World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews
eISSN: 2581-9615 CODEN (USA): WJARAI
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/wjarr
Journal homepage: https://wjarr.com/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Check for updates

Integrating Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention into Community-Based Family Support Programs

Caren Paidamoyo Kudzotsa [1,*], Petty Musekiwa [2] Kiriana Dube [3] and Kundai Mlambo [4]

[1] *Maimi University.*
[2] *St Daniels Rehabilitation and Vocational Training Center.*
[3] *University of Pennsylvania.*
[4] *Alice Vail Middle School.*

World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 28(01), 105-114

Publication history: Received on 17 August 2025; revised on 28 September 2025; accepted on 01 October 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.28.1.3317

Abstract

The problem of youth suicide has been on the rise, with the vulnerable groups of interest being immigrant, minority, and low-income families. The paper examines the role of family- and community-based crisis intervention models that can be utilized to minimize the rate of suicide among young people as well as aid families in the face of a crisis and post-crisis. The study determines various evidence-based models using the scoping review approach; the models identified are the Family-Based Crisis Intervention (FBCI), Zero Suicide Model, trauma-informed care, and peer-support programs. It also examines the role schools, clinics, and community services can play to establish more support systems. The article identifies effective practices and the impediments to effective assistance, including stigma, language differences, staff burnout, and a lack of coordination among services. Driven by this evidence, the study outlines a new framework made up of early detection tools, family-centered response protocols, layperson training programs, and community-led initiatives. The results indicate that the collaboration of clinical care and community and the involvement of family results in improved mental health among adolescents. The study has significant implications for health, school-based, and policy experts to ameliorate mental health and suicidal deaths among youths.

Keywords: Community-Based; Crisis; Integrating; Intervention; Family; Suicide

1. Introduction

Suicide amongst the youth in the United States and worldwide is a very serious and escalating public health problem. The current statistics show that suicide among adolescents is an increasingly popular killing factor among young people today (Caine et al., 2017; Mann, Michel, and Auerbach, 2021). Although significant progress has been made in raising awareness and delivering mental health services, there are still substantial gaps in supporting young people in crisis, particularly in community-based contexts where intervention systems are fragmented.

The family systems are some of the key influencing risk and protective factors in youth suicide. Positive family environments have the potential to mitigate the impact of trauma, depression, and being socially isolated, whereas dysfunctional family dynamics can predispose individuals to an even worse condition (Gay, 2025; Sharma and Sargent, 2017). Such results support the idea of involving families in the post-crisis recovery efforts and in early identification and prevention.

There has been an increasing inclination towards deinstitutionalization and a more comprehensive and community approach to care. One potential solution is incorporating mental health services into schools, homes, and local networks

* Corresponding author: Caren Paidamoyo Kudzotsa

as an effective way of providing youth access to mental health services outside of clinical settings (Telenette and Osorno, 2021). The study by Jespersen et al. (2016) also identified that the incorporation of crisis teams in the community mental health services has led to a significant decrease in the use of emergency departments, indicating the effectiveness of locally based interventions as also suggested by (Kudzotsa CP & Musekiwa P, 2025).

This journal is based on Paida certifications in Question, Persuade, Refer (QPR) and Psychological First Aid (PFA) that emphasize early intervention and community responsiveness (World Health Organization, 2011). Such frameworks present a theory for building scalable family-based suicide prevention approaches to leadership.

This study will aim at examining possible ways of applying evidence-based crisis intervention and suicide prevention models within the context of community-based family support programs to reduce suicide and increase the improvement of mental health outcomes among the youth.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Frameworks

Feasible and empirically based theoretical constructs, which can be holistically adapted, are paramount in dealing with the issue of suicide among youths by offering community-based families support. Suicide prevention models have changed in the last 20 years through the shift towards more family, school, and community-wide system interventions where each component is connected with one another. This section considers major models and theoretical formulations applied in the field of crisis intervention, suicide prevention, and family-based practice, along with their applicability, weaknesses, and use in community settings.

The Zero Suicide Model is one of the most well-known models used in current suicide prevention practice, which conceptualizes the notion that individuals must be able to receive care in a manner that prevents suicide deaths. It promotes the adoption of evidence-based practices such as screening, safety planning, staff training, and continuous performance improvement throughout the system (Brodsky, Spruch-Feiner, and Stanley, 2018). The model is strong as it is structured, and there is accountability, which is usually present in large healthcare facilities. Nevertheless, its structure and its dependency on the clinical structure are an issue when applied to community-based or informal support networks. As an example, it focuses on its measurable results and documentation, which can isolate the grassroots programs that have fewer resources or less formal organization.

On the other hand, the Narrative-Crisis Model regards suicide not only as a clinical or behavioral problem but also as a crisis of story (here, people lose their sense of meaning, identity, or future orientation) (Goncearenco, Chennapragada, and Rogers, 2023). Instead of intervening on risk dimensions or psychiatric symptoms alone, it tries to recreate a coherent story of life to connect them in an effort to produce dialogic interventions that are culturally embedded. This approach is particularly useful among youth groups that are diverse in nature and, particularly, immigrants and the marginalized, who often do not conform to dominant cultural guidelines in the various aspects of their lives. A narrative model more than the one presented by Zero Suicide does not focus on institutional control. Nonetheless, the potential need to facilitate the conceptual orientation with competency and encompass the duration of engagement as a skill may limit the scalability of the concept in the contexts of rapid or restricted resource availability.

Although both of the models have constructive insights, the Suicide Haddon Matrix can be more structural and preventive. This is a matrix developed by the injury prevention science to analyze the suicide event into three stages—pre-event, event, and post-event—and to understand the roles played by human, agent, and environmental factors in each stage (Walsh et al., 2025). It helps planners and policy formers to plan areas of intervention at various levels, including limiting access to means, enhancing family communication, or training first responders. This is unlike the narrative model, which is deeply rooted in the internal formulation of meaning, or the Zero Suicide model, which is highly clinical in nature, but the Haddon Matrix is better suited to multi-sectoral planning and the population health approach. However, it remains relatively ineffective in overcoming emotional and cultural nuances, which, many times, form the basis of suicidal behavior among young people, particularly certain cases that do occur due to trauma, displacement, or identity crisis.

Although macro-level models are necessary, family-based interventions are priceless when it comes to curbing suicide. The Family-Based Crisis Intervention (FBCI) model is a clinical attempt to involve the youth as well as the family members in case of any psychiatric emergency situation. Originally used in emergency departments of pediatric settings, FBCI integrates some aspects of cognitive-behavioral therapy with family systems theory to de-escalate crisis situations and formulate instantaneous safety strategies (Ginnis et al., 2013). An improvement in psychiatric hospitalization requirements and the involvement of families in care has been demonstrated through clinical trials (Wharff et al., 2019). It is, however, relatively confined to institutional practice and presupposes trained practitioners,

which further underlines the necessity of variants of it allowing the families to practice the same ideas in the home or community settings.

On a larger scale, family engagement in the suicide continuum of care, especially postvention, has been given greater appreciation. According to Gay (2025), families are not just support systems but excellent agents of detection, intervention, and the healing process. Families can play the roles of gatekeepers and stabilizers during times of crisis when there is appropriate training and support. Giles et al. (2021) also emphasize the effectiveness of interventions that use a trauma-informed approach attending to the needs of families in the emergency room and result in decreased risks of recurrence and increased levels of long-term treatment engagement. Contrary to the short-term crisis orientation shared by FBCI, postvention models are geared towards relational restoration, elucidation of grief, and prolonged emotional support. This is important because although it is a wider approach, it still needs constant effort by the community organizations and formal collaboration with the schools and healthcare providers in order to achieve maximum results.

Community psychology literature also contributes to the discussion of the necessity of integrated and situationally sensitive solutions. When considering the implementation of crisis teams within community mental health services, Jespersen et al. (2016) managed to identify that there were substantial decreases when it came to emergency department use and inpatient care. The proximity and responsiveness are found to be critical in suicide-saving close to them, according to their findings. However, integration is not without its complications. Issues like uncoordinated funding, employee fatigue, and irregular community outreach tend to stall such initiatives. Alfaro et al. (2020) stress that community psychologists who perform under the requirements of the top-down policy often find it difficult to reconcile technical reporting demands and the relational, dynamic character of interventions in a community. Such tensions indicate how important it is to co-create interventions with the local stakeholders in order to make them effective and sustainable.

Trauma-informed care is a philosophy that offers the necessary dimension to the entire framework of suicide prevention. Abused, neglected, or chronically adversity-exposed children and adolescents face an increased risk of suicide, but their underlying circumstances are disregarded in the paradigm of common interventions. White and Kaffman (2019) depreciate unisex assumptions that are persistent in most trauma reactions, as boys and girls might not experience or respond to trauma in the same way. As an example, boys could externalize distress by means of violence or drug abuse, and girls could internalize it, developing depression or self-destructive behaviors, and appropriate interventional measures should focus on these issues properly. On this basis, Cecchin and Murta (2025) also offer guidelines for suicide prevention at the university level at an early stage, long before crisis outbreaks. Their efforts contribute to the idea that emotion regulation, peer support, and psychoeducation should be integrated into the daily setting, as prevention needs to become a part of the surroundings of youth instead of being perceived as a separate service.

All these models and theories, collectively, bring out a convergence and divergence in their approach. The Zero Suicide Model has provided a high-control system-led strategy that is applicable in clinic-based setups but may make culturally colored or community-based practices marginalized. Although the Narrative-Crisis Model is very deep and culturally applicable, it might not necessarily give explicit rules of operation to practitioners in time-sensitive crises. With its public health applicability, the Haddon Matrix offers an effective framework, but it might not be the one to give proper emphasis on relationships and emotions that play an essential role in the conditions of youth mental health. In the same way, both FBCI and postvention frameworks lay a lot of emphasis on family involvement; they differ in their temporal perspective and institutional requirements, and that becomes the question of how successfully these merits can be combined in one single adaptive model.

3. Methodology: Scoping Approach to Research and Evidence

This research uses a scoping review approach to analyze the depth and extent of previous evidence on the combination of the models of crisis intervention and suicide prevention with the family support programs at the community level. However, the justification of employing a scoping approach is also explained by its expertise in rudimentarily charting essential concepts in a broad and heterogeneous literature base, primarily when there are divergent methodologies, contexts, and populations (Li et al., 2024). Scoping reviews provide a welcome flexibility in scope in capturing emerging frameworks and determining how broad the available strategies vary in current practice (Schlichthorst et al., 2020), unlike the systematic reviews that aim at reviewing the quality of narrowly defined interventions.

This was done within the five stages of scoping proposed by Arksey and O'Malley (2005), which involves identification of the research question, searching, selection of studies according to the given criteria, charting and summarizing, and

reporting the findings. This was streamlined by incorporating the advice of the Joanna Briggs Institute to make it methodologically strong and transparent. A preliminary search was carried out through databases like PsycINFO, ResearchGate, and Scopus by applying keywords like family-based intervention, youth suicide prevention, community mental health, and crisis response models.

Inclusion criteria were carefully defined to ensure relevance. Only peer-reviewed publications between 2013 and 2025 were taken into account to incorporate changes in courses with (a) family-based, (b) community-based mental health or social care settings, and (c) were supported with empirical evidence. Any programs focusing on the youth population (1525 years old), focusing on the early crisis response or prevention of suicide, and such that implemented collaborative family elements were given a priority. Studies that emphasized inpatient psychiatric treatment or pharmacological and psychosocial measures that did not undergo psychosocial integration were excluded due to the exclusion criteria.

In the process outlined in this methodology, the review will not only synthesize knowledge but also note areas of need in practice and research that may eventually provide a basis for policy recommendations and designing culturally responsive and family-embedded prevention efforts.

4. Analysis of Evidence-Based Family and Community Models

4.1. Emergency Department & School-Based Interventions

Emergency departments (EDs) and schools are two of the most immediate places where persons at risk for suicide can be diagnosed and treated, especially among youth. The Family Intervention for Suicide Prevention (FISP) shown by Asarnow et al. (2009) is a very short ED-based intervention that has managed to safely involve families in the temporal phase of suicide point-of-fact. Their findings indicate that outpatient mental health service utilization is substantially increased by engagement of caregivers in follow-up planning. Schmidt et al. (2015) can support this conclusion, as the researchers also say that the effectiveness of post-ED discharge interventions increases once caregivers contribute to safety planning. Nevertheless, Giles et al. (2021) underscore that ED interventions are also notorious for having follow-up and continuity of care at the family level, especially in low-income communities in the long term. This critique identifies a primary implementation shortfall: any short-term models need to be built into more lasting community-based supports to render them effective.

The early intervention designed on a school basis includes programs like the Signs of Suicide program (Singer et al., 2019) that teaches students, staff, and parents to identify and react to the warning signs. Although having families involved in school-based models of suicide education may not be as structured as ED-based models, it fosters early communication. However, institutional constraints, including the absence of trained staff and inflexible curriculum frameworks, often constrain these models. Although ED and school-based interventions appreciate the significance of the family, their ability to involve the parents systematically in protracted crisis response schemes is mixed and very dynamic.

4.2. Lived Experience and Peer Support

Programs featuring the voices of lived experience have exclusive emotive reach and credibility, especially in peer-based postvention activities. According to Schlichthorst et al. (2020), the involvement of individuals with lived experience in suicide prevention and recovery programs can be used to foster success because it increases trust and engagement not only within marginalized or skeptical groups. Their Australian research study showed the way in which the models of peer support lessened stigmatization, augmented the help-seeking conduct, and characterizedfamily disclosure regarding mental sickness. Such observations are resonant with more general transformations in the field of public health that have emphasized the role of patient or family voice in the recovery story.

Comans et al. (2013) investigated post-suicide bereavement support services and found out that families that had access to structured peer groups reported a minimal sense of isolation and guilt.

Notably, the programs promoted secondary prevention through the enhancement of family communication patterns and mental health literacy, which tend to be fragmented after a suicide. Pessimists concerning the application of the peer-led models, though, contend that since a person feels close to the issue, it can make him or her be less objective and can also lead to the retraumatization of peer facilitators without appropriate help (Schlichthorst et al., 2020). Thus, although the lived experience lens constitutes a worthwhile engagement approach, its practical outcomes lie in the proper training, professional oversight, and embedding in clinical support.

4.3. Family Engagement Strategies

Family engagement in relation to suicide prevention is more than just superficial, meaning that mere participation is not a solid strategy: there needs to be an active engagement, one that creates trust and gives the care providers the resources to enact it as well as to overcome systemic obstacles to participation. Gerhardt et al. (2020) emphasize the necessity of involving fathers in the discussion of suicide prevention because paternal emotional socialization has an impact on the coping mechanism of the young population. However, most programs are still heavily mother-focused with gendered presumptions regarding the role of a caregiver. This insight forces wider attitudes towards the idea of the family-based intervention that will not repeat the stereotypical gender roles in care.

Florence et al. (2024) expand on this by demonstrating how home-based models that involve culturally relevant engagement practices, e.g., family storytelling and rituals, promote emotional expression and family cohesion, which are both protective variables of suicide. Likewise, Li et al. (2024) point out that the flexibility term in service delivery (e.g., providing virtual or mobile services) can help to enhance the parental engagement rate, especially when it comes to families with transportation, time, or stigma-related barriers. However, despite these improvements, programs have been found to have a hard time balancing clinical objectives with family dynamics, which may involve trauma, mistrust, or a conflict between generations. Therefore, though family engagement methodology is identified as a best practice, its effectiveness depends on how well it is adapted to different family settings and cultural models.

4.4. Multisector Collaboration and Policy

Suicide prevention is cross-sectoral in nature, which requires cooperation among healthcare professionals, education systems, justice systems, social services, and local residents. Caine et al. (2017) state the case for community-based strategies that are intersectoral and encompass public health, mental health, and education. Their model suggests upstream, midstream, and downstream interventions that are centered on prevention, addressing high-risk populations, the youth, and crisis response and postvention, respectively. Alfaro et al. (2020) offer a rather strong example of a Latin American region in which multisectoral coalitions adjusted the local policies on health and education to make trauma-informed care possible in low-income communities. Such initiatives are promising, yet there are struggles in terms of coordination and the maintenance of interagency collaboration, especially where there are issues of bureaucratic fragmentation or funding constraints.

Linskens et al. (2022) also promote the whole-of-community model based on systems thinking, which framed the family systems as a part of broader systems. To this end, the former focus on piecemeal solutions is replaced by the latter one on seamless, interactive supports. Nevertheless, when it comes to practical application, ethical issues tend to become problematic in the context of ensuring both confidentiality and the right to protect or in regard to family consent when an issue of youth autonomy appears. According to Stuber and Quinnett (2013), the legal and ethical dilemmas of a practitioner in the field are posed by every instance of there being pressure on the practitioner to side one way or the other, with risk avoidance issues on the professional side sometimes triggering excessive use of institutionalization or coercion. Such frictions highlight an imperative to have defined legal provisions, trauma-oriented guidelines, and ethical guidelines that take into consideration the rights of youth and the participation of families.

5. Integration Challenges and Gaps

Regardless of the advancements that have been achieved in terms of the creation of suicide preventive measures, there are big obstacles that may not allow the seamless integration of crisis intervention into the community-based systems of family support. The unwillingness of youth and families to request help because of the cultural stigma and the lack of mental health literacy as well as language barriers has become one of the most resistant problems. According to Baldisserotto et al. (2019), stigma surrounding mental illness does not only postpone help-seeking behavior in the immigrant populations but also decreases the participation in the follow-up during treatment. This difficulty is further aided by the social setting where emotive distress is a taboo subject, causing underreporting and untreated traumas. Although stigma has also been addressed through awareness campaigns, it is limited because when it is not tailored in a culturally sensitive way based on particular beliefs and values in the community.

Stigma is not the only problem contributing to the crisis: structural barriers in the form of inaccessibility of trained professionals and long wait times are a contributing factor as well. Florence et al. (2024) state that school-based interventions often depend on overwhelmed counselors who are supposed to take care of intricate cases with little to no resources. Their results are comparable to the IES (2023), which emphasizes the fact that there is a rise in burnout among special educators and mental health providers, with many of them experiencing emotional exhaustion and high caseloads. Although the two works are in agreement regarding the negative effects of burnout on the performance of the providers, Florence et al. also highlight the fact that the issue is cyclical, as system strain triggers staff turnover,

which further enhances service gaps. The implication of this lies in the fact that sustainability in preventing suicide is not achievable without a system investment towards the wellbeing of the workforce.

A further complication lies in the fragmentation of services. Even though the community programs and crisis response teams may be working in similar areas, there is insufficient coordination among them. According to Jespersen et al. (2016), the young people are often discharged out of emergency departments without any evident routes of further assistance, particularly in rural and underserved communities. Even this continuity is somewhat compromised by siloed data systems and incompatibility of organizational mandates, which does not allow sharing of risk indicators in real time. Unlike models that have seen integration of primary care and behavioral health, the majority of the family-based reforms operate as independent projects that lack the chance to offer coordinated care.

Finally, policy frameworks often lag behind evolving best practices. The necessity of implementing trauma-informed and culturally responsive policies is widely recognized nowadays, but most recommendations have been based on one-size-fits-all practices. According to White and Kaffman (2019), trauma-informed care also means that emotional safety, trust, and empowerment must be instilled in all service delivery levels. Nevertheless, Sharma and Sargent (2017) warn that in the absence of a specific attitude toward culture, including how various communities define concepts of family roles or distressing emotions, trauma-informed strategies may turn out superficial or wrong. Policy and practice is a site of struggle contested by the implementation of evidence-based practice models through the fixed administrative regulations and a lack of funding opportunities (Mlambo K and Manetswa FM, 2025).

Addressing these challenges requires more than programmatic innovation. It requires intersectoral cooperation, participatory policymaking, and a promise of changing cultures in services to put family voices and community realities on the center stage. When there is no such structural alignment, then there is a risk that even the best models of intervention could prove to have no effect in real-world circumstances.

6. Proposed Framework for Integration

An integrated framework that focuses on families, allows early intervention, and builds on both automation technologies and human resources is asked to achieve the appropriate triaging and embedding of suicide prevention and crisis response to support people within community-based family support systems. Based on prior experience and new developments, the proposed structure focuses on four interconnected foundations: family-centered protocols on crisis, education and training of communities, applied technology on early detection, and coalitions directed locally.

The first aspect that makes this framework work is integrating Family-Based Crisis Intervention (FBCI) into community clinics and school systems. The FBCI model, described in detail by Wharff et al. (2019), was initially established in emergency department scenarios; however, the results obtained through this approach prove that well-structured and fast interventions incorporating both youth and their families have a great impact on the reduction of the number of psychiatric hospitalizations and even the enhancement of outcomes related to more controlled emotional responses. Expansion of FBCI to community mental health facilities as well as into schools is promising, in that it can ensure that families are reached at an earlier stage in the crisis trajectory, especially considering adapting the FBCI to fit local culture and local capabilities. These guidelines focus on resources, relational repair, and safety planning strategies, which are components of a lasting change.

Education of laypersons about identification and management of suicide risk is also crucial. Question, Persuade, Refer (QPR) and Psychological First Aid (PFA) are gatekeeper programs that showed effectiveness in promoting mental health literacy among non-professionals (WHO, 2011; Stuber and Quinnett, 2013). These models are especially applicable to underdeveloped communities where there exists a shortage of professional resources. By interlacing QPR along with PFA into community education through schools and religious and parent groups, the safety net becomes expanded, and increased trust with families and care systems is created. Community members usually have to be the first responders to a crisis, and well-trained members would be prone to respond to the crisis, which could save lives, as Stuber and Quinnett (2013) emphasize.

The other important pillar is the use of predictive analytics in order to detect early and intervene. Matende et al. (2025) shed light on the fact that machine learning algorithms allow finding the patterns in school attendance, social media behavior, and primary care data, which can be used to indicate a danger among at-risk youth when employed in an ethical manner. Although their use raises ethical and secrecy questions, it is irresistible to note that these technologies will enhance the clinical decision-making process, especially when incorporated to supplement but not to take the role of the human mind. The use of these tools in the organization of school health systems and the pediatric care framework can greatly reduce the gap between detected danger and the implementation of responsive measures.

Lastly, community-based coalitions are key to developing adaptive, context-specific suicide prevention efforts. Lai et al. (2020) report that this kind of coalition reacted successfully to the suicide clusters by enlisting the multi-agency response, including schools, mental health practitioners, local leaders, and family members. Such coalitions create a sense of individual responsibility and make sure that the local knowledge and community priorities are reflected in the prevention plans. Notably, they offer a monitoring and evaluation mechanism as well, which allows constant improvements in intervention work.

The combination of these four pillars comprises an effective, expandable model of how to incorporate crisis intervention and suicide prevention into community-based family provision. They embody a transition from reactive, fragmented care to proactive, relationship- and culturally sensitive outreach. As the communities and societies move to lower suicide among young people, this integrative approach provides a feasible means of reconciling policy, practice, and lived experience in the same communities experiencing the greatest impact of these issues.

7. Conclusion and Implications for Policy and Practice

This review has identified the highly significant nature of flexibly incorporating family-based models into community systems to enhance youth suicide prevention and crisis intervention. Emergency department programs, peer-led initiation, and multisector partnerships all serve as confirmed examples of the long-term and culturally appropriate results of the programs based on community inclusion and familial bonds rather than separate clinical work. Examples of the coordinated, inclusive approach to suicide risk reduction and the support of vulnerable youth would include such models as Family-Based Crisis Intervention (Wharff et al., 2019), (Musekiwa P et. al, 2025), lived experience frameworks (Schlichthorst et al., 2020), and school-based peer programs (Singer et al., 2019).

The implications of this synthesis are far-reaching. The urgency related to health systems is an inability to incorporate suicide prevention into primary and behavioral care systems with support of engagement by families. School districts should aim at implementing early-detection and reaction plans that would set caregivers as well as students in the response strategies, and students are not the only ones who need to be trained on how to react to crises. In the case of policymakers, the results indicate that they need to enact policies that will amount to cross-sector coordination, culturally responsive services, and long-term investment in community-based programs.

Among the major solutions to reduce suicide, it is proposed that investments be made to enhance cross-disciplinary training among mental health professionals, educators, and community leaders; models of postvention should be introduced that support the families in cases of suicidal attempts or deaths (Melhem et al., 2023); and that standardized and specific to the systems crisis response plans be developed (Mann et al., 2021). Such measures must be supported by continuous research and consultation in the community to be in tandem with different cultural settings.

Finally, the current study draws attention to the need to extend culturally responsive, family-based suicide prevention interventions that accommodate the emotional and systemic components of youth mental health. The development of caring, strong, and responsive support systems necessitates not just clinical innovation but also a policy culture that puts an emphasis on a family as a prime partner in prevention and healing.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Alfaro, J., Rota, J.M.F., Gamonal, P., Martin, M.P. and Verdugo, I. (2020). Analysis of public policy formulation and its effect on the technical and professional work of the community psychologist: A case study. Journal of Community Psychology, 49(1), pp.10–29. doi:https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22412.

[2] Asarnow, J.R., Berk, M.S. and Baraff, L.J., 2009. Family Intervention for Suicide Prevention: A specialized emergency department intervention for suicidal youths. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 40(2), p.118.

[3] Baldisserotto, M.L., Miranda Theme, M., Gomez, L.Y. and dos Reis, T.B.Q. (2019). Barriers to Seeking and Accepting Treatment for Perinatal Depression: A Qualitative Study in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Community Mental Health Journal, 56(1), pp.99–106. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00450-4.

[4] Brodsky, B.S., Spruch-Feiner, A. and Stanley, B. (2018). The Zero Suicide Model: Applying Evidence-Based Suicide Prevention Practices to Clinical Care. Frontiers in Psychiatry, [online] 9(33). doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2018.00033.

[5] Busby, D.R., Hatkevich, C., McGuire, T.C. and King, C.A. (2020). Evidence-Based Interventions for Youth Suicide Risk. Current Psychiatry Reports, 22(2). doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-020-1129-6.

[6] Caine, E.D., Reed, J., Hindman, J. and Quinlan, K. (2017). Comprehensive, integrated approaches to suicide prevention: practical guidance. Injury Prevention, 24(Suppl 1), pp.i38–i45. doi:https://doi.org/10.1136/injuryprev-2017-042366.

[7] Cecchin, H.F.G. and Murta, S.G., 2025. Suicide prevention starts before the crisis: intervention guidelines for university students. Psicologia, Reflexão e Crítica: revista semestral do Departamento de Psicologia da UFRGS, 38, p.21.

[8] Comans, T., Visser, V. and Scuffham, P. (2013). Cost Effectiveness of a Community-Based Crisis Intervention Program for People Bereaved by Suicide. Crisis, 34(6), pp.390–397. doi:https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000210.

[9] Florence, M., Cecilia, M., De Los, E., Lilibeth, R., Marjorie, P., & Corresponding, A. (2024). Predictors of Well-Being Among Special Education Teachers. 4(1), 121–135. https://wjehr.com/__static/f41239a26e3d065d0ad9ab75eba48808/predictors-of-well-being-among-special-education-teachers.pdf

[10] Gay, M. (2025). Enhancing youth suicide prevention: The critical role of family involvement in screening, intervention, and postvention. Families Systems & Health. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/fsh0000994.

[11] Gerhardt, M., Feng, X., Wu, Q., Hooper, E. G., Ku, S., and Chan, M. H. (2020). A naturalistic study of parental emotion socialization: Unique contributions of fathers. Journal of Family Psychology, 34(2), 204–214. https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000602

[12] Gerhardt, M., Feng, X., Wu, Q., Hooper, E.G., Ku, S. and Chan, M.H. (2020). A naturalistic study of parental emotion socialization: Unique contributions of fathers. Journal of Family Psychology, 34(2), pp.204–214. doi:https://doi.org/10.1037/fam0000602.

[13] Giles, L., Shepard, L., Asarnow, J. and Keeshin, B.R. (2021). Implementation of a Trauma-Informed Suicide Prevention Intervention for Youth Presenting to the Emergency Department in Crisis. Evidence-Based Practice in Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 6(3), pp.343–353. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/23794925.2021.1961643.

[14] Ginnis, K.B., White, E.M., Ross, A.M. and Wharff, E.A. (2013). Family-Based Crisis Intervention in the Emergency Department: A New Model of Care. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 24(1), pp.172–179. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-013-9823-1.

[15] Goncearenco, I., Chennapragada, L. and Rogers, M.L. (2023). The Narrative-Crisis Model of Suicide as a Framework for Suicide Prevention. Oxford University Press eBooks, [online] pp.465-C10P257. doi:https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780197582718.003.0010.

[16] IES STAFF. (2023). Special Educator Shortage: Examining Teacher Burnout and Mental Health | IES. Ed.gov. https://ies.ed.gov/learn/blog/special-educator-shortage-examining-teacher-burnout-and-mental-health

[17] Jespersen, S., Lawman, B., Reed, F., Hawke, K., Plummer, V. and Gaskin, C.J. (2016). The Impact of Integrating Crisis Teams into Community Mental Health Services on Emergency Department and Inpatient Demand. Psychiatric Quarterly, 87(4), pp.703–712. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s11126-016-9420-8.

[18] Lai, C.C.S., Law, Y.W., Shum, A.K.Y., Ip, F.W.L. and Yip, P.S.F. (2020). A Community-Based Response to a Suicide Cluster. Crisis, 41(3), pp.163–171. doi:https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000616.

[19] Li, Y., Maina, G., Mousavian, G., Fang, Y., Twum-Antwi, B., Sherstobitoff, J., Amoyaw, J., and Pandey, M. (2024). Family-based interventions of preventing substance use among immigrant youth: A scoping review. Substance Use: Research and Treatment, 18, Article 29768357241244680. https://doi.org/10.1177/29768357241244680

[20] Linskens, E.J., Venables, N.C., Gustavson, A.M., Sayer, N.A., Murdoch, M., MacDonald, R., Ullman, K.E., McKenzie, L.G., Wilt, T.J. and Sultan, S. (2022). Population- and Community-Based Interventions to Prevent Suicide. Crisis, 44(4). doi:https://doi.org/10.1027/0227-5910/a000873.

[21] Kudzotsa CP and Musekiwa P, Culturally Responsive Family Intervention Models for At-Risk Immigrant Youth in The United States, Paper ID: 1710792, Page: 1187-1196, Published Date: 23-09-2025, Published In: Iconic Research And Engineering Journals, Publisher: IRE Journals, e-ISSN: 2456-8880, Volume/Issue: Volume 9 Issue 3 September-2025, https://www.irejournals.com/index.php/paper-details/1710792

[22] Mann, J.J., Michel, C.A. and Auerbach, R.P. (2021). Improving suicide prevention through evidence-based strategies: A systematic review. American Journal of Psychiatry, [online] 178(7), pp.611–624. doi:https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2020.20060864.

[23] Markov, G. and Kenarov, D. (2018). Prostitution. Ploughshares, 44(3), pp.179–190. doi:https://doi.org/10.1353/plo.2018.0068.

[24] Matende, W., Remias, T., Muguti, S., & Mutoto, C. (2025). Leveraging Predictive Analytics to Identify At-Risk Students in Secondary Mathematics: An Intervention Framework for Urban and Rural School Districts.

[25] Musekiwa P, et. al (2025), Bridging the Gap: Integrating disability-friendly economic empowerment programs into child and family support systems, World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2025, 27(03), 306–315, Article DOI: 10.30574/wjarr.2025.27.3.3042 DOI url: https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.27.3.3042

[26] Melhem, N., Moutier, C.Y. and Brent, D.A. (2023). Implementing Evidence-Based Suicide Prevention Strategies for Greatest Impact. FOCUS, 21(2), pp.117–128. doi:https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.focus.20220078

[27] Mlambo K and Manetswa FM, Designing and Implementing Behaviorally Elementary and Middle School Students with Emotional Disabilities in Multicultural Settings, Paper ID: 1709716, Page: 893-903, Published Date: 22-07-2025, Published In: Iconic Research And Engineering Journals, Publisher: IRE Journals, e-ISSN: 2456-8880, Volume/Issue: Volume 9 Issue 1 July-202, https://www.irejournals.com/paper-details/1709716

[28] Niederkrotenthaler, T. (2024). Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention | Hogrefe. [online] www.hogrefe.com. Available at: https://www.hogrefe.com/us/journal/crisis.

[29] Schlichthorst, M., Ozols, I., Reifels, L. and Morgan, A. (2020). Lived experience peer support programs for suicide prevention: a systematic scoping review. International Journal of Mental Health Systems, 14(1). doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-020-00396-1.

[30] Schmidt, R., Iachini, A., Renee, M. and Weist, M.D. (2015). Integrating a Suicide Prevention Program into a School Mental Health System: A Case Example from a Rural... [online] ResearchGate. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282469647_Integrating_a_Suicide_Prevention_Program_into_a_School_Mental_Health_System_A_Case_Example_from_a_Rural_School_District.

[31] Sharma, N. and Sargent, J. (2017). Family and Community Intervention in Suicide Prevention and Management. Suicide Among Diverse Youth, pp.221–238. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-66203-9_14.

[32] Singer, J.B., Erbacher, T.A. and Rosen, P. (2019). School-Based Suicide Prevention: A Framework for Evidence-Based Practice. School Mental Health, 11(1), pp.54–71. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s12310-018-9245-8.

[33] Stuber, J. and Quinnett, P. (2013). Making the Case for Primary Care and Mandated Suicide Prevention Education. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 43(2), pp.117–124. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/sltb.12010.

[34] Téllez-Vargas, J. and Osorno, J. (2021). Community-Based Interventions in Suicide Prevention. Springer eBooks, pp.1–24. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41319-4_59-1.

[35] Thompson, E.L., Livingston, M.D., Daley, E.M. and Zimet, G.D. (2018). Human Papillomavirus Vaccine Initiation for Adolescents Following Rhode Island's School-Entry Requirement, 2010–2016. American Journal of Public Health, 108(10), pp.1421–1423. doi:https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2018.304552.

[36] Walsh, A.K., Morganstein, J.C., Heintz Morrissey, B., Weingrad, A.B., Reissman, D.B., West, J.C., Naifeh, J.A., Fullerton, C.S. and Ursano, R.J., 2025. A suicide haddon matrix for intervention and prevention to reduce suicide risk. *Psychiatry*, *88*(1), pp.1-12.

[37] Wharff, E.A., Ginnis, K.B., Ross, A.M., White, E.M., White, M.T. and Forbes, P.W. (2019). Family-Based Crisis Intervention With Suicidal Adolescents: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Pediatric Emergency Care*, [online] 35(3), pp.170–175. doi:https://doi.org/10.1097/PEC.0000000000001076.

[38] White, J.D. and Kaffman, A. (2019). Editorial Perspective: Childhood maltreatment – the problematic *unisex assumption*. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry and allied disciplines*, 61(6), pp.732–734. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.13177.

[39] World Health Organization (2011). *Psychological first aid: Guide for field workers*. [online] www.who.int. Available at: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789241548205.