

## Peer Review Report

# Review Report on Promoting the Sustainability of Suicide Prevention Projects in Switzerland

Policy Brief, Public Health Rev.

Reviewer: Birgit Reime

Submitted on: 09 Oct 2024

Article DOI: 10.3389/phrs.2025.1607824

### EVALUATION

#### Q 1 What are the main findings and conclusions reported in this manuscript?

The manuscript deals with the question how to promote sustainability of suicide prevention projects in Switzerland. The policy brief highlights the need for commitment by various stakeholders and recommends the following actions: To establish a national suicide prevention website, to involve target groups in the work of all projects, to develop a sustainable finance plan from early on and to create a guideline for multi-level collaborations. The authors conclude that these actions would be able to improve access to structured information, foster multi-level collaboration, optimize resource allocation and increase awareness of suicidality, thereby advancing suicide prevention in Switzerland.

#### Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and advantages.

Limitations:

The authors did not share how they searched for literature. Given that the recommendations provided in this policy brief are identical with the actions implemented in the canton of Zurich (Table 2, last row, first quote) it should be ruled out that the literature was used to back up solely these strategies.

The second question is whether individuals with lived experiences were asked to contribute their recommendations on valuable strategies of suicide prevention additionally to the experts whose answers partially build the basis of this manuscript.

To increase the need for commitment by various stakeholders and policymakers and to outline means to achieve this could be a fifth recommendation (or recommendation 4 should be re-named). This is not the same as to ensure "multiprofessional/multi-sectoral" collaboration.

Advantages:

The authors frame the description of the "evidence" (line 75ff) within the Integrated Sustainability Framework (ISF) and provide a solid basis.

The section "policy options and recommendations" is based on a literature review, the evaluation of four (local) suicide prevention projects and a qualitative study with SP experts from various fields. Relevance and feasibility were rated by n=11 experts quantitatively. There is a clear effort to underpin the findings/recommendations with as much evidence as possible.

The description of background, evidence, recommendations and conclusions demonstrates a deep foundation in the challenges of public health based suicide prevention and the manuscript is characterized by rigor and significance.

#### Q 3 Are there objective errors or fundamental flaws? If yes, please detail your concerns.

No.

#### Q 4 Check List

Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Does the manuscript provide an appropriate context for a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Does the manuscript use language that can be understood by a non-technical audience?

Yes.

Is the quality of figures and/or tables satisfactory?

Yes.

Is the evidence presented appropriate, sound and objective?

Yes.

Are the action points provided based on the evidence?

Yes.

Are the action points provided reasonable and feasible?

Yes.

Are there any ethical issues with the recommendations provided?

Yes.

---

**Q 5** Please provide your detailed review report to the editor and authors (including any comments on the Q4 Check List):

The abstracts provides an informative summary on what the reader can expect from the following pages. The role of the stakeholders is being highlighted in the abstract already. The conclusion of the abstract does only in part overlap with the conclusions on page 5 (line 246–251).

In the background section the authors provide an overview over the criteria for effective suicide prevention and characteristics of suicide prevention projects. The current status of suicide prevention in Switzerland and criteria for sustainability according to health Promotion Switzerland are being outlined. The authors explain their aim to identify barriers and facilitators for suicide prevention projects and to provide recommendations to promote sustainability based on a literature review, expert opinions and evaluations of previous projects. The scientific framework for the "evidence" section lies in the application of the Integrated Sustainability Framework. Here, the authors explain the necessity of project evaluation and communication of findings as well as the pitfalls related to this such as barriers to randomization, complexity and high costs. Integration of project components into the routine health system, funding, multi-level collaboration/knowledge exchange and stakeholder engagement are further aspects which are being discussed in the light of barriers and facilitators of suicide prevention.

In the section Policy Options and recommendations (lines 151 ff). the authors first repeat to report the basis of their recommendations being experts etc, these lines overlap with lines 70–72.

The authors recommend to a) establish a national suicide prevention website b) to involve individuals with lived experiences into prevention projects c) to secure sustainable funding from early on and d) to develop guidelines for multi-level collaboration. All these recommendations are grounded in relevant and adequate sources as suggested by the literature used. Having said that, it did not become clear to me why "fostering stakeholder engagement" did not become a fifth aspect of recommendation, given that this issue is being discussed as a particular challenge in the sustainability of suicide prevention. To me it makes a difference whether guidelines for "multi-sectoral" cooperation is being targeted or the involvement of policymakers. Re-naming recommendation 4 or extending to recommendation 5 could be worthwhile.

Table 1 gives a profound overview over potential barriers and facilitators institutions may face when implementing the recommendations into practice.

Table 2 underpins the relevance and feasibility of the four recommendations by the rating of n=11 experts.

Literature: As mentioned above it did not become clear to me how the literature was searched for and selected. In sum, this is a very well written important and relevant policy brief and the content is of high interest not only in Switzerland but globally.

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT

<b>Q 6</b>	Originality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 7</b>	Rigor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 8</b>	Significance to the field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 9</b>	Interest to a general audience	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 10</b>	Quality of the writing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q 11</b>	Overall quality of the study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## REVISION LEVEL

**Q 12** Please take a decision based on your comments:

Minor revisions.