

Suicide Prevention for Veterans and Active Duty Personnel

A considerable body of research has identified correlates of suicide at the genetic, neurologic, psychological, social, and cultural levels. Among risk characteristics identified in existing studies, current or former military service has emerged as a topic of considerable scientific and public interest. Of those who die from suicide, veterans and active duty military personnel represent a select group with considerable heterogeneity in individual characteristics and life histories. Such heterogeneity in individual level characteristics and precipitating events carries with it the potential to obfuscate relationships between individual risk factors, experiences uniquely associated with military service, and social and cultural factors. Despite these challenges, results from existing studies suggest that history of military service is an element worthy of consideration in efforts to address the complex and multifaceted nature of intentional self-harm. Given the intricate etiology of suicide and limitations of current data systems, it is not surprising that uncertainty surrounds the exact nature of the relationships between history of military service and suicide.¹ Moreover, the unique experiences of different military cohorts may play a key role as major contextual factors given the diverse range of exposures experienced by different cohorts.

It is our position that an appropriate response to any evidence of increased risk for suicide among veterans and active duty service members include a multifaceted prevention strategy that considers both traditional markers of individual risk for suicide and those that



US Air Force Staff Sgt. William Taylor spends a quiet moment with his mount Dakota before a horseback ride with fellow military families at a Project Sanctuary retreat on November 12, 2011, near Granby, CO. The 6-day retreat is designed to give active duty and veteran families time to reconnect with each other, often after years of separation due to military deployments. Photograph by John Moore. Printed with Permission of Getty Images.

are universally represented, without consideration of individual history.^{2,3} Universal strategies, such as public education campaigns and toll-free crisis lines, provide opportunities to increase awareness, facilitate access, and promote use of crisis services among those experiencing distress. At the same time, targeted approaches in those who have served and especially subpopulations who may bear a disproportionate burden of risk are critically needed. We also are keenly aware of the need to identify and provide immediate intervention to those who are in imminent danger of taking their own lives. Taken together, these prevention strategies embody a public health approach to prevention. A public health approach has been shown to be promising because, in part, of the overlapping influence of strategies at each level. At the same time, it avoids piecemeal approaches that

may not, by their very nature, be sustainable.² By way of example, a public health approach should include universal programs designed to promote seeking help and access to services among those in distress (ideally before they are at imminent risk for suicide), the implementation of systems to inform clinical decisions and understand outcomes among those with demonstrated risk, and the development and evaluation of clinical approaches to reduce risk for self-directed violence among unique clinical groups that have already experienced signs and symptoms (such as suicide attempts and reattempts).

The articles in this issue provide the most current and comprehensive picture of what we know about the epidemiology, assessment, and prevention of suicide from clinical and population-based perspectives. They include a reanalysis of data from the National Health Interview

Survey by Miller et al.,⁴ accompanying commentaries by Miller et al.⁵ and Kaplan et al.,⁶ and an editorial by Gibbons et al.,⁷ which reflect the ongoing debate regarding both the nature of the data available on suicide in veterans and methodological approaches for calculating estimates of risk associated with veteran status. This debate underscores the need for improved data sources to estimate the burden of suicide and suicidal behaviors in veterans and military populations and the challenges posed by a lack of integration among existing data systems. It is worth noting the difficulty in identifying the incidence or characteristics of suicide among veterans who have not received services from the Veterans Health Administration (VHA), and in ascertaining whether these veterans bear a significantly different risk for suicide than veterans seen within the VHA health care system.

Based on evidence largely from postmortem research using psychological autopsy methods, many who die by suicide bear a tremendous burden of risk associated with psychopathology. However, a study of suicide among veterans who received VHA services also suggested that many of those who died from suicide did not carry a diagnosis at the time of their death,⁸ suggesting the need for continued efforts to promote help seeking and treatment among those experiencing distress. There are a number of articles in this supplement that focus on specific risk factors that appear to increase the risk of suicidality among veterans and military personnel, including sleep disorders (Pigeon et al.⁹), substance abuse (Ilgen et al.¹⁰), and depression (Britton et al.¹¹). In an editorial in this supplement, Conner and Bossarte¹¹ argue that clinical services, rather than being in opposition to public health

approaches to suicide prevention, are a fundamental component of public health approaches to reducing deaths and associated morbidity from suicide. Finally, assessment of suicidal behaviors is a constant challenge to the field of suicide prevention in general. McCarthy et al.¹² describe the first use of a clinical assessment tool that resulted in a public health impact through providing early identification and support to airmen that potentially could reduce suicidal behaviors.

In summary, much as the Framingham study found in its early decades, collaborative efforts between clinicians and epidemiologists provide a foundation for changing the cultural norms associated with a major public health problem. Treating groups at high risk for suicide is a necessary, but insufficient response to suicide. Strategies designed to engage entire populations, with and without consideration of individual risk characteristics, may ultimately have the biggest impact.¹³ The promise of a population strategy is eloquently discussed by Katz,¹⁴ who provides one hypothesis for how a public health approach may result in reduced mortality because of suicide in veterans. This supplement represents an effort on the part of many to bring together divergent perspectives from those who are working daily to acquire a better understanding of what works for preventing suicide in those who have served our country. The considerable interest shown in this supplement is a tribute to all who have served in the military and we, as do all Americans, thank them for their service. We deeply hope that this supplement will serve as a catalyst for continued research that will improve the lives of our veterans, and reduce the morbidity and mortality because of suicide in those who have served in the military. ■

Kerry L. Knox, PhD
Robert M. Bossarte, PhD

About the Authors

Kerry L. Knox and Robert M. Bossarte are with the Department of Veterans Affairs, Canandaigua, NY, and the Department of Psychiatry, Center for the Study and Prevention of Suicide, the University of Rochester Medical Center, Rochester, NY.

Correspondence should be sent to Kerry L. Knox, PhD, Director, VISN 2 Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention, Canandaigua VA Medical Center, 400 Fort Hill Ave., Canandaigua, NY 14424 (e-mail: Kerry.knox@va.gov). Reprints can be ordered at <http://www.ajph.org> by clicking the "Reprints/Eprints" link.

This editorial was accepted November 18, 2011.

doi:10.2105/AJPH.2011.300593

Contributors

K. L. Knox took the lead in writing the article. R. M. Bossarte contributed to revisions of the initial article. Both authors contributed to the intellectual content of this editorial and approved the editorial.

Acknowledgments

The Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Integrated Services Network 2 (VISN) Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention supported the preparation of this special supplement.

The guest editors would like to sincerely thank the authors of the individual articles, editorials, and commentaries, the reviewers, and the *AJPH* editors and staff.

We owe special thanks for the tremendous support that the VISN 2 Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention received from the Department of Veterans Affairs Offices of Mental Health Services and Mental Health Operations. Specifically, we thank Antonette Zeiss, PhD; Sonja Batten, PhD; Janet Kemp, PhD; and Mary Schohn, PhD, for their ongoing and tireless support of the Center's activities.

We gratefully acknowledge our academic affiliate, the University of Rochester Medical Center, Department of Psychiatry, and especially the Department's Center for the Study and Prevention of Suicide.

We also thank the staff and investigators at the VISN 2 Center of Excellence for Suicide Prevention, especially Lisa Lochner, Kathy Main, and Annie Nolan for facilitating the administrative aspects of this project.

References

- Bossarte R, Claassen CA, Knox K. Veteran suicide prevention: emerging priorities and opportunities for intervention. *Mil Med*. 2010;175(7):461–462.
- Knox KL, Litts DA, Talcott GW, Feig JC, Caine ED. Risk of suicide and related

adverse outcomes after exposure to a suicide prevention programme in the United States Air Force. Cohort study. *BMJ*. 2003;327:1376.

3. Knox KL, Pflanz S, Talcott GW, Campise RL, Lavigne JE, Bajorska A, et al. The Air Force Suicide Prevention Program: implications for public health policy. *Am J Public Health*. 2010;100(12):2457–2463.

4. Miller M, Barber C, Young M, Azrael D, Mukamal K, Lawler E. Veterans and suicide: a reexamination of the National Death Index–linked National Health Interview Survey. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S154–S159.

5. Miller M, Azrael D, Barber C, Mukamal K, Lawler E. A call to link data to answer pressing questions about suicide among veterans. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S20, S22.

6. Kaplan MS, McFarland BH, Huguet N, Newsom JT. Estimating the risk of suicide among US veterans: how should we proceed from here? *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S21, S23.

7. Gibbons RD, Brown CH, Hur K. Is the rate of suicide among veterans elevated? *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S17–S19.

8. Ilgen MA, Bohnert AS, Ignacio RV, McCarthy JF, Valenstein MM, Kim HM, et al. Psychiatric diagnoses and risk of suicide in veterans. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2010;67(11):1152–1158.

9. Pigeon WR, Britton PC, Ilgen MA, Chapman B, Conner KR. Sleep disturbance preceding suicide among veterans. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S93–S97.

10. Ilgen MA, Conner KR, Roeder KM, Blow FC, Austin K, Valenstein M. Patterns of treatment utilization before suicide among male veterans with substance use disorders. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S88–S92.

11. Britton PC, Ilgen MA, Valenstein M, Knox K, Claassen CA, Conner KR. Differences between veteran suicides with and without psychiatric symptoms. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S125–S130.

12. McCarthy MD, Thompson SJ, Knox KL. Use of the Air Force Post-Deployment Health Reassessment for the identification of depression and posttraumatic stress disorder: public health implications for suicide prevention. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S60–S65.

13. Knox KL, Conwell Y, Caine ED. If suicide is a public health problem, what are we doing to prevent it? *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94:37–45.

14. Katz I. Lessons learned from mental health enhancement and suicide prevention activities in the Veterans Health Administration. *Am J Public Health*. 2012;102(Suppl 1):S14–S16.