

Mapping patient interactions in psychiatric presentations to a tertiary emergency department

Michael H McCullough^{1,2,*}, Michael Small^{3,4}, Binu Jayawardena^{5,6}, and Sean Hood^{5,6}

¹School of Computing, The Australian National University, Acton, ACT, Australia.

²Eccles Institute of Neuroscience, John Curtin School of Medical Research, The Australian National University, Acton, ACT, Australia.

³School of Physics, Mathematics & Computing, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA, Australia.

⁴Mineral Resources, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Kensington, WA, Australia.

⁵North Metropolitan Health Service, Government of Western Australia, WA, Australia.

⁶Division of Psychiatry, UWA Medical School, The University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA, Australia.

***Corresponding author:** michael.mccullough@anu.edu.au

May 16, 2023

Abstract

Reliable assessment of suicide and self-harm risk in emergency medicine is critical for effective intervention and treatment of patients affected by mental health disorders. Teams of clinicians are faced with the challenge of rapidly integrating medical history, wide-ranging psychosocial factors, and real-time patient observations to inform diagnosis, treatment and referral decisions. Patient outcomes therefore depend on the reliable flow of information through networks of clinical staff and information systems. We studied information flow at a systems-level in a tertiary hospital emergency department using network models and machine learning. Data were gathered by mapping trajectories and recording clinical interactions for patients at suspected risk of suicide or self-harm. A network model constructed from the data revealed communities closely aligned with underlying clinical team structure. By analysing connectivity patterns in the network model we identified a vulnerability in the system with the potential to adversely impact information flow. We then developed an algorithmic strategy to mitigate this risk by targeted strengthening of links between clinical teams. Finally, we investigated a novel application of machine learning for distinguishing

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

32 specific interactions along a patient’s trajectory which were most likely to precipitate a psy-
33 chiatric referral. Together, our results demonstrate a new framework for assessing and re-
34 inforcing important information pathways that guide clinical decision processes and provide
35 complimentary insights for improving clinical practice and operational models in emergency
36 medicine for patients at risk of suicide or self-harm.

INTRODUCTION

37 Suicide is a major global public health issue causing over 700 000 deaths per year, often with
38 far-reaching impacts on families and communities that can persist well-beyond each individual
39 tragedy [1, 2]. In addition, the prevalence of suicide and suicidal ideation creates considerable
40 economic burden for society (estimated at over US\$90 billion in the USA alone in 2013 [3]) and
41 has been linked to increasing healthcare costs [2].

42 It has been estimated that as many as 77% of individuals who die by suicide will have made
43 contact with a primary care provider in the year prior to their death [4, 5], and up to 10-20%
44 will have visited an emergency department (ED) within 1-2 months prior [6, 7, 2]. EDs are an
45 important and often primary point of access for mental health support services [8, 9, 10] and
46 therefore provide an opportunity for suicide-risk screening and prevention [2]. However, the
47 population of individuals affected by suicidal behaviours is highly heterogeneous and poses
48 significant challenges for risk assessment and clinical management, especially in emergency
49 settings [11].

50 Mental health crisis presentations account for 4-10% of ED presentations [12] and are growing
51 in number [13, 14, 15, 16]. This increases strain on EDs [13] and impacts patient flow be-
52 cause mental health presentations typically take longer to assess and staff often report feeling
53 ill-equipped to deal with these patients [12]. Further, EDs are widely understood to be challeng-
54 ing environments for patients affected by mental health issues for reasons including long wait
55 times, noise, lack of privacy, harsh lighting, and negative attitudes of staff [17, 18]. These and
56 other factors result in a predominantly negative experience of acute care settings for mental
57 health patients [19]. This is particularly problematic for patients affected by suicidal behaviours
58 because negative experiences of treatment may increase self-harm risk [20].

59 While clinical management of suicide-risk patients in emergency settings has been prioritised in
60 many national and international suicide prevention strategies [20] current research into urgent
61 emergency care models for mental health patients is limited [12]. Notably, patient journeys
62 through EDs for mental health presentations are not well understood [21], and there are only a
63 few studies attempting to describe the care pathway and interactions with medical professionals
64 in detail [20]. Multiple studies also report considerable inconsistencies and discrepancies in the
65 clinical practice guidelines and service delivery models for emergency mental health care in the
66 USA, UK, Australia and New Zealand [22, 23, 11, 24, 25, 26, 27]. As a result, there have been
67 calls for further research into methods for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of
68 clinical practice guidelines to improve patient experience and treatment outcomes [11, 20, 28].

69 We addressed these challenges in the present study by developing a novel quantitative frame-
70 work for evaluating patient journeys through the ED via statistical and algorithmic approaches
71 from the fields of network science and machine learning. Using observational data collected
72 within a tertiary hospital ED we constructed a data-driven network model of interactions be-
73 tween patients, associates, emergency services, clinical staff and information systems for pre-
74 sentations with suspected risk of suicide or self-harm. We analysed the network model to
75 investigate the flow of clinical information at a systems-level and identified properties of the
76 operational structure in the ED that might adversely impact patient care. Further, we explored

77 patient pathways as dynamic networks to understand processes of clinical decision making and
78 referrals as occurring in practice. Together, this work demonstrates the capability of our new
79 quantitative framework for evaluating models of mental health care in emergency medicine.
80 The additional insights afforded by our approach have the potential to guide improvements
81 in clinical practice and operational models to enhance treatment outcomes for patients with
82 suicide or self-harm risk.

RESULTS

83 **Characterising patient trajectories as sequences of clinical interactions**

84 We observed patient trajectories and recorded clinical interactions in a tertiary hospital ED for
85 patients presenting with suspected suicidal ideation or self-harm risk (n=43 patients; n=272
86 interactions; see Methods). To map possible trajectories from the point of presentation to re-
87 ferral or discharge we constructed a patient trajectory network using only the observational
88 data (Figure 1A). This network captured most of the transitions expected based on the opera-
89 tional structure of the ED. This suggests that our data comprised a representative collection of
90 possible patient trajectories. Discharge against medical advice was observed only once. This
91 occurred while the patient was in the care of the Emergency Medical team, but such events
92 are also possible at other points along a patient trajectory. The most common mode of presen-
93 tation was by ambulance, police or a combination of these (Figure 1B). The median trajectory
94 time per patient was 1.5 hours, 95% CI [0.3, 3.8] (Figure 1C; trajectory time is defined as the
95 duration between the first and last observation made for each patient). Along each trajectory
96 we captured a median of 5 interactions, 95% CI [2, 12] (Figure 1D), involving a median of 4
97 different types of clinical staff, 95% CI [2, 5] (Figure 1E).

98 **A network model of interactions reflects clinical team structure and reveals agents im- 99 portant for information flow**

100 To investigate the flow of clinical information in the ED we constructed a network model of
101 the of the interactions between agents (i.e., the patient, doctors, or nurses etc.) and clinical
102 information systems as observed along the combined set of patient trajectories in the data
103 (Figure 2A; see Methods). Minimal assumptions were imposed only to ensure that forbidden
104 interactions were not erroneously included in the network (e.g., a hard-copy patient file cannot
105 directly interact with a digital records database). The network edges can be interpreted as com-
106 munication channels for clinical information that would inform patient diagnosis and treatment.
107 Applying a community detection algorithm [29] to the network reveals a division between the
108 Emergency Medical team and Emergency Psychiatry team based only on the patterns of com-
109 munications and interactions in the data. The respective internal reporting structures of these
110 teams presumably contributes to this division. However, patient outcomes are likely dependent
111 on effective and reliable communication between teams.

112 Therefore, we next computed measures of node centrality [30] to quantify the importance of
113 individual agents in the interaction network with respect to information flow. Node degree quan-
114 tifies the direct connectedness and activeness of a node. The psychiatric liaison nurse (PLN),
115 patient, nurse, and patient file were most central in the interaction network by node degree
116 (Figure 2B). This result is unsurprising for the patient, patient file and the nurse given that the
117 patient is the focus of the interactions, the patient file is the primary clinical record, and nurses
118 perform regular observations of the patient. However, it is not immediately apparent as to why
119 the PLN had the highest node degree. Closeness centrality quantifies how central a given node
120 is within the overall structure of the network. The PLN also had the highest closeness centrality
121 (Figure 2C). Values of this measure for all other nodes were relatively consistent. Between-
122 ness centrality quantifies how essential a given node is for transport of information across the
123 network. By this metric the PLN again had the highest centrality, with a value more than four
124 times greater than the agent with the next highest betweenness (Figure 2D). Overall, these
125 results suggest that the PLN is a highly active and connected agent in the ED, and may play a
126 crucial role in communicating clinical information between other agents and treating teams.

127 **Assessing network vulnerabilities and reducing potential impacts via targeted algorithmic addition of edges**

128

129 The high node degree and betweenness centrality of the PLN indicates a potential network
130 vulnerability. If the function of the PLN was compromised this might adversely impact the com-
131 munication of important information between clinical staff. We first sought to establish whether
132 the high betweenness of the PLN resulted from the specific configuration of the interaction net-
133 work. The alternative hypothesis was that comparable values would arise by chance in similar
134 networks that were configured randomly. To investigate we generated 1000 randomly shuffled
135 versions of the interaction network using a connected double-edge swap algorithm [31] (Fig 3A;
136 see Methods). Betweenness centrality for the PLN was significantly higher in the true network
137 than for random shuffles ($>95^{\text{th}}$ percentile). This was not the case for any other of the ten most
138 central agents by betweenness which implies that the specific configuration of the interaction
139 network may impose a unexpectedly high load on the PLN with respect to information transfer.
140 Furthermore, the shuffling algorithm explicitly preserves the degree of each node when shuf-
141 fling. Therefore, this result also rules out the possibility that the PLN had unexpectedly high
142 betweenness only because it was highly connected, indicating that the position of the agent in
143 the network is important as well as connectivity.

144 Next, we investigated how information flow might be impacted if the function of the PLN was
145 compromised. Global efficiency measures how efficiently information flows between all pairs
146 of nodes averaged over the network. When the PLN was removed from the network model,
147 global efficiency dropped by more than 3.5% (Figure 3B). This was more than 2.5 times the
148 impact of removing the agent with the next largest impact. The closeness centrality of doctors
149 was reduced considerably more by the removal of the PLN from the network compared with
150 the removal of other clinical staff (Figure 3C). Together, these results indicate that the structure
151 of clinical interactions in the ED may make the system especially vulnerable to compromised
152 function of the PLN. This vulnerability presents a risk to flow of clinical information between
153 agents responsible for decision making along patient trajectories.

154 We sought a strategy to mitigate this risk by targeted addition of edges between doctors in
155 the Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry teams. We began by removing the PLN
156 from the network then used a greedy algorithm to add edges one at a time to maximise the
157 increase in global efficiency (see Methods). The four edges which contributed most to restoring
158 global efficiency were edges that linked a doctor from the the Emergency Medical team to
159 one from the Emergency Psychiatry team (Fig 3D). The addition of these four edges restored
160 global efficiency to a level comparable to the loss of efficiency which would arise from the
161 compromised function of other clinical staff (Figure 3B). Furthermore, closeness centrality for
162 doctors was fully restored with the exception of the Intern (INT) who required one more edge
163 (Figure 3E). In summary, these results imply that the network vulnerability caused by the high
164 centrality of the PLN could be reduced by increasing communication between doctors from the
165 Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry teams.

166 **Identifying types of interactions that precipitate clinical handovers with machine learn-** 167 **ing on interaction networks**

168 We then studied how patterns of interactions influence decision points in patient trajectories.
169 Specifically, we used machine learning to build a model that predicted the point of referral to
170 Emergency Psychiatry (see Methods). We dynamically constructed interaction networks along
171 each patient trajectory separately (i.e., building up the network by adding nodes and edges as
172 each interaction occurred). The state of the network at each point along the patient trajectory
173 was used as input for a Bernoulli naive Bayes classifier [32]. The model was configured to
174 predict the point along a patient trajectory immediately prior to referral. We trained the model
175 on a randomly sampled subset of 80% of the patient trajectories in the data set. To quantify
176 which nodes and edges were most predictive of a referral we used permutation feature im-
177 portance [33] which was computed based on the balanced accuracy score over the remaining
178 20% of trajectories. This process was repeated 10000 times for different randomised training
179 and test data sets. The mean balanced accuracy over all training iterations was 82%, 95% CI
180 [59%, 100%].

181 We found that an interaction between a Registrar (REG) and the patient file, or between a
182 Consultant (CON) and the patient were most predictive of referral on average (Figure 4A and
183 B). The next most predictive events were the involvement of a registrar in the patient trajectory,
184 an interaction between a registrar and the ED Information System (EDIS), and any access of
185 the patient file. The predictive power of all network features had high variance (Figure 4B). For
186 example, the patient file often had a negative value for permutation importance implying that the
187 contribution of this feature to the model could be worse than random. High variance in feature
188 importance is likely a result of the high dimensionality of the feature space relative the number
189 of observations, coupled with the often complex of nature patient trajectories through the ED.
190 However, the model suggests that the involvement of senior doctors in a patient's trajectory
191 (i.e., a Consultant or Registrar) is more likely to precipitate referral to ED Psychiatry than the
192 involvement of junior doctors (i.e., a Resident Medical Officer (RMO) or Intern (INT)).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

193 This study has introduced a new quantitative framework for investigating the provision of psy-
194 chiatric care in emergency healthcare settings with a focus on patients with suicide or self-harm
195 risk. By embedding observers in a tertiary hospital emergency department we collected data to
196 construct network models of patient trajectories and clinical interactions respectively. The clin-
197 ical interaction network had a community structure reflecting the operational division between
198 medical and psychiatric teams. This model indicated that the PLN likely played crucial role
199 in gathering and communicating clinical information between teams, carrying a considerably
200 higher load than other clinicians based on measures of network centrality. Further analysis
201 suggested that this unexpectedly high load may create a risk whereby compromised function
202 of the PLN could lead to reduced information flow between clinicians that negatively impacts
203 patient care. We then used a targeted algorithmic approach to show that this risk might be
204 mitigated by increasing communication between doctors in the Emergency Medical and Emer-
205 gency Psychiatry teams. Finally we used a machine learning model trained on dynamic network
206 features to identify which clinical interactions were most likely to result in a psychiatric referral.

207 The unexpectedly high importance of the PLN revealed by our quantitative analysis has impli-
208 cations for operational models that incorporate this or similar clinical roles. PLNs are generally
209 recognised as being beneficial for the provision of mental health care in emergency depart-
210 ments with studies often citing merits such as reduced wait times, positive patient experience,
211 and therapeutic benefits [34, 36, 18, 25, 37, 23, 38, 39, 17, 35, 9]. Notably, qualitative studies
212 have described how PLNs have an important function in communicating information and co-
213 ordinating patient care included providing assessments and recommendations to doctors, and
214 serving as a link to other hospital services (e.g., alcohol and other drug services) and com-
215 munity mental health services [25, 18]. This is agrees with our observation that the PLN had
216 high centrality in the clinical interaction network. These same studies also reported instances
217 of staff becoming reliant on PLNs and facing considerable impact on workload in their absence
218 [18], and that PLNs can feel unsupported and unsafe due to feeling overloaded with respon-
219 sibility [25]. These reports are congruent with our finding that high load on the PLN within the
220 interaction network may pose a risk to the function of the system and patient outcomes. This
221 shows that our novel approach appears to capture useful and interpretable information about
222 the implementation of emergency psychiatric care. The advantage of our framework is that it
223 allows for quantification and statistical comparison of different operational models and policies.
224 However, the aforementioned qualitative studies and the present study were undertaken in
225 different hospitals with different operation models. Therefore, future research should seek to
226 validate the network model via a mixed-methods study encompassing both staff interviews and
227 network analysis of clinical interactions in a range of different hospitals and healthcare settings.

228 We used the clinical interaction network to show that potential system vulnerabilities associated
229 with the high centrality of the PLN might be mitigated by strengthening lines of communication
230 between members of the Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry teams. This echos
231 the more general and well-established finding of the importance of multidisciplinary collabora-
232 tion and integration for the delivery of effective psychiatric care in emergency settings [25, 38,
233 27, 34, 40]. Furthermore, a recent study has also identified discrepancies between actual pat-
234 terns of communication between clinical staff in practice compared with reporting structures as

235 intended in the operational model based on a qualitative study [36]. The quantitative framework
236 we have developed facilitates direct assessment and comparison of actual patterns of commu-
237 nication against policy and organisational expectations in the evaluation of clinical practice.
238 In addition, we have shown how machine learning classifiers can be used in conjunction with
239 the clinical interaction network to understand how patterns of communication impact patient
240 pathways and clinical decision points.

241 Recent reports highlight the need for new evidence-based measures to evaluate the the imple-
242 mentation of clinical pathways in emergency psychiatry [11, 24, 20, 28], and more data-driven
243 methods for investigating the behavioral aspects of emergency care more broadly, where re-
244 search is currently limited [41]. The new data-driven framework and quantitative metrics pre-
245 sented here have considerable potential for application and adaption to address a range of
246 challenges in emergency psychiatry. For example, several studies have reported that men-
247 tal health patients have negative experiences of emergency care due to issues including wait
248 times, lack of appropriate spaces for the provision of care, and negative attitudes of staff during
249 interactions [38, 27, 12, 19]. By incorporating multi-modal data collection of interaction obser-
250 vations, patient interviews, and the appropriate linkage of clinical records, our framework could
251 be extended to evaluate the effectiveness of clinical pathways in terms of patient experience,
252 patient flow, or patient outcomes such as referrals or re-admission rates. In addition, mental
253 health patients who self-present can differ markedly from those brought in by ambulance or
254 police, but details about how their subsequent clinical pathways through emergency care differ
255 are not well understood [42]. Our network-based approach would be ideally suited for mapping,
256 measuring and comparing the nature of patient trajectories for different types of presentations
257 to improve resource allocation, or to develop targeted clinical pathways to enhance treatment
258 outcomes and efficiency for different patient groups.

259 Future studies utilising our framework may benefit from a larger sample size. This would en-
260 able the estimation of transition probabilities along patient pathways, and the frequency of dif-
261 ferent interactions in the network model to provide a more accurate characterisation of informa-
262 tion flow. Deploying additional observers and retrospectively augmenting data using medical
263 records would also reduce the risk of sampling bias during data collection.

264 In summary, our quantitative framework for mapping patient trajectories in a tertiary hospital
265 emergency department provides a new and complimentary approach for the assessment and
266 improvement of operational models and clinical practice in the provision of emergency mental
267 health care. To conclude, we note that while this study focused specifically on patients with
268 suicide or self-harm risk, our framework could be applied equivalently to investigate other as-
269 pects of healthcare service delivery including different medical specialties, other patient groups
270 or demographics, or alternative settings such as community mental health clinics.

METHODS

271 Data collection

272 Data were collected at a tertiary hospital in the city of Perth, Western Australia. A team of two
273 observers including a Psychiatry Registrar (not on clinical duties) worked simultaneously to
274 record clinical interactions for patients presenting with risk of suicide or self-harm. Observations
275 we taken for a total of 101 hours in the ED over a period of approximately one month, including
276 40 hours during day shifts, 40 hours during night shifts, and 21 additional hours of observations
277 during day shifts specifically focused around the ED Psychiatry team. Observation hours were
278 distributed between weekdays and weekends, and were generally undertaken in 8 hour shifts.
279 A total n=213 interactions were observed from n=36 patient trajectories in the ED. The Mental
280 Health Observation Area (MHOA) was observed for a total of 17.5 hours over 5 weekdays. A
281 total of n=59 interactions were observed from n=7 patient trajectories in the MHOA.

282 Observers sought to identify patients for inclusion in the study at the earliest possible opportu-
283 nity along their trajectory, ideally at the time of presentation. Patients presenting with known
284 or suspected suicidal or self-harm behaviours were approached at an appropriate time and
285 asked if they consented to being observed for the purpose of the study. Observers then fol-
286 lowed patients and clinical staff to record all interactions in an event log to the extent that it
287 was practicable (Table 1). This included observations of interactions between the patient, clin-
288 ical staff, emergency services (i.e., police and paramedics), support and community health
289 services, clinical information systems, and associates of the patient (i.e., relatives or friends).
290 Observations were taken with minimal involvement by the observers who acted as bystanders.
291 However, it was occasionally necessary to briefly interview clinical staff to establish the details
292 of some interactions (i.e., phone calls, access of digital records etc.). No identifying information
293 or clinical information were recorded during data collection.

294 Data analysis and software

295 Data analysis were performed in Python using the packages Numpy [43], Pandas [44], Net-
296 workX [45], Scikit-Learn [46] and Imbalanced-Learn [47]. Figures and data visualisations were
297 prepared using Matplotlib [48] and NetworkX.

298 Patient trajectory network

299 We defined nodes in the network representation of patient trajectories as the clinical team treat-
300 ing the patient, modes of presentation and modes of discharge. An unweighted and directed
301 edge was assigned between a pair nodes if we observed at least one instance of that transition
302 in our data (i.e., a patient being moved from the ED to the Observation Ward). The combined
303 data from all ED and MHOA observations were used to construct the patient trajectory network.

304 When computing the presentation type, trajectory time, interactions, and clinical staff types
305 we excluded patients that were observed only in the MHOA. We excluded this data because
306 the MHOA serves a different function than the other areas of the ED, providing specialised
307 observation of at-risk mental health patients for 24-48 hours. This exclusion was also applied
308 in the subsequent analysis of the clinical interaction network.

309 Clinical interaction network

310 The clinical interaction network is a map of observed interactions between patients, clinical
311 staff, information systems and other agents involved in patient trajectories observed within the
312 ED (see Figure 1D for a complete list of agents and acronyms). The network comprises a
313 set of nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{i\}_{i=1}^n$, where each node i corresponds to one of the $|\mathcal{V}| = n$ total possible
314 agents or information systems. The network is represented by an n by n adjacency matrix A .
315 Elements of A are given by $a_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ where $a_{i,j} = 1$ implies an unweighted bi-directional
316 edge between nodes i and j . An edge was assigned between nodes i and j if and only if
317 an interaction between the corresponding pair of agents or information systems occurred at
318 least once in the combined data from all patients. The operational policy of a hospital imparts
319 intrinsic structure in the network that is not directly reflected in the event log data. For ex-
320 ample, a recorded interaction may involve the patient, a nurse and the patient file which the
321 nurse is either reading or appending information to. However, a patient's file is never accessed
322 by the patient. Therefore, edges between nodes corresponding to the patient and the patient
323 file are considered forbidden and are excluded from the clinical interaction network by defini-
324 tion. In this study, forbidden edges included those (a) between clinical information systems,
325 (b) between clinical information systems and agents that were not clinical staff at the hospital,
326 (c) between the Psychiatric Services Online Information System (PSOLIS) or ED Psychiatry
327 Handover Document (EDYHO), which are clinical information systems specific to psychiatry,
328 and any agents that were not part of the Emergency Psychiatry team. We rendered the vi-
329 sualisation of the interaction network using the *spring_layout* function for Networkx [45] which
330 produces a force-directed graph layout.

331 To detect community structure in the network we applied the greedy modularity maximisation
332 algorithm from [29]. Node centrality measures were computed based on the definitions given
333 in [30], as briefly summarised here. The degree centrality of a node is the number of edges
334 connected to that node. The degree centrality of node i was computed as:

$$k_i = \sum_j a_{i,j} \quad \text{for } i, j \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (1)$$

335 Closeness centrality is the inverse of the average distance from a given node to all other nodes
336 in the network. The closeness centrality of node i was computed as:

$$c_i = \frac{(n-1)}{\sum_j d_{i,j}} \quad \text{for } i, j \in \mathcal{V} : i \neq j, \quad (2)$$

337 where $d_{i,j}$ is the length of the shortest path on the network between nodes i and j . The be-
338 tweenness centrality of a node measures how often that node forms part of a path between

339 other pairs of nodes. The clinical interaction network models the flow of information between
340 agents. In this context, high betweenness would suggest that a node is important for passing
341 information between other agents or different communities in the network. If a node with high
342 betweenness is compromised this is likely to adversely impact the flow information through the
343 network more than for a node with low betweenness. The betweenness centrality of node i
344 was computed as:

$$b_i = \sum_{j,k} \frac{\sigma(j, k|i)}{\sigma(j, k)} \quad \text{for } i, j, k \in \mathcal{V} : i \neq j \text{ and } i \neq k, \quad (3)$$

345 where $\sigma(j, k|i)$ equals the number of shortest paths between nodes j and k which pass through
346 node i , and $\sigma(j, k)$ equals the total number of shortest paths between nodes j and k . This
347 particular variant of betweenness centrality is described in [49]. We further normalised b_i by
348 the total number of possible paths through node i [50].

349 Network vulnerability analysis

350 We applied a random shuffling algorithm to assess the degree to which the structure in our
351 observed network is due to inherent structure rather than randomness. The principle is that
352 we generate an ensemble of networks which appear similar to our clinical interaction network
353 (they have the same number of nodes, node degrees, etc.) but are otherwise random. We then
354 seek to answer the question of whether the observed clinical interaction network is different
355 from random — and if so, how?

356 Random shuffling of the clinical interaction network was performed using a connected double-
357 edge swap algorithm [31] to preserve local and global degree structure. The algorithm begins
358 by randomly selecting two pairs of nodes (i, j) and (v, u) such that the nodes within each pair
359 are connected (i.e., $a_{(i,j)} = a_{(v,u)} = 1$). The edges are then swapped so that the network has
360 two new connected node pairs (i, v) and (j, u) . This swap is only performed if: (a) the edges for
361 new nodes pairs (i, v) and (j, u) did not already exist in the network, (b) the network remains
362 connected after the swap. If these conditions are not met, the edges for these two node pairs
363 are left unchanged and the algorithm proceeds to attempt a swap with a different randomly
364 selected set of node pairs. We impose a further condition that edges can only be swapped
365 if the resulting network remains free of forbidden edges as defined for the clinical interaction
366 network. We generated 1000 shuffled networks from independent sequences of random edge
367 swaps to assess the likelihood of the observed network configuration. For each shuffle we
368 attempted 20000 connected double-edge swaps, of which approximately 1900 swaps were
369 successful on average.

370 We assessed network vulnerability based on changes in closeness centrality and global effi-
371 ciency [51] when a potentially vulnerable node was removed. Global efficiency measures how
372 efficiently information propagates on a network. Assuming that efficiency of information flow
373 between a pair of nodes i and j is inversely proportional to the shortest path between them $d_{i,j}$,
374 the global efficiency is the average over all node pairs, computed as:

$$g = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{d_{i,j}} \quad \text{for } i, j \in \mathcal{V} : i \neq j. \quad (4)$$

375 To investigate strategies for mitigating against the adverse effects of a compromised node,
376 we developed a simple greedy algorithm for the addition of edges. The algorithm begins by
377 removing the compromised node from the network. From a set of candidate edges we then
378 added the edge which maximised the increase in global efficiency. This process was repeated
379 until all edges from the candidate set were added to the network. If a tie was encountered with
380 respect to the increase in global efficiency, then the greedy algorithm is no longer guaranteed to
381 find an optimal sequence for the addition of edges. Therefore, once a tie occurred we tested all
382 possible permutations for the sequence of the remaining edges that had not yet been added.
383 This allowed us to enumerate the complete set of optimal solutions. For our data and the
384 specific set of candidate edges investigated in this study there was a subset of edges that
385 were tied with respect to their contribution to global efficiency, regardless of the order in which
386 they were added to the network.

387 Machine learning for predicting clinical referrals

388 To assess which agents and interactions were likely to precipitate a referral to the Emergency
389 Psychiatry team, we trained a binary classifier to predict the referral point based on the evolving
390 state of clinical interaction networks along individual patient trajectories. We used machine
391 learning to achieve this as a way of extracting structural information from the underlying data,
392 independent of our own application driven bias. The machine learning algorithm is agnostic to
393 our knowledge of the system and simply seeks to extract significant structural patterns from the
394 data. We used data from trajectories for $n=20$ patients who were referred from the Emergency
395 Medical team to the Emergency Psychiatry team during the period of observation. A dynamic
396 clinical interaction network $A_{p,t}$ was iteratively constructed along the trajectory for each patient
397 p and observation number t starting with an empty network $A_p(t = 0)$. For each interaction
398 along the trajectory we added nodes and edges for the corresponding agents if they did not
399 already exist in the network. This process continued up to and including the interaction which
400 precipitated referral. The final state of the $A_{p,t}$ along the trajectory was assigned a positive
401 class label $y_{p,t} = 1$, delineating the the referral point. All other states of $A_{p,t}$ were assigned the
402 class label $y_{p,t} = 0$. Each state of $A_{p,t}$ was mapped to a 1-dimensional binary feature vector:

$$X_{p,t} = [v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_n \mid a_{1,1}, a_{1,2}, \dots, a_{1,n}, a_{2,1}, a_{2,2}, \dots, a_{n,n}] \quad , \quad (5)$$

403 where v_i is a Boolean variable which is true when node i exists and $a_{i,j}$ is the Boolean variable
404 representing the existence of an edge between nodes i and j . The indices i and j correspond
405 to those for the complete interaction network A .

406 The features $X_{p,t}$ and labels $y_{p,t}$ were then used to train a Bernoulli naive Bayes classifier [32]
407 to predict the referral point based on the dynamic network state. We hypothesised that some
408 features of $X_{p,t}$ would be more predictive than others, and that it may be useful to identify the
409 agents or interactions corresponding to these features. To investigate this we used permutation
410 feature importance [33] which quantifies the contribution of each feature in the model by mea-
411 suring the change in a scoring metric when the data for that feature are randomly permuted.
412 We used balanced accuracy [46] as the scoring metric because class labels are highly imbal-
413 anced - positive class labels (referral) typically only occur once in a patient trajectory through

414 the ED and only account for 23% of the data. The balanced accuracy is given by:

$$\text{score} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{TP}{TP + FN} + \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \right), \quad (6)$$

415 where TP, FP, TN and FN are the number of true positives, false positives, true negatives and
416 false negatives in the test data respectively. We estimated the permutation feature importance
417 for 10000 randomly re-sampled 80:20 train/test splits of the data. Data were grouped such
418 that observations from any given patient trajectory could not be split between the training and
419 test sets. To avoid bias in the model due to highly imbalanced class labels, we used random
420 over-sampling of the minority class label to balance the data in each training split [47].

DECLARATIONS

421 Ethics approval

422 This study was approved as a Quality Activity by WA Health North Metropolitan Health Service
423 and received Ethics Approval from the Chair of the North Metropolitan Health Service Research
424 Ethics Committee. Consent for participation in this study was obtained orally and the data were
425 analyzed anonymously.

426 Availability of data and code

427 Data and code for this study are available online at <https://github.com/mhmcc/ED-interaction-mapping>.

428 Competing interests

429 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

430 Funding

431 SH and MS received funding for this research from The University of Western Australia Young
432 Lives Matter Foundation (UWA YLM) which was a cross-disciplinary research initiative active
433 from 2018 to 2021. UWA YLM supported research at The University of Western Australia
434 through internal funding schemes (<https://www.research.uwa.edu.au/>). The funders had no
435 role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the
436 manuscript.

437 **Author contributions**

438 Conceptualization: SH, MS; Methodology: MHM, BJ; Data collection: BJ, MHM; Data analysis
439 & code: MHM; Investigation: MHM, BJ, MS, SH; Writing — original draft: MHM; Writing —
440 review and editing: MHM, MS, BJ, SH; Supervision: MS, SH.

441 **Acknowledgments**

442 We thank the clinicians and staff at the Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Emergency Department
443 (North Metropolitan Health Service, Department of Health, Western Australia) several of whom
444 provided advisory and logistical support for this research.

REFERENCES

- 445 1. World Health Organization. Suicide. fact sheet. WHO, 2021
- 446 2. Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D, O'Connor RC, Oquendo MA, Pirkis J, and Stanley BH.
447 Suicide and suicide risk. *Nature Reviews Disease Primers* 2019 Oct; 5:1–22. DOI: [10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0)
448
- 449 3. Shepard DS, Gurewich D, Lwin AK, Reed Jr GA, and Silverman MM. Suicide and suicidal
450 attempts in the United States: costs and policy implications. *Suicide and Life-Threatening*
451 *Behavior* 2016; 46:352–62. DOI: [10.1111/sltb.12225](https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12225)
- 452 4. Silverman MM and Berman AL. Suicide Risk Assessment and Risk Formulation Part I: A
453 Focus on Suicide Ideation in Assessing Suicide Risk. en. *Suicide and Life-Threatening*
454 *Behavior* 2014 Aug; 44:420–31. DOI: [10.1111/sltb.12065](https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12065)
- 455 5. Nelson HD, Denneson LM, Low AR, Bauer BW, O'Neil M, Kansagara D, and Teo AR.
456 Suicide Risk Assessment and Prevention: A Systematic Review Focusing on Veterans.
457 *Psychiatric Services* 2017 Jun; 68:1003–15. DOI: [10.1176/appi.ps.201600384](https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201600384)
- 458 6. Bowers A, Meyer C, Hillier S, Blubaugh M, Roepke B, Farabough M, Gordon J, and Vassar
459 M. Suicide risk assessment in the emergency department: Are there any tools in the
460 pipeline? *The American Journal of Emergency Medicine* 2018 Apr; 36:630–6. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajem.2017.09.044](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2017.09.044)
461
- 462 7. Ahmedani BK, Simon GE, Stewart C, Beck A, Waitzfelder BE, Rossom R, Lynch F, Owen-
463 Smith A, Hunkeler EM, Whiteside U, et al. Health care contacts in the year before suicide
464 death. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2014; 29:870–7. DOI: [10.1007/s11606-014-2767-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-014-2767-3)
465
- 466 8. Larkin GL, Beautrais AL, Spirito A, Kirrane BM, Lippmann MJ, and Milzman DP. Men-
467 tal Health and Emergency Medicine: A Research Agenda. en. *Academic Emergency*
468 *Medicine* 2009; 16:1110–9. DOI: [10.1111/j.1553-2712.2009.00545.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1553-2712.2009.00545.x)

- 469 9. McDonough S, Wynaden D, Finn M, McGowan S, Chapman R, and Hood S. Emergency
470 department mental health triage consultancy service: an evaluation of the first year of the
471 service. *en. Accident and Emergency Nursing* 2004 Jan; 12:31–8. DOI: [10.1016/S0965-
472 2302\(03\)00054-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0965-2302(03)00054-7)
- 473 10. Clarke DE, Dusome D, and Hughes L. Emergency department from the mental health
474 client’s perspective. *en. International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 2007; 16:126–31.
475 DOI: [10.1111/j.1447-0349.2007.00455.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1447-0349.2007.00455.x)
- 476 11. Wilhelm K, Korczak V, Tietze T, Reddy P, Wilhelm K, Korczak V, Tietze T, and Reddy
477 P. Clinical pathways for suicidality in emergency settings: a public health priority. *en.*
478 *Australian Health Review* 2016 Jun; 41:182–4. DOI: [10.1071/AH16008](https://doi.org/10.1071/AH16008)
- 479 12. Coates D. Service Models for Urgent and Emergency Psychiatric Care: An Overview.
480 English. *Journal of Psychosocial Nursing & Mental Health Services* 2018 Aug; 56:23–
481 30. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3928/02793695-20180212-01>
- 482 13. Pascoe SE, Aggar C, and Penman O. Wait times in an Australian emergency department:
483 A comparison of mental health and non-mental health patients in a regional emergency
484 department. *en. International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 2022; n/a. DOI: [10.1111/
485 inm.12970](https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12970)
- 486 14. Tran QN, Lambeth LG, Sanderson K, Graaff B de, Breslin M, Huckerby EJ, Tran V, and
487 Neil AL. Trend of emergency department presentations with a mental health diagnosis in
488 Australia by diagnostic group, 2004–05 to 2016–17. *en. Emergency Medicine Australasia*
489 2020; 32:190–201. DOI: [10.1111/1742-6723.13451](https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13451)
- 490 15. Perera J, Wand T, Bein KJ, Chalkley D, Ivers R, Steinbeck KS, Shields R, and Dinh
491 MM. Presentations to NSW emergency departments with self-harm, suicidal ideation, or
492 intentional poisoning, 2010–2014. *en. Medical Journal of Australia* 2018; 208:348–53.
493 DOI: [10.5694/mja17.00589](https://doi.org/10.5694/mja17.00589)
- 494 16. Clements C, Turnbull P, Hawton K, Geulayov G, Waters K, Ness J, Townsend E, Khun-
495 dakar K, and Kapur N. Rates of self-harm presenting to general hospitals: a comparison of
496 data from the Multicentre Study of Self-Harm in England and Hospital Episode Statistics.
497 *en. BMJ Open* 2016 Feb; 6:e009749. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009749](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009749)
- 498 17. Summers M and Happell B. Patient satisfaction with psychiatric services provided by a
499 Melbourne tertiary hospital emergency department. *en. Journal of Psychiatric and Mental*
500 *Health Nursing* 2003; 10:351–7. DOI: [10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00600.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00600.x)
- 501 18. Wand T, Collett G, Cutten A, Buchanan-Hagen S, Stack A, and White K. Patient and
502 clinician experiences with an emergency department-based mental health liaison nurse
503 service in a metropolitan setting. *en. International Journal of Mental Health Nursing* 2020;
504 29:1202–17. DOI: [10.1111/inm.12760](https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12760)
- 505 19. Schmidt M and Uman T. Experiences of acute care by persons with mental health prob-
506 lems: An integrative literature review. *en. Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing*
507 2020; 27:789–806. DOI: [10.1111/jpm.12624](https://doi.org/10.1111/jpm.12624)
- 508 20. MacDonald S, Sampson C, Turley R, Biddle L, Ring N, Begley R, and Evans R. Patients’
509 Experiences of Emergency Hospital Care Following Self-Harm: Systematic Review and
510 Thematic Synthesis of Qualitative Research. *en. Qualitative Health Research* 2020 Feb;
511 30:471–85. DOI: [10.1177/1049732319886566](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732319886566)

- 512 21. Coates D, David M, Roberts B, and Duerden D. An examination of the profile and journey
513 of patients with mental illness in the emergency department. en. *International Emergency*
514 *Nursing* 2019 Mar; 43:15–22. DOI: [10.1016/j.ienj.2018.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2018.06.003)
- 515 22. Bernert RA, Hom MA, and Roberts LW. A Review of Multidisciplinary Clinical Practice
516 Guidelines in Suicide Prevention: Toward an Emerging Standard in Suicide Risk As-
517 sessment and Management, Training and Practice. en. *Academic Psychiatry* 2014 Oct;
518 38:585–92. DOI: [10.1007/s40596-014-0180-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40596-014-0180-1)
- 519 23. Walker A, Barrett JR, Lee W, West RM, Guthrie E, Trigwell P, Quirk A, Crawford MJ, and
520 House A. Organisation and delivery of liaison psychiatry services in general hospitals in
521 England: results of a national survey. *BMJ Open* 2018 Aug; 8:e023091. DOI: [10.1136/
522 bmjopen-2018-023091](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-023091)
- 523 24. Wand AP, Wood R, Fossey MJ, and Aitken P. Standards, efficiency and effectiveness in
524 consultation-liaison psychiatry. en. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 2015
525 Feb; 49:104–5. DOI: [10.1177/0004867414563580](https://doi.org/10.1177/0004867414563580)
- 526 25. Wand T, D’Abrew N, Acret L, and White K. Evaluating a new model of nurse-led emer-
527 gency department mental health care in Australia; perspectives of key informants. en.
528 *International Emergency Nursing* 2016 Jan; 24:16–21. DOI: [10.1016/j.ienj.2015.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2015.05.003)
- 529 26. Gardner G, Gardner A, Middleton S, Considine J, Fitzgerald G, Christofis L, Doubrovsky
530 A, Adams M, O’Connell J, Gardner G, Gardner A, Middleton S, Considine J, Fitzgerald
531 G, Christofis L, Doubrovsky A, Adams M, and O’Connell J. Mapping workforce configu-
532 ration and operational models in Australian emergency departments: a national survey.
533 en. *Australian Health Review* 2017 May; 42:340–7. DOI: [10.1071/AH16231](https://doi.org/10.1071/AH16231)
- 534 27. Bost N, Johnston A, Broadbent M, and Crilly J. Clinician perspectives of a mental health
535 consumer flow strategy in an emergency department. en. *Collegian* 2018 Aug; 25:415–
536 20. DOI: [10.1016/j.colegn.2017.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colegn.2017.10.007)
- 537 28. Guthrie E, Romeu D, Czoski-Murray C, Relton S, Walker A, Trigwell P, Hewison J, West
538 R, Fossey M, Hulme C, and House A. Experiences of people seen in an acute hospital
539 setting by a liaison mental health service: responses from an online survey. *BMC Health*
540 *Services Research* 2021 Oct; 21:1050. DOI: [10.1186/s12913-021-06974-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06974-4)
- 541 29. Clauset A, Newman ME, and Moore C. Finding community structure in very large net-
542 works. *Physical Review E* 2004; 70:066111. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.70.066111](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.70.066111)
- 543 30. Newman M. *Networks*. Oxford University Press, 2018. DOI: [10.1093/oso/9780198805090.
544 001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198805090.001.0001)
- 545 31. Gkantsidis C, Mihail M, and Zegura EW. The Markov chain simulation method for generat-
546 ing connected power law random graphs. *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Algorithm*
547 *Engineering and Experiments*. Ed. by Ladner RE. SIAM, 2003 :16–25
- 548 32. McCallum A, Nigam K, et al. A comparison of event models for naive bayes text clas-
549 sification. *AAAI-98 workshop on learning for text categorization*. Vol. 752. 1. 1998 :41–
550 8
- 551 33. Breiman L. Random forests. *Machine learning* 2001; 45:5–32. DOI: [10.1023/A:1010933404324](https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324)
- 552 34. Wand T, Collett G, Cutten A, Stack A, Dinh M, Bein K, Green T, Berendsen Russell
553 S, Edwards J, and White K. Evaluating an emergency department-based mental health
554 liaison nurse service: A multi-site translational research project. en. *Emergency Medicine*
555 *Australasia* 2021; 33:74–81. DOI: [10.1111/1742-6723.13583](https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13583)


- 556 35. Callaghan P, Eales S, Coates T, and Bowers L. A review of research on the structure,
557 process and outcome of liaison mental health services. en. *Journal of Psychiatric and*
558 *Mental Health Nursing* 2003; 10:155–65. DOI: [10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00300.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2850.2003.00300.x)
- 559 36. Wand T, Collett G, Cutten A, Buchanan-Hagen S, Stack A, and White K. Patient and staff
560 experience with a new model of emergency department based mental health nursing
561 care implemented in two rural settings. en. *International Emergency Nursing* 2021 Jul;
562 57:101013. DOI: [10.1016/j.ienj.2021.101013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ienj.2021.101013)
- 563 37. Eales S, Callaghan P, and Johnson B. Service users and other stakeholders' evaluation of
564 a liaison mental health service in an accident and emergency department and a general
565 hospital setting. en. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing* 2006; 13:70–7.
566 DOI: [10.1111/j.1365-2850.2006.00915.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2850.2006.00915.x)
- 567 38. Carstensen K, Lou S, Groth Jensen L, Konstantin Nissen N, Ortenblad L, Pfau M, and
568 Vedel Ankersen P. Psychiatric service users' experiences of emergency departments: a
569 CERQual review of qualitative studies. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry* 2017 May; 71:315–
570 23. DOI: [10.1080/08039488.2017.1288759](https://doi.org/10.1080/08039488.2017.1288759)
- 571 39. Clarke DE, Hughes L, Brown AM, and Motluk L. Psychiatric Emergency Nurses in the
572 Emergency Department: The Success of the Winnipeg, Canada Experience. en. *Journal*
573 *of Emergency Nursing* 2005 Aug; 31:351–6. DOI: [10.1016/j.jen.2005.03.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jen.2005.03.008)
- 574 40. Østervang C, Geisler Johansen L, Friis-Brixen A, and Myhre Jensen C. Experiences of
575 nursing care for patients who self-harm and suggestions for future practices: The per-
576 spectives of emergency care nurses. en. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*
577 2022; 31:70–82. DOI: [10.1111/inm.12933](https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.12933)
- 578 41. Ortíz-Barrios MA and Alfaro-Saíz JJ. Methodological Approaches to Support Process
579 Improvement in Emergency Departments: A Systematic Review. en. *International Jour-*
580 *nal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 2020 Jan; 17:2664. DOI: [10.3390/](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082664)
581 [ijerph17082664](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17082664)
- 582 42. Wardrop R, Ranse J, Chaboyer W, and Crilly J. Profile and outcomes of emergency de-
583 partment presentations based on mode of arrival: A state-wide retrospective cohort study.
584 en. *Emergency Medicine Australasia* 2021; n/a. DOI: [10.1111/1742-6723.13914](https://doi.org/10.1111/1742-6723.13914)
- 585 43. Harris CR, Millman KJ, Walt SJ van der, Gommers R, Virtanen P, Cournapeau D, Wieser
586 E, Taylor J, Berg S, Smith NJ, et al. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 2020;
587 585:357–62. DOI: [10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2649-2)
- 588 44. McKinney W et al. Data structures for statistical computing in python. *Proceedings of the*
589 *9th Python in Science Conference*. Vol. 445. Austin, TX. 2010 :51–6
- 590 45. Hagberg A, Swart P, and S Chult D. Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function
591 using NetworkX. Tech. rep. Los Alamos National Lab.(LANL), Los Alamos, NM (United
592 States), 2008
- 593 46. Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M, Pret-
594 tenhofer P, Weiss R, Dubourg V, et al. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal*
595 *of Machine Learning Research* 2011; 12:2825–30
- 596 47. Lemaître G, Nogueira F, and Aridas CK. Imbalanced-learn: A Python Toolbox to Tackle
597 the Curse of Imbalanced Datasets in Machine Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning*
598 *Research* 2017; 18:1–5

- 599 48. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: A 2D graphics environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering*
600 2007; 9:90–5. DOI: [10.1109/MCSE.2007.55](https://doi.org/10.1109/MCSE.2007.55)
- 601 49. Brandes U. On variants of shortest-path betweenness centrality and their generic com-
602 putation. *Social Networks* 2008; 30:136–45. DOI: [10.1016/j.socnet.2007.11.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2007.11.001)
- 603 50. Freeman LC. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social Networks* 1978;
604 1:215–39
- 605 51. Latora V and Marchiori M. Efficient behavior of small-world networks. *Physical review*
606 *letters* 2001; 87:198701. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.198701](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.87.198701)


Patient	Presentation	Date	Time	Agents	Information Systems	Action
1	Associate	01/MM/YYYY	12:52	Triage Nurse Patient Associate	EDIS	Referral to Emergency Medical
1	Associate	01/MM/YYYY	13:36	Consultant Patient Associate	Patient File	Referral to Emergency Psychiatry
1	Associate	01/MM/YYYY	13:37	Consultant Psychiatric Liaison Nurse		
2	Ambulance	02/MM/YYYY	12:15	Triage Nurse Paramedic		
2	Ambulance	02/MM/YYYY	12:16	Triage Nurse Patient	EDIS	Referral to Emergency Medical
2	Ambulance	02/MM/YYYY	12:20	Triage Nurse Paramedic	EDIS	
2	Ambulance	02/MM/YYYY	12:26	Nurse Paramedic	Patient File	

Table 1: **Example event log:** Data were collected in the form of an event log similar to this table. Shown here are partial trajectories for two patients. Each row corresponds to an observed interaction, listed in chronological order. Dates have been recorded relative to the date on which data collection commenced.


A




B



C



D



E




Figure 1: Mapping trajectories through an ED for patients at risk of suicide or self-harm: (A) A network representation of possible patient trajectories constructed from observations from a total of $n=43$ patients (see Methods). There were $n=36$ observed within in the ED (including the Observation Ward and Emergency Psychiatry), and $n=7$ observed only within the Mental Health Observation Area (MHOA). Solid arrows show the observed directional transitions from presentation through the different clinical teams to the point of discharge. The nature of discharge or referral is indicated by the annotations with dashed grey lines. Histograms of (B) presentation type, (C) trajectory time which was the total time between the first and last observation in each patient trajectory, (D) the number of interactions observed per patient, (E) the number of types of clinical staff involved per patient.




Figure 2: The interaction network comprises two communities divided between the Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry teams and their respective clinical information systems: (A) The interaction network of clinical staff, support services, external services and information systems constructed from observations of $n=213$ interactions for patient trajectories in the ED (see Methods). Each node represents one of the listed agents. Node size reflects the relative number of instances with which each agent was observed where larger nodes were observed more often. Edges are unweighted and undirected, and represent the observation of at least one interaction between a pair of agents in the data. Two communities were identified by greedy modularity maximisation. Community membership is indicated on both the network visualisation and the glossary of agents. The network layout was generated using a force-directed graph algorithm. (B) Degree centrality, (C) closeness centrality and (D) betweenness centrality of all nodes in the network show high importance of the Psychiatric Liason Nurse (PLN).




Figure 3: Network vulnerability to compromised function of the PLN is reduced by strengthening links between Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry doctors: (A) The distributions of betweenness centrality shown as violin plots for 1000 random shuffles of the interaction network for the ten nodes with the highest values for this statistic (see Methods). The betweenness for the PLN in the true network is greater than 95th percentile of the shuffles, indicating that this network may be more vulnerable to compromised function of the PLN than expected by chance in similar networks. (B) The change in global efficiency when key clinical staff are removed from the network. (C) The change in closeness centrality for doctors when key clinical staff are removed from the network. (D) Greedy cumulative addition of edges after the removal of the PLN to show that global efficiency can be restored to a level comparable to the removal of other key clinical staff (dashed line) by the addition of four edges between doctors from the Emergency Medical and Emergency Psychiatry teams. Edges marked as tied contribute equally to the increase in global efficiency regardless of order. (E) Closeness centrality for doctors in the network can be restored by the same greedy addition of edges.




Figure 4: Machine learning on network features reveals agents and interactions that predict the referral from the Emergency Medical team to Emergency Psychiatry: (A) A circular visualisation of the average interaction network for patient trajectories where there is a clinical referral to the Emergency Psychiatry team up to the point of the referral (n=20 patients, n=87 interactions). Node sizes and edge weights reflect the respective relative number of instances for which agents and interactions were observed in this subset of trajectories, where larger size or heavier weight indicates more instances of observation. The color of a node or edge shows its importance for predicting the clinical referral in a subsequent interaction, as computed by permutation feature importance using a Bernoulli naive Bayes classifier trained on the set of nodes and edges at each step of a patient trajectory (see Methods). (B) Mean feature importance and 95% CI for the top 20 nodes or edges over 10000 randomly re-sampled 80:20 train/test splits of the data.