

Appendix 1 (as supplied by the authors): Online Supplement

This supplement provides additional methodological details and an additional analysis of the primary study objective.

Participants

We chose the age range of 13 to 17 years because SH behaviours are common in adolescence (1) and a previous Canadian study (2) found that the mean age of onset of SH was 15.2 years.

Variables and Data Sources

Data on ED visits were obtained from the Canadian National Ambulatory Care Reporting System (NACRS) database from the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI), using the International Classification of Diseases, 10th Revision (ICD-10) (3). The data were accessed through health administrative databases at ICES (Toronto, ON). NACRS records are produced by coders who abstract the documentation generated by ED clinicians (4).

Validity of Exposures and Outcomes

NACRS records are subject to several forms of error, including inaccurate or incomplete documentation of problems by physicians, and errors in coding and abstraction of data from clinical records. Gibson and her colleagues studied the quality of NACRS data by carrying out reabstractions of charts at several Ontario EDs, and found agreement rates for ICD-10 codes that ranged from 86-90% (4).

Concerning SH specifically, chart review studies indicate that some injuries and poisoning that are coded as having an undetermined cause are actually instances of intentional SH (5,6). Steele studied the validity of MH diagnostic codes abstracted from family practice records and found that the accuracy of the administrative data was 86.8% when compared with clinical data (7). The MH codes had high specificity, 97.0% to 99.5%, but lower sensitivity, 22.3% to 80.7%. Moreover, NACRS coders may record only the main diagnostic code that led to the ED visit; meaning that a mental health disorder or a self-injury might be omitted if another medical problem took precedence. This means that estimates of the prevalence of SH and MH diagnoses in the ED setting are likely biased downwards.

Overall mortality was determined by linking records to a database provided by Ontario Office of the Registrar General, where provincial vital statistics are collected. Suicides were determined using a method developed by ICES using ICD9 codes E950-E959 or ICD10 codes X60-84 (8). This method had 97% sensitivity for suicides between 2003 and 2012 and 95% sensitivity for 2013 onward.

Variable Definitions

Table A.1. Definitions of Covariates

| <i>Covariate</i> | <i>Definition</i> | <i>ICD-10 Codes</i> |
|---|--|--|
| <i>Mental Health and Substance Abuse Covariates</i> | | |
| Alcohol | Alcohol abuse | F10 |
| Anxious-neurotic | Anxiety and neurotic disorders, reaction to severe stress, and adjustment disorders. | F40 F41 F42 F44 F45 F48 F930 F931 F932 |
| Behavioural-emotional | Behavioural and emotional disorders | F90 F91 F92 F933 F938 F939 F94 F95 F98 |
| Behavioural-physical | Behavioural syndromes associated with physiological disturbances | F51 F52 F53 F54 F55 F59 |
| Bpd-manic | Bipolar Disorder or manic episode | F30 F31 |
| Eating | Eating disorders | F50 F70 F71 F72 F73 |
| Intellectual disability | Intellectual disability | F78 F79 |
| Mood | Mood disorders other than bipolar/mania | F31 F30 F32 F33 F34 F38 F39 F00 F01 F02 F03 |
| Organic | Organic mental disorders | F05 F06 F07 F09 |
| Other mental health | Other mental health disorders | F99 |
| Personality-behavioural | Disorders of personality and behaviour | F60 F61 F62 F63 F64 F65 F66 F68 F69 |
| Psychological development | Disorders of psychological development | F8 |
| Schizophrenia | Schizophrenia | F2 |

| <i>Covariate</i> | <i>Definition</i> | <i>ICD-10 Codes</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Stress adjustment | Reaction to severe stress, and adjustment disorders | F43 |
| Substance abuse | Substance abuse (non-alcohol) | F11 F12 F13 F14 F15 F16 F17 F18 F19 |
| Suicidal ideation | Suicidal ideation | R45.8 |
| <i>Clinical Covariates</i> | | |
| Acne | Acne | L70 |
| Asthma | Asthma | J45 J46 |
| Bowel | Inflamed bowel | K50 K51 K90.0 |
| Cancers | Cancers | C0 C1 C2 C3 C4 C5 C6 C7 C8 C90 C91 C92 C93 C94 C95 C96 C97 |
| CF | Cystic fibrosis | E84 |
| Concussion or traumatic brain injury | Concussion or traumatic brain injury | S06 S09 |
| Diabetes | Diabetes mellitus | E10 E11 E12 E13 E14 |
| Downs | Downs syndrome | Q90 |
| Eczema | Eczema | L2 L30 |
| Epilepsy | Epilepsy | G40 G41 |
| Heart | Congenital heart disease | Q20 Q21 Q22 Q23 Q24 |
| Inflammation | Inflammatory polyarthropathies | M05 M06 M07 M08 M09 M12 M13 M14 |
| Migraine | Migraine | G43 |
| Neuromuscular | Neuromuscular conditions | G71 G80 G81 G82 G83 |
| Psoriasis | Psoriasis | L40 |
| Sickle cell | Sickle cell anaemia | D57 |
| Spina bifida | Spina bifida | Q05 |

| <i>Covariate</i> | <i>Definition</i> | <i>ICD-10 Codes</i> |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Self-Harm History</i> | | |
| Self-injury | Self-injury | X7 X80 X81 X82 X83 X84 |
| Self-poisoning | Self-poisoning | X6 |

Note. Some clinical covariates were also identified by a series of non-ICD-10 codes that are unique to Ontario databases (definitions are available from the corresponding author).

Propensity-Score Matching Algorithm

The propensity score (PSCORE) was the logit transform of the estimated probability that the youth's ED presentation would include SH. We hard-matched youths with SH ED visits with controls on age, sex, and rural residence, and matched them on the PSCORE using the GREEDY algorithm. As described by Austin (9):

In greedy matching, a treated subject is first selected at random. The untreated subject whose propensity score is closest to that of this randomly selected treated subject is chosen for matching to this treated subject. This process is then repeated until untreated subjects have been matched to all treated subjects or until one has exhausted the list of treated subjects for whom a matched untreated subject can be found. This process is called greedy because at each step in the process, the nearest untreated subject is selected for matching to the given treated subject, even if that untreated subject would better serve as a match for a subsequent treated subject.

Potential matches were rejected if the difference between the PSCORE of the self-harming youth and the potential match was greater than $0.2 \times SD(\text{PSCORE})$. The 1:2 matching strategy produced 10,731 controls. The number of matched controls is less than twice the number of matched adolescents with SH visits because we could find only one control for 591 (10.1%) of adolescents with SH visits. To document differences on covariations, we calculated the standardised mean differences (D) between the matched group of youths with SH visits and youths who did not have an SH visit.

Inverse Probability Weighting Analysis

As a sensitivity check on the propensity-matched comparisons, we compared adolescents with SH ED visits and those with ED visits without SH using an Inverse Probability Weighting Analysis (IPWA) (10). Instead of using matching to compare treatment and control, IPWA calculates weighted means for

each group using all the members in each group and compares those means. The weights are based on the propensity scores, so that individuals with a higher probability of belonging to the group are more heavily weighted in the calculation of the mean. Table A.2 presents analyses that parallel those reported in Table 2 and the results are similar.

Table A.2. Association of Self-Harm and Outcomes: Inverse Probability Weighting Analysis

| | <i>Youths with 0 SH Visits (N = 397,973)</i> | <i>Youths with ≥ 1 SH Visits (N = 5,832)</i> | <i>Conditional Logistic Regression</i> | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| <i>Outcome</i> | <i>Count (%)</i> | <i>Count (%)</i> | <i>OR (95% CI)</i> | <i>P</i> |
| Readmissions to ED or hospital for SH | 7,252 (1.8%) | 1,718 (29.5%) | 7.67 (7.22 – 8.15) | < 0.001 |
| Suicides | 199 (0.1%) | 43 (0.7%) | 7.26 (5.07 – 10.40) | < 0.001 |
| Overall mortality | 937 (0.2%) | 61 (1.0%) | 3.27 (2.47 – 4.33) | < 0.001 |
| | <i>Mean ± SD</i> | <i>Mean ± SD</i> | <i>t</i> | <i>P</i> |
| Cummulative 5-year health care costs (\$) | 9,270.85 ± 32,829.08 | 31,697.65 ± 64,011.36 | 86.66 | < 0.001 |

Note. For the cost data, the standardized mean difference *D* is calculated as the difference between the average 5-year costs for youths with ≥ 1 SH visit minus the average costs for those with 0 SH visits, divided by \$33,593, which was the standard deviation of 5-year costs among the 403,805 youths with ED visits who were eligible to be matched. The *t* statistic is the comparison of the average log-transformed costs, with statistical significance *P*.

Time-to-Event and Cost Analyses

We used stratified Cox proportional hazards regression to compare youths with SH visits to controls on the time from the index visit to a hospitalization for SH or ED visit for SH. The proportionality assumption was assessed by visual inspection of the Schoenfeld residuals (11). Five-year cumulative health-care costs were log-transformed and compared using paired *t*-tests.

References

1. Whitlock J, Selekman M. Non-suicidal self-injury across the lifespan. In: Nock MK, editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Suicide and Self-Injury*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2014. p. 61–81.
2. Nixon M, Cloutier P, Jansson S. Nonsuicidal self-harm in youth: a population-based survey. *CMAJ*. 2008
3. World Health Organization. *International statistical classification of diseases and related health problems*. 11th ed. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2018.
4. Gibson D, Richards H, Chapman A. The national ambulatory care reporting system: factors that affect the quality of its emergency data. *Int J Inf Qual*. 2008;2(2):97–114.
5. Rhodes AE, Links PS, Streiner DL, Dawe I, Cass D, Janes S. Do hospital E-codes consistently capture suicidal behaviour? *Chronic Dis Can*. 2002;23(4):139–45.
6. Bethell J, Rhodes AE. Identifying deliberate self-harm in emergency department data. *Heal Reports*. 2009 Jun;20(2):35–42.
7. Steele LS, Glazier RH, Lin E, Evans M. Using administrative data to measure ambulatory mental health service provision in primary care. *Med Care*. 2004;42(10):960–5.
8. Gatov E, Kurdyak P, Sinyor M, Holder L, Schaffer A. Comparison of Vital Statistics Definitions of Suicide against a Coroner Reference Standard: A Population-Based Linkage Study. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2018;63(3):152–60.
9. Austin PC. An Introduction to Propensity Score Methods for Reducing the Effects of Confounding in Observational Studies. *Multivariate Behav Res*. 2011 May 31;46(3):399–424.
10. Mansournia MA, Altman DG. Inverse probability weighting. *BMJ*. 2016;352.
11. Grambsch P, Therneau T. Proportional hazards tests and diagnostics based on weighted residuals. *Biometrika*. 1994 Sep 1;81(3):515–26.