



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY
Ricardo Gusmão,
University of Porto, Portugal

REVIEWED BY
M. David Rudd,
University of Memphis, United States

*CORRESPONDENCE
Christian Greiner
✉ christian.greiner@hug.ch

RECEIVED 13 August 2025
ACCEPTED 21 August 2025
PUBLISHED 04 September 2025

CITATION
Greiner C, Huber J, Prada P and Large M
(2025) Beyond risk: rethinking
hospitalization for suicidal individuals.
Front. Psychiatry 16:1684927.
doi: 10.3389/fpsy.2025.1684927

COPYRIGHT
© 2025 Greiner, Huber, Prada and Large. This
is an open-access article distributed under the
terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s) and the
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or reproduction
is permitted which does not comply with
these terms.

Beyond risk: rethinking hospitalization for suicidal individuals

Christian Greiner^{1*}, Jacqueline Huber², Paco Prada¹
and Matthew Large³

¹Liaison Psychiatry and Crisis Intervention, Department of Psychiatry, Geneva University Hospital, Geneva, Switzerland, ²Mental Health, St Vincent's Hospital Sydney, Darlinghurst, Australia, ³Discipline of Psychiatry and Mental Health, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

KEYWORDS

suicide prevention and intervention, risk assessment, psychiatric hospitalization, clinical formulation, relational approach

Introduction

Efforts to prevent suicide have traditionally focused on identifying “high-risk” groups and protecting them, often through psychiatric hospitalization, which is considered the ultimate safeguard. However, decades of research have demonstrated that predicting individual suicide deaths is impossible at both the point of entry (1) and the point of exit from hospital (2). Suicide risk assessments, once considered foundational to practice, have shown limited reliability and poor predictive value. Meta-analyses consistently reveal that most individuals labeled as “high risk” do not die by suicide, while many who do are not identified (3, 4). Similar concerns arise from reviews of deaths by suicide occurring shortly after assessments in healthcare settings, highlighting that the assessment process itself offers little protection when not paired with sustained and relational care (5). Only recently have these facts started to gain mainstream recognition (6); yet, clinical practice, likely influenced by community expectations, continues to be shaped by the entrenched belief that admission and discharge decisions hinge on the illusion of precise risk assessment. In fact, research highlights how clinicians’ emotional regulation abilities may affect risk evaluations and hospitalization decisions, especially in uncertain and emotionally charged clinical interactions (7).

Additionally, meta-analytic data indicate that suicide rates remain alarmingly high immediately after discharge, even when the protective effect of hospitalization is assumed to peak (2, 8, 9), concluding that there is no evidence that hospitalization reduces suicide risk (10). In fact, there exists recent evidence that hospitalization may increase risk of suicide attempts, though those who attempted suicide within the past day were found to possibly benefit from hospitalization (11). As a result, we are now facing a significant ethical and clinical reckoning. If accurate risk assessment does not guide decision-making, then what does? If admission does not reliably mitigate the risk of suicide, whom should we admit, and what should admission aim to achieve?

In this piece, we argue that hospitalization based on “risk assessment” is inappropriate, unfeasible, and potentially harmful. Instead, we should focus on goals that do not aim to reduce “risk”, such as pursuing highly effective relational approaches for individuals presenting to hospitals with suicidality.

The limits of suicide prediction

It is now widely recognized that our ability to predict suicide remains effectively “no better than chance” (3), with risk instruments inevitably producing numerous false positives and negatives. Even if we were to consider stratified risk assessment as beneficial, all individuals admitted to hospitals for psychiatric care fall into the “high-risk” category, ultimately rendering this categorization ineffective. Moreover, widely used instruments such as the Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS) have demonstrated poor predictive value in emergency settings, with large U.S. and Swedish cohorts reporting negligible discrimination and very low positive predictive values, and additional findings suggesting that ideation ratings were insensitive to risk after discharge (12–14). Furthermore, an excessive focus on risk categorization may hinder care. As Smith et al. described, an “appropriately narrow focus” on diagnosis and risk factors can lead to hasty or inconsistent decision making, compromising therapeutic engagement (15). For this reason, and given the ineffectiveness of suicide risk assessments, it is crucial to reassess the role of hospitalization in suicidal individuals.

Hospitalization and suicide outcomes

Psychiatric admissions are frequently viewed as the ultimate safeguard for patients with suicide. However, evidence indicates that admissions do not appear to prevent suicide. In fact, the period following discharge is exceptionally high-risk, a result that remains unaffected by the duration of an individual’s hospital stay (2). A meta-analysis of global data revealed that the suicide rate in the first three months post-discharge was approximately 100 times the global average. For patients admitted because of suicidal thoughts or attempts, the relative risk was even greater, reaching approximately 200-fold (8).

This post-discharge vulnerability may not necessarily suggest that the act of hospitalization is inherently harmful or ineffective. It is often argued, for example, that these statistics highlight both the severity of the crises that clinicians admit for inpatient care, and the structural weaknesses in managing transitions out of the hospital (16); or that the sudden loss of structure, disconnection from therapeutic relationships, and delays in starting outpatient follow-up may contribute to this period of increased risk (17, 18). It should also be acknowledged that in some specific situations such as acute psychotic episodes where suicidality may be present, hospitalization retains utility by providing medical stabilization and access to pharmacological or structured interventions that are not always feasible in community settings. However, there is also evidence that hospitalization itself may intensify distress and incidence of suicide attempts, particularly when

it is perceived as coercive, depersonalizing, or disconnected from the patient’s subjective needs (11, 19, 20), or when individuals are involuntarily hospitalized (21). Interestingly, there is evidence that rates of in-patient suicide vary widely, suggesting that differences in hospital practices may contribute to suicide rate heterogeneity (22).

Heterogeneity and hospitalization

Randomized trials that specifically evaluated hospitalization as an intervention are limited. However, studies on specific clinical interventions have provided valuable insights. For example, brief suicide-focused therapies, safety planning, and post-crisis outreach have all demonstrated benefits. A recent meta-analysis of acute care interventions found that a single targeted session, typically involving a collaboratively developed safety plan and connection to follow-up care, was linked to approximately 30% fewer subsequent suicide attempts (23). In contrast, few randomized controlled trials have directly examined the impact of inpatient admission, with existing studies largely relying on correlational designs (24). While some structured, time-limited therapeutic interventions during hospitalization, such as those focusing on emotion regulation or relational stabilization, have shown promise (25), many routine practices (e.g., constant observation, safety contracts, or seclusion) lack robust empirical support, and interventions and outcome measures are heterogeneous (26, 27). Importantly, none has demonstrated efficacy in suicide prevention.

In practice, hospitalization often functions less as a targeted clinical intervention and more as an institutional reflex aimed at managing acute crises and institutional anxiety (28). This underscores the importance of critically examining the conditions under which it is used, what it aims to achieve, and how it is embedded within a broader continuum of care. If not carefully conceptualized and supported by post-discharge continuity, hospitalization risks being simply an episode of respite, only with the potential for significant harm. To fully grasp the persistent reliance on hospitalization, despite limited evidence, we must turn our attention to the powerful symbolic and emotional expectations it carries for clinicians, patients, and families.

Admissions are nonetheless likely to occur

Despite the limited empirical support for its effectiveness, hospitalization remains widely regarded as a life-saving intervention. Within the mental health ecosystem, it serves as a symbol of reassurance: clinicians view it as a way to “contain risk,” families see it as an act of protection, and those in crisis perceive it as a safe haven and signifier of the seriousness of their suffering (29, 30). Concerns about litigation, institutional scrutiny, and personal responsibility can lead to decisions that are procedurally safer but not necessarily based on therapeutic rationale (31). Meanwhile, individuals in crises may experience admission as either validation or condemnation, sometimes finding temporary relief, while at other times reinforcing narratives of helplessness (19, 23). Confronted with intolerable uncertainty, high

emotional stakes, and institutional expectations, clinicians may resort to hospitalization not out of belief in its therapeutic value but as a response to systemic anxiety and medicolegal pressures (29, 32). Thus, hospitalization becomes a symbolic gesture of having acted and protected rather than enacting appropriate care in response to a clinical formulation.

In the current cultural context, admissions for individuals expressing suicidality frequently occur even in the absence of clear evidence for their effectiveness, and given the marked variability in outcomes across hospitals, such decisions may at times be justifiable. Within this clinical reality, we must ask: how might hospital admission serve a meaningful therapeutic function? We argue that it could be conceptualized not merely as a containment strategy, but as a time-limited, formulation-based clinical intervention. Preliminary evidence supports the efficacy of brief admissions when combined with targeted suicide-focused interventions (25). Structured psychotherapeutic tools such as safety planning, crisis response planning, and brief mentalization-based or cognitive-interpersonal strategies can be integrated into inpatient care to reduce suicidal ideation and behaviors (26, 33, 34) though, to our knowledge, not deaths by suicide. Rather than relying on standardized risk thresholds, the decision to hospitalize should emerge from an individualized understanding of the patient's psychological functioning, interpersonal dynamics and current stressors; that is, through a collaborative clinical formulation (24, 35).

Goals, not risk

Confronted with the limitations of current knowledge and lack of reliable predictive tools, clinicians should shift from an anxiety-driven, risk-focused model to one that prioritizes distress-oriented, relational care. While qualitative studies have explored individuals' expectations of the inpatient environment, such as sanctuaries, safety, respite, and therapeutic settings (29), there is a lack of research on specific treatment goals. Although some data exists on clinicians' opinions regarding goals (32), there is little formal comparison between the two perspectives in the literature.

Care goals should be collaboratively established with those seeking care, and some recommendations may include the following:

- a. Distress management: This might involve implementing structured interventions that target emotional dysregulation, identity confusion, trauma, and epistemic mistrust, especially in individuals with personality vulnerabilities or histories of invalidation. Approaches such as Mentalization-Based Treatment (MBT), brief relational crisis models, and other personalized methods can guide these interactions (34, 36).
- b. Building and repairing trust: Hospitalization often disrupts continuity of care, taking patients away from familiar environments, routines, and therapeutic relationships. For

many, particularly those with a history of relational trauma, this disruption can intensify feelings of mistrust and alienation. Therefore, clinicians could prioritize relational repair by transparently explaining decisions, validating the individual's subjective experience, and ensuring continuity of care both before and after admission (29, 37).

- c. Supporting the transition back to community: The period following discharge is one of the most critical and vulnerable phases in a person's trajectory. However, due to resource limitations, follow-up care is often fragmented, delayed, or misaligned with patient needs. An effective transition requires bridging the gap between inpatient and outpatient care through warm handovers, coordinated plans, and individualized crisis management tools (38). Collaborative crisis planning, which involves engaging patients in identifying triggers, warning signs, and protective strategies, has shown promise in enhancing safety and engagement post-discharge (39).

Conclusion

Clinicians considering hospitalizing a patient should not understand it as a calculated response to risk, but as a relational and pragmatic intervention for addressing intolerable distress. At the same time, clinicians must remain alert to emerging evidence suggesting that admission may, in some cases, heighten suicide risk. The aim, therefore, cannot be limited to the preservation of life, especially given the lack of evidence that this is reliably achievable, but must extend to relational and systemic supports that help make life livable. This requires broad-scale shifts in training, psychiatric treatment and environmental design, clarification of appropriate outcome measures, a heavy emphasis on clinical research, and change in how suicide is understood in public discourse.

Author contributions

CG: Conceptualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Investigation. JH: Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Investigation. PP: Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing. ML: Supervision, Validation, Writing – review & editing.

Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research and/or publication of this article.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Generative AI statement

The author(s) declare that no Generative AI was used in the creation of this manuscript.

Any alternative text (alt text) provided alongside figures in this article has been generated by Frontiers with the support of artificial

intelligence and reasonable efforts have been made to ensure accuracy, including review by the authors wherever possible. If you identify any issues, please contact us.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

References

- Grover C, Huber J, Brewer M, Basu A, Large M. Meta-analysis of clinical risk factors for suicide among people presenting to emergency departments and general hospitals with suicidal thoughts and behaviours. *Acta Psychiatr Scandinavica*. (2023) 148:491–524. doi: 10.1111/acps.13620
- Tai A, Pincham H, Basu A, Large M. Meta-analysis of risk factors for suicide after psychiatric discharge and meta-regression of the duration of follow-up. *Aust New Z J Psychiatry*. (2025) 59(8):679–91. doi: 10.1177/00048674251348372
- Franklin JC, Ribeiro JD, Fox KR, Bentley KH, Kleiman EM, Huang X, et al. Risk factors for suicidal thoughts and behaviors: A meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *psychol Bull*. (2017) 143:187. doi: 10.1037/bul0000084
- Belsher BE, Smolenski DJ, Pruitt LD, Bush NE, Beech EH, Workman DE, et al. Prediction models for suicide attempts and deaths: a systematic review and simulation. *JAMA Psychiatry*. (2019) 76:642–51. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2019.0174
- Berman AL. Risk factors proximate to suicide and suicide risk assessment in the context of denied suicide ideation. *Suicide Life-Threatening Behav*. (2018) 48:340–352. doi: 10.1111/sltb.12351
- National Health Service England. *Staying safe from suicide: Best practice guidance for safety assessment, formulation and management*. London: NHS England (2025). Available online at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/publication/staying-safe-from-suicide/> (Accessed June 24, 2025).
- Barzilay S, Gagnon A, Yaseen ZS, Chennapragada L, Lloveras L, Bloch-Elkouby S, et al. Associations between clinicians' emotion regulation, treatment recommendations, and patient suicidal ideation. *Suicide Life-Threatening Behav*. (2022) 52:329–40. doi: 10.1111/sltb.12824
- Chung DT, Ryan CJ, Hadzi-Pavlovic D, Singh SP, Stanton C, Large MM. Suicide rates after discharge from psychiatric facilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. (2017) 74:694–702. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.1044
- Swaraj S, Wang M, Chung D, Curtis J, Firth J, Ramanuj PP, et al. Meta-analysis of natural, unnatural and cause-specific mortality rates following discharge from inpatient psychiatric facilities. *Acta Psychiatr Scandinavica*. (2019) 140:244–64. doi: 10.1111/acps.13073
- Goldman-Mellor SJ, Bhat HS, Allen MH, Schoenbaum M. Suicide risk among hospitalized versus discharged deliberate self-harm patients: generalized random forest analysis using a large claims data set. *Am J Prev Med*. (2022) 62:558–66. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2021.08.028
- Ross EL, Bossarte RM, Dobscha SK, Gildea SM, Hwang I, Kennedy CJ, et al. Estimated average treatment effect of psychiatric hospitalization in patients with suicidal behaviors: A precision treatment analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. (2024) 81:135–43. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.3994
- Brown LA, Boudreaux ED, Arias SA, Miller IW, May AM, Camargo CA Jr., et al. C-SSRS performance in emergency department patients at high risk for suicide. *Suicide Life-Threatening Behav*. (2020) 50:1097–104. doi: 10.1111/sltb.12657
- Bjureberg J, Dahlin M, Carlborg A, Edberg H, Haglund A, Runeson B. Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale Screen Version: initial screening for suicide risk in a psychiatric emergency department. *psychol Med*. (2022) 52:3904–12. doi: 10.1017/S0033291721000751
- Simpson SA, Goans C, Loh R, Ryall K, Middleton MC, Dalton A. Suicidal ideation is insensitive to suicide risk after emergency department discharge: Performance characteristics of the Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale Screener. *Acad Emergency Med*. (2021) 28:621–9. doi: 10.1111/acem.14198
- Smith MJ, Bouch J, Bradstreet S, Lakey T, Nightingale A, O'Connor RC. Health services, suicide, and self-harm: patient distress and system anxiety. *Lancet Psychiatry*. (2015) 2:275–80. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(15)00051-6
- Large MM, Kapur N. Psychiatric hospitalisation and the risk of suicide. *Br J Psychiatry*. (2018) 212:269–73. doi: 10.1192/bjp.2018.22
- Qin P, Nordentoft M. Suicide risk in relation to psychiatric hospitalization: evidence based on longitudinal registers. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. (2005) 62:427–32. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.62.4.427
- Walter F, Carr MJ, Mok PL, Astrup A, Antonsen S, Pedersen CB, et al. Premature mortality among patients recently discharged from their first inpatient psychiatric treatment. *JAMA Psychiatry*. (2017) 74:485–92. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2017.0071
- Berg SH, Rortveit K, Aase K. Suicidal patients' experiences regarding their safety during psychiatric in-patient care: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *BMC Health Serv Res*. (2017) 17:1–13. doi: 10.1186/s12913-017-2023-8
- Ward-Ciesielski EF, Rizvi SL. The potential iatrogenic effects of psychiatric hospitalization for suicidal behavior: a critical review and recommendations for research. *Clin Psychol: Sci Pract*. (2021) 28(1):60. doi: 10.1111/cpsp.12332
- Large M, Smith G, Sharma S, Nielssen O, Singh SP. Systematic review and meta-analysis of the clinical factors associated with the suicide of psychiatric in-patients. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. (2011) 124:18–29. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2010.01672.x
- Walsh G, Sara G, Ryan CJ, Large M. Meta-analysis of suicide rates among psychiatric in-patients. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*. (2015) 131:174–84. doi: 10.1111/acps.12383
- Doupnik SK, Rudd B, Schmutte T, Worsley D, Bowden CF, McCarthy E, et al. Association of suicide prevention interventions with subsequent suicide attempts, linkage to follow-up care, and depression symptoms for acute care settings: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. (2020) 77:1021–30. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.1586
- Berman AL, Silverman MM. Hospital-based suicides: challenging existing myths. *Psychiatr Q*. (2022) 93:1–13. doi: 10.1007/s11126-020-09856-w
- Berrino A, Ohlendorf P, Duriaux S, Burnand Y, Lorillard S, Andreoli A. Crisis intervention at the general hospital: An appropriate treatment choice for acutely suicidal borderline patients. *Psychiatry Res*. (2011) 186:287–92. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2010.06.018
- Stanley B, Brodsky B, Monahan M. Brief and ultra-brief suicide-specific interventions. *Focus*. (2023) 21:129–36. doi: 10.1176/appi.focus.20220083
- Huber JP, Milton A, Brewer MC, Norrie LM, Hartog SM, Glozier N. The effectiveness of brief non-pharmacological interventions in emergency departments and psychiatric inpatient units for people in crisis: A systematic review and narrative synthesis. *Aust New Z J Psychiatry*. (2024) 58:207–26. doi: 10.1177/00048674231216348
- Knesper DJ. *Continuity of care for suicide prevention and research: Suicide attempts and suicide deaths subsequent to discharge from the emergency department or psychiatry inpatient unit*. Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc. (2011).
- Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Chadburn G, Fenton SJ, Bhui K, Larkin M, et al. Experiences of in-patient mental health services: systematic review. *Br J Psychiatry*. (2019) 214:329–38. doi: 10.1192/bjp.2019.22

30. Michaud L, Greenway KT, Corbeil S, Bourquin C, Richard-Devantoy S. Countertransference towards suicidal patients: a systematic review. *Curr Psychol*. (2021), 1–15. doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-01424-0
31. Chambers M, Gallagher A, Borschmann R, Gillard S, Turner K, Kantaris X. The experiences of detained mental health service users: issues of dignity in care. *BMC Med Ethics*. (2014) 15:1–8. doi: 10.1186/1472-6939-15-50
32. Huber J, Milton A, Brewer M, Fry K, Evans S, Coulthard J, et al. What is the purpose of Psychiatric Emergency Care Centres? A qualitative study of health care staff. *Aust New Z J Psychiatry*. (2025) 59:552–63. doi: 10.1177/00048674251331466
33. Yiu HW, Rowe S, Wood L. A systematic review and meta-analysis of psychosocial interventions aiming to reduce risks of suicide and self-harm in psychiatric inpatients. *Psychiatry Res*. (2021) 305:114175. doi: 10.1016/j.psychres.2021.114175
34. Bateman A, Fonagy P, Campbell C, Luyten P, Debbané M. *Cambridge guide to mentalization-based treatment (MBT)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (2023).
35. Macneil CA, Hasty MK, Conus P, Berk M. Is diagnosis enough to guide interventions in mental health? Using case formulation in clinical practice. *BMC Med*. (2012) 10:1–3. doi: 10.1186/1741-7015-10-111
36. Wampold BE. Brave new world: Mental health services 25 years since Dodo and 25 years in the future. *Psychother Res*. (2023) 33:533–4. doi: 10.1080/10503307.2022.2154177
37. Molin J, Graneheim UH, Lindgren BM. Quality of interactions influences everyday life in psychiatric inpatient care—patients' perspectives. *Int J Qual Stud Health Well-being*. (2016) 11:29897. doi: 10.3402/qhw.v11.29897
38. Hawton K, Lascelles K, Pitman A, Gilbert S, Silverman M. Assessment of suicide risk in mental health practice: shifting from prediction to therapeutic assessment, formulation, and risk management. *Lancet Psychiatry*. (2022) 9:922–8. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(22)00232-2
39. Greiner C, Debbané M, Besch V, Prada P. TBM-Crise: intervention hospitalière brève basée sur la mentalisation. *Santé Mentale Au Québec*. (2022) 47:221–33. doi: 10.7202/1098902ar