O077

Machine learning model development to retrospectively predict suicide attempts in the Millenium Cohort Study sample

C. Peña Gómez[1,2*], M. Fradera[1,2,3], M. Caravaca[1,2], D. Roche[4], J. Giraldo[1,2,3] and D. Palao[1,2,3]

[1]Unitat de Neurociència Traslacional, Institut d'Investigació i Innovació Parc Taulí (I3PT-CERCA), Sabadell; [2]Institut de Neurociències (INc), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra; [3]Centro de Investigación Biomédica en Red de Salud Mental, Instituto de Salud Carlos III, Madrid and [4]Research Institute for Evaluation and Public Policies (IRAPP), Universitat Internacional de Catalunya (UIC), Barcelona, Spain

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.335

Introduction: Suicidal behavior is a complex phenomenon that affects all demographics, with children and adolescents being particularly vulnerable. It is associated with multifactorial conditions that must be considered for the development of more effective prevention strategies. The use of machine learning (ML) models to predict suicide attempts is becoming widespread, as they allow for the simultaneous testing of numerous factors, their complex interactions, and non-linearity in predictive model creation. The Millennium Cohort Study (MCS) is an observational, multidisciplinary cohort study that encompasses a wide range of dimensions, including psychological, genetic, biological, familial, social, and economic factors, as well as traumatic life events, family history, and medical history. This allows for the exploration of their relationship with suicidal behavior throughout individual development using ML models.

Objectives: The aim was to develop a statistical method that applies ML models to retrospectively predict suicide attempts using structured tabular data from an adolescent cohort defined by the MCS.

Methods: The sample consists of 9,824 MCS participants (age 17) who were asked if they had ever purposely hurt themselves in an attempt to end their life. Of these, only 7.4% (725) responded affirmatively. Before starting the modeling phase and fine-tuning any algorithm, several stages were completed: data cleaning, feature extraction and engineering, and feature scaling and selection. We used a wide range of algorithms, from low-complexity (linear regression) to high-complexity (neural networks), while tracking their effectiveness, robustness, generalization, sensitivity, and accuracy.

Results: Even though overall accuracy ranged from 0.83 to 0.87, we generally obtained low f1-scores (˜0.45-0.55) for the targeted class (suicide attempt) and high f1-scores (˜0.95) for the control class. Similar results were observed for precision scores; however, the recall scores were good for both classes, ranging from 0.67 to 0.87. The best performing models were logistic regression and neural networks.

Conclusions: These preliminary results shows that ML models trained with multidimensional data from a young cohort are sensitive in classifying individuals who have attempted suicide. We aim to improve the f1-score and area under the curve (AUC) metrics for the target class through several techniques: over/under-sampling, target encoding, class weight adjustments, ensemble methods, and various neural network architectures.

Disclosure of Interest: None Declared

O078

Early Interventions for Preventing Self-Harm Recurrence: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

G. P. Roncete[1*], L. C. Farhat[2], L. Beiram[2], K. L. Ramirez[3], M. H. Bloch[3], R. F. Damiano[2] and E. C. Miguel[2]

[1]Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo; [2]Departamento e Instituto de Psiquiatria, Hospital das Clínicas da Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil and [3]Yale Child Study Center, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, United States

*Corresponding author.

doi: 10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.336

Introduction: Deliberate self-harm (DSH) is a strong predictor of future suicide attempts (SAs), highlighting the need to evaluate interventions that reduce recurrence risk.

Objectives: This systematic review and meta-analysis aimed to evaluate pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions for preventing repeated DSH in individuals recently engaged in DSH. We also examined how participants' characteristics and trial inclusion criteria impacted interventions' effectiveness.

Methods: Randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with participants engaged in DSH within one month before enrollment were included. Studies with participants showing only suicidal ideation or older DSH were excluded. We searched five databases (PubMed, Embase, PsycINFO, WHO ICTRP, and ClinicalTrials.gov) with no language restrictions through September 2023. Two reviewers independently selected studies and resolved discrepancies through discussion. Outcomes were assessed at three time points: T1 (0–6 months), T2 (6–12 months), and T3 (>12 months). The primary outcome was repeat DSH; secondary outcomes included suicidal ideation, suicide deaths, all-cause mortality, anxiety, depression, hopelessness, and quality of life. Interventions were categorized by type and delivery format (individual or group, remote or in-person).

Results: The PRISMA flowchart is shown in Image 1. Sixty-one trials involving 125 comparisons and 21,147 participants were included in this review. Average age was 31.5 years, with most being female (66.58%), unmarried (60.82%), and white (65.49%). Participants' history of self-harm was noted in 48 studies, with at least 56% having engaged in another act before inclusion. In 42 studies, suicidal intent was either not investigated or not required. The most common types of interventions were Treatment As Usual (TAU) (46 arms), Psychotherapy (36), and Active Contact and Follow-up (25). Interventions were primarily applied individually and in person (84), with Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (16) being the most frequent psychotherapy framework. Psychotherapies were associated with a reduced risk of new self-harm acts within the first six months (T1) compared to TAU (k = 12; N = 2110; OR = 0.69; 95% CI 0.48–0.99). Active contact and follow-up interventions

https://doi.org/10.1192/j.eurpsy.2025.335 Published online by Cambridge University Press