolescents: a population based study of 82 countries. *EClinicalMedicine* 2020;82(24). doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100395.
- 22 Campisi SC, Carducci B, Akseer N *et al.* Suicidal behaviours among adolescents from 90 countries: a pooled analysis of the global school-based student health survey. *BMC Public Health* 2020;**20**(1): 1–11.
- 23 Quarshie ENB, Waterman MG, House AO. Self-harm with suicidal and non-suicidal intent in young people in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry* 2020;**20**(234):1–26.
- 24 Asante KO, Kugbey N, Osafo J et al. The prevalence and correlates of suicidal behaviours (ideation, plan and attempt) among adolescents in senior high schools in Ghana. SSM-Population Health 2017;3: 427–34.
- 25 Lim K-S, Wong CH, McIntyre RS *et al.* Global lifetime and 12-month prevalence of suicidal behavior, deliberate self-harm and non-suicidal self-injury in children and adolescents between 1989 and 2018: a metaanalysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2019;**16**(22):4581.
- 26 Acheampong AK, Aziato L. Suicidal ideations and coping strategies of mothers living with physical disabilities: a qualitative exploratory study in Ghana. *BMC Psychiatry* 2018;**18**(1):1–8.
- 27 Senayah EA, Mprah WK, Opoku MP *et al.* The accessibility of health services to young deaf adolescents in Ghana. *Int J Health Plann Manage* 2019;**34**(1):e634–e45.

- 28 Vandenbroucke JP, Von Elm E, Altman DG *et al.* Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med* 2007;**4**(**10**):e297.
- 29 Yamane T. Statistics: an introductory analysis, 2nd edn. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- 30 WHO. Global school-based student health survey (GSHS). 2019. https:// www.who.int/ncds/surveillance/gshs/ghana/en/ (10 January 2018, date last accessed).
- 31 Koenig HG, Büssing A. The Duke University religion index (DUREL): a five-item measure for use in epidemological studies. *Religions* 2010;**1**(1):78–85.
- 32 Hawton K, Saunders KE, O'Connor RC. Self-harm and suicide in adolescents. *The Lancet* 2012;**379**(9834):2373–82.
- 33 Clarke A, Friede T, Putz R et al. Warwick-Edinburgh mental wellbeing scale (WEMWBS): validated for teenage school students in England and Scotland. A mixed methods assessment. BMC Public Health 2011;11(1):487.
- 34 Stewart-Brown S. The Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS): performance in different cultural and geographical groups. In: Keyes CLM (ed). *Mental Well-Being: international contributions* to the study of positive mental health. London: Springer, 2013, 133–50.
- 35 Graham JW. Missing data analysis: making it work in the real world. Annu Rev Psychol 2009;60:549–76.
- 36 Sun G-W, Shook TL, Kay GL. Inappropriate use of bivariable analysis to screen risk factors for use in multivariable analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1996;**49**(8):907–16.
- 37 Babyak MA. What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med* 2004;66(3):411–21.
- 38 Linsell L, Malouf R, Morris J *et al.* Risk factor models for neurodevelopmental outcomes in children born very preterm or with very low birth weight: a systematic review of methodology and reporting. *Am J Epidemiol* 2017;**185**(7):601–12.

- 39 Butcher E, Dezateux C, Cortina-Borja M et al. Mental health in young people with hearing loss: longitudinal analysis of the millennium cohort study. J Epidemiol Community Health 2019;73(1):A27.
- 40 Blum RW. Youth in sub-Saharan Africa. J Adolesc Health 2007;41(3):230–8.
- 41 Owen JP, Baig B, Abbo C *et al.* Child and adolescent mental health in sub-Saharan Africa: a perspective from clinicians and researchers. *BJPsych International* 2016;**13**(2):45–7.
- 42 Adjei JK, Saewyc EM. Boys are not exempt: sexual exploitation of adolescents in sub-Saharan Africa. *Child Abuse Negl* 2017;65: 14–23.
- 43 African Union. State of Africa's population 2017: Keeping rights of girls, adolescents and young women at the centre of Africa's demographic dividend. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: African Union, 2017.
- 44 Harber C. Schooling in Sub-Saharan Africa: Policy, practice and patterns. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2017.
- 45 Woodward M. Epidemiology. Study design and data analysis. London, UK: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group, 2014.
- 46 Millner AJ, Lee MD, Nock MK. Single-item measurement of suicidal behaviors: validity and consequences of misclassification. *PLoS One* 2015;10(10):e0141606.
- 47 Hom MA, Joiner TE Jr, Bernert RA. Limitations of a single-item assessment of suicide attempt history: implications for standardized suicide risk assessment. *Psychol Assess* 2016;28(8):1026–30.
- 48 De Luca S, Yan Y, Lytle M *et al.* The associations of race/ethnicity and suicidal ideation among college students: a latent class analysis examining precipitating events and disclosure patterns. *Suicide Life Threat Bebav* 2014;44(4):444–56.
- 49 The Parliament of Ghana. Criminal Offences Act of Ghana. Act 29, 1960. Accra, Ghana: Assembly Press, 1960.
- 50 Osafo J, Akotia CS, Andoh-Arthur J et al. Attempted suicide in Ghana: motivation, stigma, and coping. *Death Stud* 2015;**39**(5): 274–80.