

1 Research article

2 **Running title:** The effect of primary psychological healthcare system in diluting risks of
3 suicide ideation

4

5 **The real-world evidence to the effects of primary psychological healthcare system**
6 **in diluting risks of suicide ideation in underrepresented children/adolescents: an**
7 **observational, multi-center, population-based, and longitudinal study**

8

9 **Authors:** Wei Li^{1*}, Xuerong Liu^{1*}, Qianyu Zhang^{1,2*}, Xiaobing Tian^{3,4}, Jidong Ren⁴, Xiaodi
10 Han¹, Chang Shen¹, Yanyan Li¹, Ji Chen⁵, Lei Xia¹, Jingxuan Zhang¹, Yi Wu¹, Jie Gong⁴,
11 Hai Lan⁶, Yan Wu⁷, Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of
12 China (CPHG) consortium, Chinese Open Science Network (COSN) consortium, Zhengzhi
13 Feng^{1*}, Zhiyi Chen^{1,8*}

14

15 **Affiliation:**

16 ¹ Experimental Research Center of Medical and Psychological Science (ERC-MPS),
17 School of Psychology, Third Military Medical University, Chongqing, China 400038

18

19 ² Department of Public Management, Chongqing University, Chongqing, China 400044

20

21 ³ Department of Epidemiology and Public Health Statistics, North Sichuan Medical College,
22 Nanchong, Sichuan, China 637000

23

24 ⁴ Nanchong Psychosomatic Hospital (The Sixth People's Hospital of Nanchong), Sichuan,
25 China 637000

26

27 ⁵ Department of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou,
28 Zhejiang, China 310058

29

30 ⁶ Department of psychology, Sichuan Normal University, Sichuan, China 610068

31

32 ⁷ School of Architecture, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China 450001

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

33

34 ⁸ Key Laboratory of Cognition and Personality, Ministry of Education, Faculty of Psychology,
35 Southwest University, Chongqing, China 400715

36

37 * Corresponding at: Zhiyi Chen (chenzhiyi@tmmu.edu.cn; TEL: +86 0 68771767) or

38 Zhengzhi Feng (fzz@tmmu.edu.cn; TEL: +86 0 68771480), Experimental Research Center

39 for Medical and Psychological Science, School of Psychology, Third Military Medical

40 University; Gao Tan-Yan Main Street, Shapingba, Chongqing, P.R. China.

41

42

43 [†]These authors contributed equally to this work

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57 **Abstract**

58 **Background**

59 Establishing primary psychological healthcare system to prevent suicide was eagerly
60 advocated. However, it remains unclear whether such policy-driven and low-cost
61 healthcare systems could be practical, especially with equal benefits for underrepresented
62 children/adolescents. We aimed to examine the real-world practical effects of primary
63 psychological healthcare system in preventing suicide ideation among
64 children/adolescents, particularly underprivileged ones.

65

66 **Method and Findings**

67 The study employed an observational, multi-center, population-based and longitudinal
68 design. 19,140 children/adolescents sampled from lower- and middle-income areas of
69 western China (Nanchong) with 1-year followed-ups were included, of which majority to
70 underrepresented underprivileged ones. The primary outcome was the incidence for
71 reporting severe suicide ideation after practicing primary psychological healthcare system
72 at 0.5-year and 1-year follow-ups, as contrasts to baseline. Subgroup analysis was
73 conducted to examine the equal benefits of system for underrepresented
74 children/adolescents. After instigating such system, the risks of reporting suicide ideation
75 for included children/adolescents were found significantly lower compared with the control
76 group at 0.5-year (adjust odds ratios [aOR] 0.28, 95%CI 0.23-0.33; $p < 0.001$) and 1-year
77 follow-ups (aOR 0.28, 95%CI 0.23-0.33; $p < 0.001$). The effects were also observed among
78 underrepresented children/adolescents including “left-behind” children/adolescents,

79 “single-parent” children/adolescents and children/adolescents in especially difficult
80 circumstance (CEDC, all $p_{\text{corrected}} < 0.001$). The effects in CEDC and “left-behind”
81 children/adolescents were found non-inferior to typical developing cohort (all $p_{\text{corrected}} <$
82 0.01).

83

84 **Conclusions**

85 Primary psychological healthcare system was practically effective in reducing risks of
86 suicide ideation in children/adolescents in 1-year, at least, but not yet with fully equal
87 benefits for all the underprivileged ones.

88

89 **Keywords:** primary psychological healthcare system; suicide ideation; underprivileged
90 children/adolescents

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101 **Introduction**

102 Death by suicide is sharply becoming the one of the leading cause for increased mortality
103 in the children/adolescents around the world.^{1,2} As official reports illustrated from the
104 United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) in 2021, 4 per 100,000
105 children/adolescents aged at 10-19 died from suicide at home or even school per year.³
106 To make matters worse, given the prominently more risky factors derived from poor
107 educational, healthcare or political resources, approximately 80% of suicide deaths
108 occurred into low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) compared to advantaged ones.⁴
109 In China, almost 7 children/adolescents die from suicide per day, with 18-25% of this
110 population having ever suicidal ideation. To control such suicide epidemics in
111 children/adolescents, not only substantial financial budgets (e.g., Healthy China Initiative
112 2023, ¥1.1 billion) but also ambitious policy reform have been skewed into suicide
113 prevention from establishing social psychological healthcare systems.⁵⁻⁷ Despite promising
114 efforts and supports, the practices of these systems on preventing from suicide in
115 children/adolescents still confronted challenging, as results of the fact that over 80%
116 victims died from suicide even though they had ever reached out healthcare services.⁸
117 Thus, it is of imperative needs to explore practicable and effective psychological healthcare
118 pattern for suicide prevention, especially for children/adolescents.

119

120 As one of the promising solutions for suicide prevention, there is a growing call from various
121 sectors of society to integrate psychological services into the social primary healthcare
122 system to ensure universally essential psychological health services with equitable

123 accesses favoring to control suicide,⁹⁻¹¹ but it still remains elusive for the practical roles of
124 such changes. As official report drawn from the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2021,
125 even though remarkable efforts have been made to establish and practice primary
126 psychological healthcare system,⁶ one disappointing fact was that there still exists a
127 worldwide failure to provide people in need with mental health services, due to the global
128 shortfall in investment in mental health.¹² Over 70% of total mental health expenditures in
129 middle-income countries are allocated to for-profit hospitals/institutions, far exceeding
130 investment in primary psychological healthcare system.¹³ Even more worryingly, the
131 effectiveness of the current system is still questionable, especially in lower-middle-income
132 western Pacific areas. Such non-profit healthcare system does not encourage high-
133 quality services, leading to limited infrastructure, shortage of human resources and limited
134 community awareness of psychological health.¹⁴ In addition of the “low-quality” concern
135 brought by inadequate investment, primary psychological healthcare system still needs to
136 address potential inaccessibility and unavailability for children/adolescents under
137 underprivileged conditions³. Given that children/adolescents are under developmental for
138 economic status and independent self-care ability, with thoughts and behaviors shaped
139 and constrained by their parents/caregivers, their help-seeking intentions and actions
140 usually arrested by their parents due to poor mental health literacy and suicide stigma
141 especially in Chinese cultures.^{15,16} From what has been discussed for these existing
142 challenges, it necessitates to provide real-world evidence clarifying the practical effects of
143 such healthcare system as a policy for suicide prevention among the whole group of
144 children/adolescents.

145

146 In contrast to primary physical healthcare system, the representation of
147 children/adolescents, particularly those from underprivileged circumstances in LMICs,
148 remains disproportionately negligible when practicing the primary psychological healthcare
149 system, despite the principle of equitable distribution being the primary focus in the system.

150 In LMICs, the number of psychiatrists specializing in treating children and adolescents was
151 fewer than 0.1 per 100,000, significantly lower than 5.5 per 100,000 in high-income
152 countries.³ Thus, the shortage of essential psychological services may handicap their
153 children/adolescents in need from help-seeking. Unlike to the common sense for the needs
154 of primary physical healthcare, stigma associated with mental health problems functions
155 as a substantial societal and cultural barrier to the practices of primary psychological
156 healthcare system among children/adolescents, especially in the lower-middle-income
157 areas. As the results of less mental health knowledge and educations in such areas, the
158 poor literacy leaves parents or even patients themselves to evaluate the mental problems
159 as immoral and disgraceful “dirty disorder”.¹⁷ Several LMICs even legally criminate suicide
160 behaviors, further increasing the their stigmatization for children/adolescents.¹⁸ On the
161 other hand, children/adolescents living with underprivileged circumstances has long
162 been underrepresented in the healthcare system. Compared with typical developing
163 children/adolescents, underprivileged individuals living in disadvantaged socio-cultural
164 environments (e.g., orphans, de facto unattended children/adolescents, "left-behind"
165 children/adolescents, "single-parent" children/adolescents, and children/adolescents in
166 especially difficult circumstances) experience greater psychiatric burdens and suicidal

167 risks,¹⁹ but are more likely to “dropped out” from primary healthcare systems, as the fact
168 that healthcare centers or service providers are geographically limited to economically
169 developed urban areas, as well easily accessed for children/adolescents who are under
170 well-parenting only.^{20,21} Therefore, we still need evidence to show whether underprivileged
171 children/adolescents in LMICs equally benefit from psychological healthcare, examining
172 whether such system provides equitable mental health rights in the real-world practices.

173

174 In June 2022, the Nanchong, one of biggest lower and middle-economic-status city
175 including over 60% children/adolescents who are in underprivileged conditions in the
176 western China, instigated a citywide primary psychological healthcare system (the
177 Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China, CPHG) for all
178 eligible children/adolescents, especially in five underprivileged cohorts (i.e.,
179 children/Adolescents in especially difficult circumstance, CEDC, “Single-parenting”
180 children/adolescents, “Left-behind” children/adolescents, de facto unattended
181 children/adolescents and orphan). This system employed a “2+2” primary psychological
182 healthcare pattern, including two-round psychological screening for risks of suicide and
183 two-round psychological cares, The follow-ups for the incidences of suicide ideation were
184 conducted at May. 21, 2023 and Oct. 29, 2023 for all the cohorts, respectively.

185

186 **Methods**

187 **Study design and participants**

188 A citywide, observational, multi-center, population-based, and longitudinal cohort study of

189 children/adolescents (aged at 10-19) was conducted at Nanchong, Sichuan Province,
190 China, to investigate the real-world effects of instigating primary psychological healthcare
191 system on controlling the risks of suicidal ideation. The Nanchong was a representative
192 lower-middle-economic-status city in the western China (National Bureau of Statistics of
193 P.R.C., 2022). This study was implemented by the CPHG group.

194

195 We firstly established 385 healthcare centers in each middle and high school, as well as
196 social welfare institutions in Nanchong. We assessed suicide ideation with a self-report
197 signaling question at baseline, 0.5 year, and 1 year. All children/adolescents who reported
198 suicide ideation in the past two weeks at baseline were not included in the final analysis,
199 but they received immediately psychological services, clinical assessment, and medical
200 treatment when necessarily. Thus, at the baseline, all the healthy children/adolescents
201 were included in the current study.

202

203 Based on the locally legal definition to the underprivileged conditions (Ministry of Civil
204 Affairs of the PRC, 2019), the enrolled children/adolescents in the present study were
205 further categorized into five underprivileged cohorts, including de facto unattended
206 children/adolescents, “left-behind” children/adolescents, “single-parent”
207 children/adolescents, children/adolescents in especially difficult circumstance (CEDC),
208 and orphan, as well as grouped for typically developing children/adolescents who were
209 free from above conditions. The criterion of underprivileged adolescents can be found in
210 supplementary materials (Appendix pp. 4).

211

212 This study is reported as per the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in
213 Epidemiology (STROBE) guideline (Appendix pp. 14).

214

215 Informed consents were digitally signed by their parents or legal carers. This study has
216 been formally approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of The Sixth People's
217 Hospital of Nanchong (IRB-2022.002).

218

219 **Procedure**

220 This system that the CPHG adopted was the “2+2” psychological healthcare pattern. The
221 former “2” represented two-round psychological screenings for capturing the suicide
222 ideation, In the first round, we used Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression Scale
223 (CES-D) to investigate whether children/adolescents reported depressive symptoms. The
224 individuals with CES-D scores \geq 16 would be identified as “at-risk” children/adolescents for
225 undergoing the second-round screening of directly measuring suicide ideation by a single
226 signaling question (i.e., have you ever felt hopeless for the future, give rise to the idea of
227 suicide?). Once identifying the suicide ideation, those ones would receive two-round
228 specific psychological cares (interviews, the latter “2”). The first-round primary
229 psychological care was carried out by trained and qualified staffs at healthcare centers
230 following structural guidelines. A portion of them who were still identified “at-risk” for suicide
231 ideation after primary psychological care would be transferred to the second-round
232 preclinical (early) psychological interventions that conducted by clinicians at government-

233 sponsored hospitals (Appendix pp. 7). Those children/adolescents would be transferred
234 for inpatient medical treatments/interventions in case they were diagnosed for “high-risk”
235 or clinically psychiatric disorders. Screening their depressive symptoms and suicide
236 ideation has been implemented by the purpose-built online software in the cellphone.
237 Meantime, healthcare centers lacking such infrastructures were supplemented by offline
238 pencil-and-paper questionnaires. The practices of screenings were guided and supervised
239 by CPHG staffs who trained and qualified ahead of this system implementation.

240

241 **Outcome**

242 The primary outcomes were changes of incidence of reporting suicide ideation after
243 instigating this primary psychological healthcare with “2+2” pattern at 0.5-year and 1-year
244 follow-ups, compared to the ones at baseline.

245

246 **Statistical analysis**

247 Descriptive statistical analyses were conducted using R (version 4.3.1), SPSS (IBM, Inc.,
248 version 29.0.1.0) and SPSSAU. The Mann-Whitney test and chi-square tests were carried
249 out to examine the homogeneity between CPHG (child/adolescents enrolled in the “2+2”
250 workflow) and control group. The frequency (rate) was calculated with 95% confidence
251 interval (CI, estimated by Bootstrapping method at $n = 5,000$) to quantify the incidence of
252 reporting suicide ideation.

253

254 As for the inferential statistics, the generalized linear mixed-effect models (GLMM) were

255 built by *lmerTest* package in R, to test the effect size of instigating primary mental
256 healthcare system on reducing risks of suicide ideation. A random effect for clustering of
257 children/adolescents within regions was accounted to capture variability between groups.
258 Missing data were dummy coded in Sociodemographic characteristics and removed in
259 CES-D and suicide ideation records. For singular fit occurred in GLMM, we performed
260 generalized linear model (GLM) to simplify the analysis. The GLMM for outcome included
261 fixed effects for CPHG group and control, including comparison of the whole group and
262 comparison of the subgroups (e.g., CEDC, orphan, de facto unattended
263 children/adolescents, “single-parent” children/adolescents, and “left-behind
264 children/adolescents”), adjusted for centers, age, sex, offspring, family condition (excluded
265 in the comparison of subgroups) and depressive symptoms. By building upon logit
266 regression model, we calculated original and adjusted odds ratios (OR) and 95% CI for
267 CPHG group compared with control group at 0.5-year and 1-year follow-ups, respectively.
268 Also, the absolute risk difference, relative risk reduction for such changes were calculated.
269
270 To further examine the whether such benefits are equal effects in underprivileged
271 children/adolescents, we used non-inferiority tests that implemented by SPSSAU. Given
272 that no evidence-based non-inferiority boundary values that provided previously, we
273 tentatively limited this liberal boundary value to 40% of incidence rate of typical developing
274 individuals. We estimated the sample size by using normal approximation method, with a
275 two-sided α of 0.05, a β of 0.10. The minimum sample size was found to be 2,034. Holm-
276 Bonferroni correction was employed to adjust p values for the multiple comparisons.

277

278 For sensitivity analysis, we have redone main analyses mentioned above by re-enrolling
279 from propensity score (PS)-matched samples that calculated by nearest neighbor matching
280 algorithm. After estimations to PS, the 2,807 children/adolescents of CPHG group who
281 individually matching to ones in the control group were selected out. Homogeneity of these
282 population-based covariables (e.g., age, sex, offspring, and family condition) between
283 CPHG and control group were verified in the post-hoc analyses. Sensitivity of the current
284 study was evaluated for the replications of these findings between original sample and PS-
285 match one.

286

287 **Role of the funding source**

288 The study was funded by Civil-Affairs Fund of Sichuan. The funder of the study was not
289 engaged in the study design, data collection and analysis, interpretation of result, report
290 writing, and the decision of submitting the paper for publication.

291

292 **Results**

293 A total of 180,006 children/adolescents geographically representing the entire Nanchong
294 were enrolled in this primary psychological healthcare system, All the eligible
295 children/adolescents (n = 19, 140) derived from 326 centers were included in the present
296 study, with 13,527 children/adolescents for undergoing “2+2 pattern” primary psychological
297 healthcare and 5,613 ones for receiving traditional social healthcare (Fig 1 for details).
298 Demographic characteristics for these groups have been tabulated (Table 1). Details for

299 the subgroups (i.e., underprivileged cohorts) can be found at the Table 2.

300

301 As shown in fig 2, at the 0.5-year follow-up, since instigating this “2+2 pattern” primary
302 psychological healthcare system 5.7% (95% CI: 5.3 - 6.1, 772/13,527)
303 children/adolescents in the CHPG group reported suicide ideation, whereas higher
304 incidence reporting suicide ideation was found higher for children/adolescents in the
305 control group (8.1%, 95% CI: 7.4 - 8.9, 475/5,613) Results of GLMM showed significant
306 effects (adjusted OR = 0.28, 95% CI 0.23-0.33; $p < 0.001$) of practicing this system on
307 reducing risks of reporting suicide ideation in the CPHG group, as contrast to ones in the
308 control ones. Further, we observed the relative risk reduction (RRR) of 29.6% for the CPHG
309 group compared to control ones ($p < .01$, Permutation test at $n = 5,000$; e.g., of 1000
310 children/adolescents, 57 ones reporting suicide ideation in the CPHG group vs 81 in the
311 control group). At 1-year follow-up (fig 3), the incidence rate of reporting suicide ideation
312 further decreased to 5.6% (95% CI: 5.3 - 6.0) in the CPHG group, but increasingly reached
313 to 9.1% (95% CI 8.4 - 9.9) in the control group. The statistically significant 1-year-lasting
314 effects (aOR = 0.28, 95% CI 0.23-0.33; $p < 0.001$, the same as 0.5-year follow-up) of
315 implementing this system on reducing risks of reporting suicide ideation was still found in
316 the CPHG group, as contrasts of control ones. The RRR was observed to be increasing to
317 38.5% ($p < .01$, Permutation test at $n = 5,000$).

318

319 In the subgroup analysis, at 0.5-year follow-up (May. 21, 2023), we found the statistically
320 lower risks of reporting suicide ideation after practicing this “2+2 pattern” primary

321 psychological healthcare, in not only typical developing children/adolescents (adjusted OR
322 0.39, 95%CI 0.24-0.65), but also these underprivileged cohorts including CEDC
323 (adjusted OR 0.28, 95%CI 0.21-0.37), “single-parent” children/adolescents (adjusted OR
324 0.24, 95%CI 0.16-0.38), “left-behind” children/adolescents (adjusted OR 0.26, 95%CI 0.21-
325 0.33) and de facto unattended children/adolescents (adjusted OR 0.13, 95%CI 0.04-0.45),
326 as contrasts of control group (Table 2; all $p \leq 0.001$, Benjamini-Hochberg corrections). At
327 1-year follow-up (Oct. 29, 2023), such benefits were observed in typical developing cohort
328 (adjusted OR 0.35, 95%CI 0.21-0.58), CEDC (adjusted OR 0.31, 95%CI 0.23-0.41),
329 “single-parent” children/adolescents (adjusted OR 0.28, 95%CI 0.18-0.44) and “left-behind”
330 children/adolescents (adjusted OR 0.25, 95%CI 0.20-0.31) only (all $p < .001$, Benjamini-
331 Hochberg corrections; Table 2).

332

333 Despite such prominent and (1-year) long-term benefits, by using non-inferiority tests, we
334 further examined whether this system unexpectedly incurs inequality of such primary
335 health benefits in underprivileged children/adolescents, including the CEDC, “left-behind”
336 and “single-parent” children/adolescents’ group, respectively, given their sample sizes
337 reached statistical prerequisite. Results demonstrated the statistically non-inferior effects
338 of practicing this system to CEDC and “left-behind” children/adolescents, compared to
339 typical developing ones, irrespective of in 0.5-year and 1-year follow-ups (all $p_{\text{corrected}} \leq$
340 0.01, Table S4). Exploratory analysis for the non-inferiority to other underprivileged cohorts
341 can be found at Table S4.

342

343 As for the sensitivity analysis, we replicated main analyses by re-selecting PS-matched
344 control group. Results were found to be parallel with main findings by showing the
345 decreased incidence and risks of reporting suicide ideation after instigating primary
346 psychological healthcare system in CPHG groups, compared to control group at both 0.5-
347 year and 1-year follow-ups (Fig 4-5).

348

349 **Discussion**

350 This study provides the real-world evidence to illustrate the practical effects of establishing
351 primary psychological healthcare system on reducing the risks of children and adolescents'
352 suicide ideation in a lower- and middle-income city. By implementing such “2+2 pattern” of
353 primary psychological healthcare system, the reported reduction of relative risk was nearly
354 30% than for the control group at 0.5-year follow-up and nearly 40% at 1-year follow-up. In
355 terms of the risks of psychological health inequality from this system, we found the absolute
356 and relative risk reductions in not only the typical developing cohort but also all the
357 underprivileged subgroups, including CEDC, “left-behind” children/adolescents, and
358 “single-parent” children/adolescents, whereas failed to equally benefit to orphan and
359 unattended children/adolescents in our exploratory analysis. Together, these results
360 substantiated the real-world and (1-year) long-term benefits of establishing this citywide,
361 low-cost, and population-based “2+2 pattern” primary psychological healthcare system
362 to reduce risks of suicide ideation in children/adolescents living in lower-middle-income
363 areas, even if under several specific underprivileged conditions.

364

365 The current study firstly examined the real-world effects of establishing a primary
366 psychological healthcare system to control the risks of children and adolescents' suicide
367 ideation in a lower-middle-income city, and found nearly 40% relative risk reduction after
368 implementing this system at even 1-year follow-up with a consistent adjusted OR. Although
369 integrating primary healthcare and psychological services is considered as one of the most
370 viable options for preventing and solving children and adolescents' suicide issues,²¹ the
371 role of such healthcare system in preventing suicide ideation among children/adolescent
372 is still unclear so far. The supporting evidence drawn from a global meta-analysis reported
373 the significantly decreasing in suicide ideation after integrating psychological healthcare
374 into the primary system which employed a post-primary school-based suicide prevention
375 (PSSP) pattern including awareness programs, screening, and interventions for high-risk
376 children/adolescents.²² However, the contradictory results also illustrated null effects of
377 integrative psychological services neither on controlling the incidence of suicide attempts
378 or severe suicide ideation at follow-ups (e.g., The Screening by Professionals program),²³
379 leading to the concern that such integrative primary psychological services may be not well
380 enough to tackle "suicide epidemics", especially for global children/adolescents. Therefore,
381 the overarching and major contribution of the current study was to provide real-world
382 evidence supporting the practical effects of establishing pattern-specific primary
383 psychological healthcare on reducing the risks of children and adolescents' suicide ideation.
384
385 The practical effects of implementing primary psychological healthcare system in the
386 current study could be attributed to its rectification of the following deficiencies. On the one

387 hand, because of limited mental health resources (licensed psychiatrists, psychiatric
388 registrars, and psychiatric nurses) and millions of community-dwelling individuals in-need,
389 the accessibility of psychological healthcare and medical services is still insufficient,²⁴
390 despite the excessive mental health expenditures in the mental health, especially in
391 LMICs.¹³ Therefore, the “2+2” psychological pattern combined with large-scale, multi-
392 center, and population-based design in the primary psychological healthcare system could
393 directly ameliorate the universal accessibility of early identifying of suicide ideation and
394 early psychological services, covering all children/adolescents in need.²⁵ On the other
395 hand, stigma associated with suicide related issues among children and adolescents who
396 are suffering from suicidal ideation handicap them from seeking psychological support,
397 leading to more serious outcomes (suicide attempt and suicide).²⁶ These
398 children/adolescents who arrested by stigma are usually lack of mental health education
399 and literacy as well as social support.²⁷ Hence, despite that primary psychological
400 healthcare system is categorized as low-cost project with “low-quality” concern, such brief
401 psychological healthcare in this system could give them social support, enhance the mental
402 health literacy about suicide related issues of children/adolescents, and help them to
403 overcome the suicide crisis.²⁸

404

405 Another finding worthy to be discussed is to specifically evaluate the potential risks of
406 psychological health inequality from instigating this primary psychological healthcare
407 system for underprivileged children/adolescents who are generally underrepresented in
408 the family, school, and social cares. However, we observed a potentially moderate

409 “inequality” for condition-specific underprivileged cohorts from this system, especially in
410 unattended and orphan children/adolescents. Unlike to children/adolescents under
411 parental or family-based cares, on the one hand, these unattended and orphan
412 children/adolescents are confront with more mental health challenges from prominently
413 lower socioeconomic positions, peer bullying and relevant disadvantageous conditions
414 (e.g., poverty, less caregiving and lacking access to education), leading to higher risks for
415 mental health problems than do of their peers.²⁹ On the other hand, previous practices
416 linking to primary healthcare services for children/adolescents, are highly dependent from
417 full-fledged social systems (e.g., family, school, community), but are hard to individually
418 reach unattended ones outside these systems.³⁰ Given the worse benefits of this system
419 for these unattended ones, we may prompt a urgent calls for specific psychological
420 healthcare towards these underprivileged children/adolescents without well-established
421 parenting cares. More importantly, generalizing this system elsewhere may need to design
422 specific solicitude for these underrepresented cohorts.³¹

423

424 Despite merits, the several limitations in the current study should be considered These
425 results were derived from observational cohorts in the policy changes to establish primary
426 psychological healthcare (i.e., CPHG), but not yet from standard Randomized Controlled
427 Trial (RCT) providing “casual and conclusive” evidences. In addition, given the cost-saving
428 design for this universally primary healthcare system, we indeed lacked clear evidences to
429 validate the healthcare quality (e.g., psychological cares, psychological screenings,
430 individual evaluations to this “2+2 pattern” practices). Lastly, these data in the current study

431 were drawn from a citywide real-world population, leading to unpredictable losses in the
432 follow-ups, such as lacking of parental consents and cooperation.

433

434 In conclusion, the current study provided this empirical real-world evidence of the benefits
435 of the population-based and low-cost primary psychological healthcare system to reducing
436 citywide risks of suicide ideation for children/adolescents, especially in such lower-middle-
437 income areas. What's more, we found nearly 30% relative risk reduction after establishing
438 this system at 0.5-year follow-up, and even observed 1-year long-term benefits by showing
439 nearly 40% at 1-year follow-up. On the other hand, the current study highlighted the risks
440 of health inequality for the benefits of this system on underrepresented
441 children/adolescents, especially for ones in underprivileged parenting cares. Taken
442 together, by conducting this observational, population-based and 1-year longitudinal study,
443 we provided real-world evidences to substantiate the benefits of instigating the primary
444 psychological healthcare system with "2+2 pattern" to reducing risks of children and
445 adolescents' suicide ideation, particularly in such lower-middle-income areas
446 encompassing underrepresented ones who were in underprivileged conditions.

447

448

449

450

451

452

453 **References**

- 454 1. Naghavi M. Global, regional, and national burden of suicide mortality 1990 to 2016:
455 systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2016. *Bmj*. 2019; 364: I94. DOI:
456 10.1136/bmj.I94
- 457 2. The Lancet. An age of uncertainty: mental health in young people. *Lancet*. 2022;
458 400(10352): 539. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(22)01572-0
- 459 3. United Nations Children's Fund. The State of the World's Children 2021. 2021 October
460 [Cited 2024 January 10]. Available from: [https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-worlds-children-](https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-worlds-children-2021)
461 [2021](https://www.unicef.org/reports/state-worlds-children-2021).
- 462 4. Favril L, Yu R, Geddes JR, et al. Individual-level risk factors for suicide mortality in the
463 general population: an umbrella review. *Lancet Public Health*. 2023; 8(11): e868-e77. DOI:
464 10.1016/S2468-2667(23)00207-4
- 465 5. McGorry PD, Mei C, Chanen A, et al. Designing and scaling up integrated youth mental
466 health care. *World Psychiatry*. 2022; 21(1): 61-76. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20938
- 467 6. CPC Central Committee, State Council. "Healthy China 2030" Plan. 2016 October 25
468 [Cited 2024 January 10]. Available from: [https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-](https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-10/25/content_5124174.htm?wm=2226_2965)
469 [10/25/content_5124174.htm?wm=2226_2965](https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2016-10/25/content_5124174.htm?wm=2226_2965).
- 470 7. National Disease Control and Prevention Administration. Guidance on Strengthening
471 Mental Health Services. 2017 January 24 [Cited 2024 January 10]. Available
472 from:[https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2017-](https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2017-01/24/content_5162861.htm?eqid=a6dd29ca001fb44900000002646089fb#1)
473 [01/24/content_5162861.htm?eqid=a6dd29ca001fb44900000002646089fb#1](https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2017-01/24/content_5162861.htm?eqid=a6dd29ca001fb44900000002646089fb#1).
- 474 8. Stene-Larsen K, Reneflot A. Contact with primary and mental health care prior to suicide:

- 475 A systematic review of the literature from 2000 to 2017. *Scand J Public Health*. 2019; 47(1): 9-
476 17. DOI: 10.1177/1403494817746274
- 477 9. Kohlbeck S, Armanious M, Pickett M. Assessing the Healthcare Utilization of Youth Who
478 Died by Suicide: A Case-Control Study. *Arch Suicide Res*. 2023; 27(1): 80-8. DOI:
479 10.1080/13811118.2021.1967238
- 480 10. United Nations. The World Health Organization has released new guidelines to help the
481 world achieve the goal of reducing the suicide rate by one-third by 2030. 2021 June 17 [Cited
482 2024 January 10]. Available from: <https://news.un.org/zh/story/2021/06/1086232>.
- 483 11. World Health Organization. Primary health care. 2023 November 15 [Cited 2024 January
484 10]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/primary-health-care>.
- 485 12. World Health Organization. Mental Health ATLAS 2020. 2021 October 8 [Cited 2024
486 January 10]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240036703/>.
- 487 13. World Health Organization. WHO report highlights global shortfall in investment in mental
488 health. 2021 October 8 [Cited 2024 January 10]. Available from:
489 [https://www.who.int/news/item/08-10-2021-who-report-highlights-global-shortfall-in-](https://www.who.int/news/item/08-10-2021-who-report-highlights-global-shortfall-in-investment-in-mental-health)
490 [investment-in-mental-health](https://www.who.int/news/item/08-10-2021-who-report-highlights-global-shortfall-in-investment-in-mental-health).
- 491 14. Wainberg ML, Scorza P, Shultz JM, et al. Challenges and Opportunities in Global Mental
492 Health: a Research-to-Practice Perspective. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2017; 19(5): 28. DOI:
493 10.1007/s11920-017-0780-z
- 494 15. Liu CH, Li H, Wu E, et al. Parent perceptions of mental illness in Chinese American youth.
495 *Asian J Psychiatr*. 2020; 47: 101857. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajp.2019.101857
- 496 16. Burke CT, Calear AL, Cruwys T, et al. Are Parents the Key? How Parental Suicide Stigma

- 497 and Suicide Literacy Affect Help-Seeking Attitudes and Intentions for their Child. *J Youth*
498 *Adolesc.* 2023; 52(11): 2417-29. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-023-01841-3
- 499 17. Renwick L, Pedley R, Johnson I, et al. Mental health literacy in children and adolescents
500 in low- and middle-income countries. a mixed studies systematic review and narrative synthesis.
501 *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry.* 2022. DOI: 10.1007/s00787-022-01997-6
- 502 18. Ochuku BK, Johnson NE, Osborn TL, et al. Centering decriminalization of suicide in low -
503 and middle - income countries on effective suicide prevention strategies. *Front Psychiatry.* 2022;
504 13: 1034206. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyt.2022.1034206
- 505 19. Xiao Y, Chen Y, Meng Q, et al. Suicide ideation and suicide plan in Chinese left-behind
506 children: Prevalence and associated factors. *J Affect Disord.* 2019; 257: 662-8. DOI:
507 10.1016/j.jad.2019.07.072
- 508 20. Michaud PA, Visser A, Vervoort JPM, et al. Availability and accessibility of primary mental
509 health services for adolescents: an overview of national recommendations and services in EU.
510 *Eur J Public Health.* 2020; 30(6): 1127-33. DOI: 10.1093/eurpub/ckaa102
- 511 21. Xiao Y, Chen TT, Du N. Challenges facing China's mental health services in the context
512 of COVID-19. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry.* 2022; 79: 191-2. DOI:
513 10.1016/j.genhosppsy.2022.10.007
- 514 22. Walsh EH, McMahon J, Herring MP. Research Review: The effect of school-based suicide
515 prevention on suicidal ideation and suicide attempts and the role of intervention and contextual
516 factors among adolescents: a meta-analysis and meta-regression. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.*
517 2022; 63(8): 836-45. DOI: 10.1111/jcpp.13598
- 518 23. Wasserman D, Hoven CW, Wasserman C, et al. School-based suicide prevention

- 519 programmes: the SEYLE cluster-randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2015; 385(9977): 1536-
520 44. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61213-7
- 521 24. Xiang YT, Ng CH, Yu X, et al. Rethinking progress and challenges of mental health care
522 in China. *World Psychiatry*. 2018; 17(2): 231-2. DOI: 10.1002/wps.20500
- 523 25. The Lancet Regional Health-Southeast Asia. Early intervention in mental health: The best
524 bet. *Lancet Reg Health Southeast Asia* 2022; 5: 100090. Doi: 10.1016/j.lansea.2022.100090
- 525 26. Turecki G, Brent DA, Gunnell D, et al. Suicide and suicide risk. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2019;
526 5(1): 74. DOI: 10.1038/s41572-019-0121-0
- 527 27. Cruwys T, An S, Chang MX, et al. Suicide literacy predicts the provision of more
528 appropriate support to people experiencing psychological distress. *Psychiatry Res*. 2018; 264:
529 96-103. DOI: 10.1016/j.psychres.2018.03.039
- 530 28. Fleischmann A, Bertolote JM, Wasserman D, et al. Effectiveness of brief intervention and
531 contact for suicide attempters: a randomized controlled trial in five countries. *Bull World Health*
532 *Organ*. 2008; 86(9): 703-9. DOI: 10.2471/blt.07.046995
- 533 29. Green EP, Cho H, Gallis J, et al. The impact of school support on depression among
534 adolescent orphans: a cluster-randomized trial in Kenya. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2019;
535 60(1): 54-62. DOI: 10.1111/jcpp.12955
- 536 30. Robinson J, Bailey E, Witt K, et al. What Works in Youth Suicide Prevention? A Systematic
537 Review and Meta-Analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2018; 4-5: 52-91. DOI:
538 10.1016/j.eclinm.2018.10.004
- 539 31. Ministry of Civil Affairs of the People's Republic of China, Ministry of Education of the
540 People's Republic of China, National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China,

541 The Central Committee of the Communist Youth League of China, All-China Women's
542 Federation. Guidance on Strengthening Mental Health Care Services for Children in Difficult
543 Circumstances. 2023 October 26 [Cited 2024 January 10]. Available from:
544 https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/202311/content_6913516.htm.

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

555

556

557

558

559

560

561

562

563 **Consortia authorship**

564 **For the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China**

565 **(CPHG) Group**

566 Yue-Guang Liu,⁴ Xian-Yong An,⁴ Ji-Dong Ren,⁴ Xiang Yuan,⁴ Yi Zhang,⁴ Jian Yang,⁴ Wan-

567 Xia Li,⁴ Yao Peng,⁴ Yao Peng,⁴ Yu-Jia Liao,⁴ Si-Yu Cheng,⁴ Lu Liu,⁴ Hong-Jiang Yu,⁴ Tian-

568 Tian Liu,⁴ Li-Jun Liang,⁴ Meng-Zhu Cheng,⁴ Xi Zhao,⁴ Xiang-Yu Deng,⁹ Hui-Lei Xu,⁹ Jidong

569 Ren,⁴ Xiaobing Tian,^{3,4} Xue-Hua Li,⁴ Yi-Han Wen,⁴ Jun Lei,⁴ Xiao He,⁴ Hong-Ying Liu,⁴ Lei

570 Zhang,⁴ Zhen-Mi Liu,⁹ Xian-Dong Meng,¹⁰ Xia Jiang,¹⁰ Yuan-Yuan Li,¹⁰ Jiajun Xu,¹⁰

571 Zhengzhi Feng,¹ Zhiyi Chen¹

572

573 ⁹ Department of Children and Maternal Health, Western China Hospital, Sichuan University,

574 Chengdu, Sichuan 610065

575 ¹⁰ Mental Health Center, Western China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan

576 610065

577

578 **Contributors**

579 Conceptualization, C.Z.Y., F.Z.Z., and L.W.; Data curation, L.Y.Y., S.C., G.J., H.X.D., W.Y.,

580 and X.L.; Formal analysis, L.W., L.X.R., and Z.Q.Y.; Visualization, L.W., L.X.R., and Z.Q.Y.;

581 Funding acquisition, C.Z.Y. and F.Z.Z.; Project administration, C.Z.Y. and F.Z.Z.;

582 Resources, L.Y.G., A.X.Y., R.J.D., Y.X., Z.Y., Y.J., P.Y., L.Y.J., C.S.Y., L.L., Y.H.J., L.T.T.,

583 L.L.J., C.M.Z., Z.X., D.X.Y., X.H.L., L.X.H., W.Y.H., L.J., H.X., L.H.Y., Z.L., L.Z.M., M.X.D.,

584 J.X., L.Y.Y. and X.J.J.; Writing-original draft, L.W., L.X.R., and Z.Q.Y.; Writing-review and

585 editing, C.Z.Y., F.Z.Z., C.J., T.X.B., Z.J.X., L.H., W.Y., and R.J.D. All authors have read
586 and approved the publication of this manuscript.

587

588 **Data sharing statement**

589 All the follow-up data had been deposited into the Science Data Bank (ScienceDB,
590 <https://doi.org/10.57760/sciencedb.12150>) for full accesses once being approved by the
591 Data Regulation Office (CPHG-DRO). Form for applying the case-by-case approval could
592 be found at the FigShare (<https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.24297532.v1>). All the
593 analyses were implemented by the commercial software (i.e., SPSS, IBM.Inc.) and open-
594 source R packages (e.g., MICE). All code used in R software had been deposited into the
595 Open Science Framework (OSF, <https://osf.io/e5h3a/>) for full accesses.

596

597 **Declaration of interests**

598 T.X.B., L.Z.M., M.X.D., J.X., L.Y.Y., X.J.J and G.J. disclosed to receive financial supports
599 from this project. All other authors disclosed no competing interests.

600

601 **Acknowledgement**

602 This study was conducted with the support of funding from the Civil Affairs Department of
603 the Sichuan Government (China) and the Minors Protection Care Foundation of the
604 Sichuan Charity Federation (China). We do appreciate all the efforts and contributions
605 of the government and other sectors for children and adolescents' mental health.

	Before PS matching				After PS matching			
	CPHG	Control	Total	<i>p</i> -value	CPHG	Control	Total	<i>p</i> -value
	(n=13527)	(n=5613)	(n=19140)		(n=2807)	(n=2807)	(n=5614)	
Age	14.22 (1.50)	13.85 (1.48)	14.11 (1.51)	<0.001	14.22 (1.49)	14.22 (1.48)	14.22 (1.48)	0.998
10-11	75 (0.6%)	62 (1.1%)	137 (0.7%)		11 (0.4%)	10 (0.4%)	21 (0.4%)	
12-14	7696 (56.9%)	3673 (65.4%)	11369 (59.4%)		1616 (57.6%)	1613 (57.5%)	3229 (57.5%)	
15-17	5629 (41.6%)	1854 (33.0%)	7483 (39.1%)		1159 (41.3%)	1163 (41.4%)	2322 (41.4%)	
18-19	127 (0.9%)	24 (0.4%)	151 (0.8%)		21 (0.7%)	21 (0.7%)	42 (0.7%)	
Sex								
boy	5146 (38.0%)	2216 (39.5%)	7362 (38.5%)	0.77	1088 (38.8%)	1081 (38.5%)	2169 (38.6%)	0.848
girl	8381 (62.0%)	3397 (60.5%)	11778 (61.5%)		1719 (61.2%)	1726 (61.5%)	3445 (61.4%)	
Offspring								
Non-single child	11259 (83.2%)	4645 (82.8%)	15904 (83.1%)	0.42	2321 (82.7%)	2330 (83.0%)	4651 (82.9%)	0.750

Single child	2268 (16.8%)	968 (17.2%)	3236 (16.9%)		486 (17.3%)	477 (17.0%)	963 (17.1%)	
Family condition								
Typical developing cohort	2224 (16.4%)	677 (12.1%)	2901 (15.2%)	<0.001	475 (16.9%)	470 (16.7%)	945 (16.8%)	0.967
Underprivileged cohort	11210 (82.9%)	4864 (86.7%)	16074 (84.0%)		2316 (82.5%)	2322 (82.7%)	4638 (82.6%)	
Missing	93 (0.8%)	72 (1.3%)	165 (0.9%)		16 (0.6%)	15 (0.5%)	31	
CES-D	24.40 (8.01)	7.25 (5.03)	19.37 (10.67)	<0.001	24.39 (8.08)	7.54 (4.97)	15.96 (10.77)	<0.001

Table 1: Sociodemographic characteristics of the population enrolled in this study. Data are mean (SD) or n (%). Missing=missing value.

CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale. Data were extracted from CPHG group across 596 sites covering almost all the areas of Nanchong city (Sichuan, China). A total of 180,006 children/adolescents were included in CPHG group, whereas 19140 individuals were enrolled in the current study because of completely missing records, lack of informed consent, and loss to follow up. Underprivileged cohort consisted of orphan, de facto unattended children/adolescents, children/adolescents in especially difficult circumstance, “left-behind” children/adolescents, and “single-parent” children/adolescents. The criteria of these underprivileged conditions were detailed in supplementary materials (Appendix pp.4).

Cohorts	N	0.5-year follow-up					1-year follow-up				
		Case	%	aOR ^a	95% CI	P value	Case	%	aOR ^a	95% CI	P value
Typical developing cohort											
CPHG	2224	129	5.8%	0.39	0.24-0.65	<0.001	118	5.3%	0.35	0.21-0.58	<0.001
Control	677	44	6.5%		Reference		53	7.8%		Reference	
Children/Adolescents in especially difficult circumstance											
CPHG	5283	288	5.5%	0.28	0.21-0.37	<0.001	302	5.7%	0.31	0.23-0.41	<0.001
Control	2236	179	8.0%		Reference		189	8.5%		Reference	
“Single-parent” children/adolescents											
CPHG	1931	141	7.3%	0.24	0.16-0.38	<0.001	115	6.0%	0.28	0.18-0.44	<0.001
Control	848	90	10.6%		Reference		92	10.8%		Reference	
“Left-behind” children/adolescents											
CPHG	9160	534	5.8	0.26	0.21-0.33	<0.001	511	5.6%	0.25	0.20-0.31	<0.001

Control	3765	296	7.9%		Reference		334	8.9%		Reference	
De facto unattended children/adolescents											
CPHG	168	15	8.9%	0.13	0.04-0.45	0.001	16	9.5%	0.32	0.09-1.19	0.089
Control	60	11	18.3%		Reference		7	11.7%		Reference	
Orphan											
CPHG	51	7	13.7%	0.20	0.03-1.34	0.097	7	13.7%	0.55	0.08-3.80	0.542
Control	29	8	27.6%		Reference		7	24.1%		Reference	

Table 2: Subgroup analysis of the practical effects of implementing primary psychological healthcare system. Generalized linear mixed models were used for the analysis. a Adjusted Odd Ratios, adjusted for all Sociodemographic characteristics (age, sex, offspring) and depression estimated by Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale (CES-D).




Fig 1: Screening and primary outcome population. The CPHG group refers to those who were enrolled in the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China (CPHG), whereas the control group was not enrolled in the CPHG.




Fig 2: The Odd Ratio (OR) for the self-reporting suicide ideation at 0.5-year follow-up. The ORs were calculated by generalized linear mixed model. 95%CI=95% Confidence Interval. CES-D= Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale. The CPHG group refers to those who were enrolled in the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China (CPHG), whereas the control group was not enrolled in the CPHG. When $OR < 1$, the variable is considered as protective factor for preventing suicide ideation. When $OR > 1$, the variable is considered as risk factor.




Fig 3: The Odd Ratio (OR) for the self-reporting suicide ideation at 1-year follow-up. The ORs were calculated by generalized linear mixed model. 95%CI = 95% Confidence Interval. CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale. The CPHG group refers to those who were enrolled in the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China (CPHG), whereas the control group was not enrolled in the CPHG. When $OR < 1$, the variable is considered as protective factor for preventing suicide ideation. When $OR > 1$, the variable is considered as risk factor.




Fig 4: The Odd Ratio (OR) for the self-reporting suicide ideation after PS matching at 0.5-year follow-up. The ORs were calculated by generalized linear mixed model. 95%CI=95% Confidence Interval. PS matching = propensity score matching. The matching characteristics included age, sex, family condition, and offspring. CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale. The CPHG group refers to those who were enrolled in the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China (CPHG), whereas the control group was not enrolled in the CPHG. When $OR < 1$, the variable is considered as protective factor for preventing suicide ideation, whereas the variable is considered as risk factor when $OR > 1$.




Fig 5: The Odd Ratio (OR) for the self-reporting suicide ideation after PS matching at 1-year follow-up. The ORs were calculated by generalized linear mixed model. 95%CI=95% Confidence Interval. PS matching = propensity score matching. The matching characteristics included age, sex, family condition, and offspring. CES-D = Center for Epidemiological Survey, Depression scale. The CPHG group refers to those who were enrolled in the Psychological Health Guard for Children and Adolescents Project of China (CPHG), whereas the control group was not enrolled in the CPHG. When $OR < 1$, the variable is considered as protective factor for preventing suicide ideation, whereas the variable is considered as risk factor when $OR > 1$.